

Appendix

Address by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, Before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address I delivered in Chicago, Ill., on December 11, 1958, before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ABSTRACT OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, AT THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 11, 1958

These are times when prudent men should analyze the changes which are occurring against the indisputable fact that free enterprise democracy is the source of this country's greatness.

There is no doubt that developments such as those in atomic energy, rocketry, and so forth, have placed us upon the threshold of a new era.

In addition, this country is experiencing great increase in population.

While we may have unduly exploited our resources, they are still tremendous.

Our productive know-how and capacity are yet unsurpassed.

These are elements on which free enterprise democracy should thrive, and proceed soundly and constructively for the good of all mankind.

Our free enterprise democracy is the greatest system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money.

It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak. This basic requirement of our system is equally vital to all of us as individuals, and to every segment of our people—labor, management, agriculture, finance, professions, government, and so forth.

With fiscal soundness I would have no fear for the future, economically or militarily. I would anticipate the period ahead with enthusiasm for my children and with pride in the contribution of my own generation.

Without solvency and sound money there will be neither solid economic progress nor national security with military preparedness.

Assurance of fiscal soundness in the future does not now exist. This is my concern.

We cannot perpetuate national solvency and integrity of the dollar through continuous deficit spending, unchecked national debt, and spiraling inflation. This situation jeopardizes our system of government and our future.

With only two bona fide exceptions, we have been on a deficit financing basis for 29 years. The fiscal situation deteriorated faster this year than in any comparable peacetime period to my knowledge.

Between January and June, we moved from estimates of virtually balanced budgets in the past and current years to combined deficits totaling \$15 billion.

At the present rate, Federal agencies would spend more than \$400 billion in 5 years. This would mean a Federal debt of more than \$300 billion is in immediate prospect. This would be the highest national debt in the history of the world.

During the past session of Congress we were forced to raise the statutory limit on the national debt twice within 7 months. This was unprecedented. But we are forewarned. Some people are now contending the recent election was a mandate for even more dangerous Federal spending activity.

If more programs for nonessential spending should be adopted by the new Congress to be convened next month, our fiscal situation will deteriorate faster next year.

From experience it is to be expected that, if such new programs are enacted they will be long-term in nature with huge multiyear commitments for the future. It is programs of this kind that make the Federal budget so difficult to reduce when the necessity is upon us.

Contrary to general understanding, recent great increases in Federal spending have not been for defense and foreign aid. They have been for domestic-civilian programs.

Since 1954, expenditures outside of defense, atomic energy, and foreign aid categories have increased from \$19.1 billion a year to \$33.4 billion. This is an increase of \$14.3 billion, or 75 percent.

It is in this category where we find so many Federal programs which may be popular, or even desirable, but nonessential.

Much of the domestic-civilian spending is for subsidies. And many of these subsidy programs are bottomless pits for Federal spending and contribute to sky-high inflation. Most of the proposals following the recent election were of this nature.

The Federal Government of the United States cannot now pay its bills except by increasing debt and inflation. Revenue from present tax rates does not meet our commitments.

Interest on the Federal debt is now taking more than 11 cents out of every tax dollar, and chronic inflation has reduced the purchasing power of our money 52 percent. The American dollar is now worth 48 cents by the 1939 index.

Inflation destroys fixed incomes, provident investment, prudent business, sound financing, national security, and democratic government.

More than 20 years of destructive inflation in this country to date have led to continual demands for increased subsidization.

The Federal Government is now subsidizing business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, health, education, States, localities, individuals, and so forth.

By the process of cheapening our money and centralizing power in the Federal Government, we have descended to a level of state socialism which is obvious, if not admitted.

Social democracy is a subterfuge for sound

government and constructive enterprise. Its evils are historically documented wherever nations have stooped to it.

Herein lies my concern, as I indicated before. Our free enterprise democracy is being undermined. In our present position there is no assurance of fiscal soundness for the future. In these circumstances, how can we hope fully to develop the great potentialities which lie ahead?

I think the situation is urgent. We must start Federal fiscal recovery immediately. Such recovery must start with balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and stopping inflation.

This must be our goal. Responsibility for achieving it lies equally upon the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States, individually and collectively.

The President originates budget recommendations, and the Congress enacts the authority for Federal spending. Both respond to the expressed will of the people.

The budget for the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, is being formulated at the White House now. I discussed the situation with the President last August when Congress adjourned. I have noted his actions since that time, especially his orders of the last few weeks. I hope and believe he will recommend a balanced budget for next year.

I have come to Chicago today to emphasize the seriousness of the problems confronting us. I believe by your own examination you would find I do not exaggerate the conditions we have allowed to develop, or the consequences we might expect if we continue on our present course.

The Federal position alone is bad enough, but we must keep the whole picture in view.

As background keep these facts in mind:

Total public expenditures in this country—Federal, State, and local—this year will be approximately \$145 billion.

Federal, State, and local governments this year will take approximately \$130 billion out of the pockets of American taxpayers in revenue receipts from all sources.

In their regular budgets Federal, State, and local governments this year will run deficits totaling some \$15 billion.

Public debt—Federal, State, and local—this year will approach \$350 billion.

Private debt now totals more than \$500 billion.

This means our economy is burdened with indebtedness amounting to between \$800 billion and \$900 billion. This is close to a trillion dollars. These are figures beyond ordinary comprehension.

When individuals become insolvent, they take bankruptcy and dispose of their obligations. When governments become insolvent their money becomes worthless, and they go through some kind of a revolution wringer. The nature and the process may vary. But invariably the form of government is changed. Democratic government, as we have known it, could not survive.

Of course, I concede the necessity of deficits in extreme national emergencies.

For the first 150 years of our history we met our emergencies when they arose, but when they were over we promptly restored sound financing, characterized by balanced budgets, and began paying off the debt.

Under this practice, combined with our wealth and natural resources, this Nation grew great in the short span of a century and a half. But in our time we have not only

continued exploitation of our resources, we have abandoned our traditional policy of fiscal soundness.

For 25 years, through 1955, we were on a deficit basis without real exception. In that period the Federal debt rose from about \$16 billion to \$274 billion, and from 1939 the value of the dollar dropped at an average of more than 3 cents a year.

Finally, in 2 consecutive fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, we brought the Federal budget back into real balance. At the same time we financed substantial tax reduction, reduced the debt, and slowed inflation down to a virtual stop.

After a quarter century of deficit financing, rising debt and spiraling inflation these balanced budgets gave us reason to hope we were back on an even peacetime keel.

But for reasons I shall never understand, the President in January 1957 brought in his budget for fiscal year 1958 proposing an \$8 billion increase in expenditures. It was the biggest peacetime spending budget to that date.

You remember that budget 2 years ago. The country was shocked. There has never been anything like the opposition which developed spontaneously from the grassroots of this Nation.

Congress responded, and reduced appropriations by billions. But in the complexities of big government, with tremendous balances remaining in prior appropriations, expenditures rose notwithstanding. They were rising before sputnik and recession appeared on the scene.

This brought us to the conditions of the past fiscal year which ended June 30 and the present fiscal year which started July 1. Original estimates for these 2 years showed a combined surplus of \$2.3 billion. By the latest figures this has changed to a combined deficit of \$15 billion.

I emphasize these figures to tell the story of record-breaking deterioration in the Federal fiscal situation.

Seizing upon sputnik and recession as justification, Congress in the past session insisted upon enactment of legislation which could require Federal expenditures at an annual rate of \$80 billion for years to come.

All of the New Deal recovery programs from 1933 to 1939 combined cost us only about half of the current year expenditure budget. This year's budget was exceeded only in the 2 peak years of World War II.

The Korean war has been over more than 5 years. But Federal budgets in that costly campaign never came close to the level of Federal expenditures reached this year.

When the present administration came into office it established a commendable record. It reduced expenditures in 2 consecutive fiscal years—1954 and 1955.

But from a low point of \$64.5 billion in that period, expenditures have now been increased to this year's estimate of \$81.7 billion. For accurate comparison this figure includes expenditures for highways and Federal National Mortgage Association which are now financed through so-called trust funds.

To show the tremendous increase in domestic-civilian expenditures—straight from the budget documents, here is the Federal spending record for the period from fiscal year 1954 to date:

1. In categories other than domestic-civilian:

Expenditures for military functions have been increased \$500 million, from \$40.3 billion to \$40.8 billion.

Expenditures for stockpile and defense production have been decreased \$600 million from \$1 billion to \$400 million.

Expenditures for atomic energy have been increased \$700 million, from \$1.9 billion to \$2.6 billion.

Expenditures for foreign military assistance have been decreased \$1.4 billion from \$3.6 billion to \$2.2 billion.

Expenditures for foreign economic aid have been increased \$400 million from \$1.5 billion to \$1.9 billion.

Expenditures for international affairs have been increased \$100 million, from \$200 million to \$300 million.

From these figures, it can be seen that Federal expenditures in categories other than

domestic-civilian have been decreased \$300 million since 1954, from \$48.6 billion to \$48.3 billion.

2. But in the same period since 1954, domestic-civilian expenditures have been increased \$14.3 billion, from \$19.1 billion to \$33.4 billion.

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1954-59

[In billions of dollars]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
National security:						
Military functions.....	40.3	35.5	35.8	38.4	39.0	40.8
Stockpile and defense production.....	1.0	.9	.6	.5	.6	.4
Atomic energy.....	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6
Subtotal, national security.....	43.3	38.3	38.0	40.9	41.9	43.8
Foreign aid:						
Military assistance.....	3.6	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.2
Economic and other aid.....	1.5	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.9
Subtotal, foreign aid.....	5.1	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
International affairs.....	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3
Total, other than domestic-civilian.....	48.6	42.8	42.5	45.2	46.3	48.3
Domestic civilian:						
Veterans services and benefits.....	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.2
Labor and welfare.....	2.5	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.4	4.3
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	2.6	4.4	4.9	4.6	4.5	6.4
Natural resources.....	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7
Commerce and housing.....	.8	1.4	2.1	3.4	3.8	6.4
General government.....	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.7
Interest.....	6.5	6.4	6.8	7.3	7.7	7.6
Allowance for contingencies.....						.2
Total, domestic-civilian.....	19.1	21.7	24.2	26.1	27.3	33.4
Grand total.....	67.8	64.5	66.7	71.4	73.6	81.7

¹ For comparison, includes trust fund expenditures of Federal National Mortgage Association beginning fiscal year 1955, and highways beginning fiscal year 1957.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

I suggest the new proposal to expand the urban renewal program as an example of domestic-civilian programs which are bottomless pits for Federal expenditures.

In the first place, I think people should keep up their own property. I know of no reason why the Federal Government should absorb two-thirds of the loss entailed in cleaning up huge city subdivisions to be used for private profit.

Federal funds already available for this program total \$1 billion for loans and \$1.2 billion for cash grants. These tremendous sums will not be a drop in the bucket if we are to undertake these projects in cities and towns from one end of this country to the other.

Federal subsidies generally constitute a vast field of domestic-civilian expenditures. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures is contemplating a study of the subject.

At the outset we are confronted with two questions: What is a subsidy? Who is subsidized?

Nearly 40 million people will receive direct payments from the Federal Treasury this year. This includes nearly 200,000 Federal employees working overseas. Generally speaking, these 40 million people with their families could reach a number equivalent to half of the population of the United States.

Nearly \$80 billion is outstanding at this moment under so-called Federal credit programs for housing, veterans, agriculture, commerce, defense production, small business, and so forth. This has increased \$12 billion in the last 3 years.

Grants to State and local governments now total \$4.9 billion. There are now 62 programs for State and local subsidy.

When I came to the Senate 25 years ago, there was only one State aid program of any consequence. That was the highway program which was costing \$250 million.

I mention these categories of Federal expenditures simply to illustrate the areas

where there may be subsidies which do not meet the eye. There are others. For instance, who is subsidized by the postal deficit?

It may be contended that the foreign agricultural trade development programs are another subsidy to American agriculture.

Are the beneficiaries of government contracts with industry and institutions subsidized to the degree that they think they have a vested interest in the level of Federal expenditures? Reaction to justifiable reductions a year ago would indicate an affirmative answer.

A great fallacy has been built up around Federal payments, whether you call them subsidies or choose to avoid the ugly word. People have gotten the idea that they are getting something for nothing.

There is no greater mistake. American taxpayers sooner or later pay every dime of the expenditures through these programs, and more.

When we are on a sound basis we pay these costs directly from taxes. If we are on a deficit basis we charge them into the debt, pay interest on the loan until we pay off the obligation, and stimulate inflated prices in the process.

In either event, about 15 percent goes into overhead for Federal administration. Since I have been in the Senate, interest on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than \$100 billion.

Until we get Federal expenditures down, balance the budget, and stop inflation, there is no hope for sound tax reduction. To reduce taxes when we are on a deficit basis simply charges the tax cut into the Federal debt. This aggravates the whole deficit-inflation cycle.

Others may have their own programs for the coming new Congress. Mine would have two objectives. The first would be to balance the Federal budget. The second would be legislation to correct abuses practiced by unscrupulous labor leaders primarily

against labor itself, but also against management and the public.

Practices revealed by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee are a national disgrace. I voted for legislation in the past session of Congress to correct these abuses. I shall vote for it again this year. It should have the support of the rank and file of labor, management and the general public.

I am frequently accused of being against labor. This is because I support the best interest of the laboring man; not the powerful labor czar.

I favor the right to work. But statements by certain labor leaders make it definite that when the new Congress convenes, great effort will be made to enact legislation to make States right-to-work laws invalid.

This would be another usurpation of State authority and still further concentration of power at Washington. Such an effort should be resisted to the utmost.

It is certain, too, that these same labor leaders will attempt to federalize unemployment insurance now administered by the States.

A strong effort to this end was made last year. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I fought the proposal and it was defeated.

The purpose of the move to federalize unemployment insurance is not only to standardize the law for all States, but also the payments for all business and industry.

To federalize unemployment insurance would mean that the powerful labor lobby would be constantly applying pressure on Congress for increased benefits and extension of the payment period.

Early introduction of both of these proposals is certain, and the need to resist them is obvious. In our present condition, I think the Government of the United States is dangerously vulnerable to the influence of ruthless labor dictators.

I am fully aware that the achievement of both of my objectives—correcting abuses by labor leaders and balancing the Federal budget—will be extremely difficult. I am the only man remaining in the Senate who voted against the Wagner Act and for 25 years I have analyzed the budgets submitted by three Presidents.

Year after year I have gone over every expenditure and appropriation item, and these number some 1,100.

I know the problems involved in our outmoded appropriation procedures. I know the devices which have been developed to bypass appropriation control, such as authority to spend directly from the public debt.

I know how difficult it is to reduce expenditures when unexpended balances in prior appropriations approach or exceed the new requests to which annual congressional action ordinarily is limited.

In the current year approximately \$147 billion will be available to Federal spending agencies, \$75 billion or more in new spending authorizations enacted this year, and approximately \$72 billion in unexpended balances carried over from prior years.

The President has a dual responsibility: First, to originate the budget with requests for the new year and, second, to administer the expenditures from both old and new money. I hope he will take the lead not only in balancing the Federal expenditure budget for the coming year, but in the full recovery of our fiscal stability.

On my own experience I submit that expenditure reductions of the necessary magnitude, if applied with care and wisdom, would strengthen our economy, strengthen our Government, strengthen our national defense and strengthen our international position.

I am certain that such reductions can be

made in all of the Federal sending categories—military, foreign aid, and domestic-civilian.

With respect to defense expenditures, we should rechart the whole military program and reevaluate the objectives of our spending in view of changing methods of warfare.

I yield to no one in advocacy of national defense but, as the President has said, there is waste and duplication in the military departments.

We unified the armed services. We adopted the Eberstadt amendments for businesslike operations in the Military Establishment. We passed the Military Procurement Act. We revised military pay scales and increased survivors benefits to allow the Armed Forces to compete for capable personnel. In the past session of Congress we enacted the military reorganization bill.

It is time these actions paid off in economy and efficiency for more defense at less money.

The waste in foreign aid, especially economic aid, has been obvious from its inception. We enacted the Marshall plan in 1948 for 4 years. Postwar foreign aid expenditures have now run more than a decade. To date our gross authorizations for foreign aid expenditures have totaled more than \$80 billion.

Expenditures for economic aid should be sharply curtailed. Our best interests, and those of our allies, would be better served by preserving the integrity of the American dollar to stimulate international trade.

I know, basic legislation will be required for substantial reduction in domestic-civilian expenditures. This will require the exercise of statesmanlike leadership by the President and the unwavering support of Congress and the public.

But I urge the President in his January budget message to submit a blueprint for substantial expenditure reductions in all categories and to follow through with specific legislative recommendations where they are necessary. I pledge him my support and I hope this objective will have yours.

I am aware of the cynical contention that what this country wants is continuing inflation and a fast-buck economy, with no regard for the certain consequences and the next generation.

But I feel certain that the great majority of the people of this Nation want the integrity of our money protected, want their form of government preserved, and want their free enterprise system to survive, in order that we may pursue this Nation's great mission in the world.

If this is what we want, we must have a national crusade from the grassroots to save our representative democracy which is founded upon the free enterprise system.

Such a crusade must be inspired and led by the President. It must be supported by the Congress—House and Senate. Most important of all, it must be fired by the people themselves.

From long experience in the Senate of the United States I can say the voice of the people in this country, if it is loud enough, will overcome selfish and highly organized minorities and will prevail—that is the great virtue of our constitutional democracy as contrasted with dictatorship.

So the job is up to you and every other citizen.

Our people must remember that the very foundation of our democracy rests upon the fact that people must support the Government. It is not the purpose of government to support the people.

The national interest must come ahead of private gain.

So, to achieve our objectives, there must be sacrifice all down the line.

Responsibilities of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on November 11, 1958, at St. Andrew's Cathedral, Honolulu, T.H., Lt. Gen. Vernon E. Magee, U.S. Marine Corps, delivered a very important address entitled, "The Responsibilities of Citizenship." The address which was delivered on that historic occasion is such a fine presentation of an important matter that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address is ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP, AN ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. VERNON E. MAGEE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ON THE OCCASION OF VETERANS DAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1958

Bishop Kennedy, distinguished guests, veterans of the service of the United States, I am singularly honored this morning with the privilege of addressing you from the pulpit of this great cathedral.

This is a privilege which comes to few laymen; I accept it with humility and reverence. It is fitting that we should choose this sacred temple for our purpose this morning. My fellow veterans, of whatever religion, who have walked through the valley of the shadow of death, will not forget that we did not walk alone. We were sustained through our ordeal by a spiritual presence—by whatever name called—whose earthly abode is in our churches and our temples. Thus, in meeting here this morning, we do reverence to that Supreme Being, and honor to our mortal brothers, the veterans of the United States.

Today marks the 40th anniversary of the armistice of World War I. America's greatest and most costly war to end all wars had come to an end. Some few of us here remember all too vividly the events of those action-packed years. The then Commander in Chief, President Wilson, who had been successful in carrying the great war to a victorious conclusion, was soon to learn that it was easier to win a war than to make lasting peace. For since that war we have added to the rolls 15 million veterans of an even greater war, and 5 million veterans of Korea. It is small wonder that the original observance of Armistice Day is no longer appropriate; and that by logical evolution we now dedicate this date of November 11 to all veterans.

Here in this historic area where World War II began, the day has real meaning. For no other city of American soil has Honolulu's distinction. If our Nation should ever again be forced into general warfare, Honolulu will not be so singularly honored. It is with this in mind that we who have spent years in learning the techniques of war are now learning the more difficult task of keeping the peace.

Three times within my span of service, the United States determined that it was willing to cast its lot in the fight against aggression and went to war in support of our beliefs. It may appear to be an anomaly, but our love for peace has never been so great that we were not willing to fight for the preservation of those principles and relationships which are the only justifiable foundations of peace.

In these short hours dedicated to our veterans, it is well to recall proudly the great scenes of the past wherein our freedom was won, nurtured and maintained. In our minds we can see the battles and picture the places where freedom was tested and where freedom triumphed. We can think of the shot heard round the world at Concord and Lexington, of the bitter winter at Valley Forge, of the long lean years of the Revolution, to be terminated finally with the triumph at Yorktown.

Then there were other places like Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Manila Bay, the Argonne Forest, and Belleau Wood; and World War II with the flaming beach at Anzio, the enervating jungle of Guadalcanal, the concentrated hell of Tarawa, Iwo Jima, and Omaha Beach on Normandy, and lastly the defense of freedom in far away Korea. These were some of the places.

Then there were the men, Washington, John Paul Jones, Grant, Lee, Pershing, Eisenhower, MacArthur, King, Arnold, Nimitz, Halsey, and Howlin' Mad Smith. The places and the men who led. Names burned forever in the mind, tattooed across the soul of freedom. With them go many other names. The lesser known places where great bravery changed history. Places where American boys were laid down forever and kept their rendezvous with death, in the hills and valleys of these United States, in the blue depths of the oceans, and in the good earth of strange foreign lands.

The boys who did these things and went to these places had names, too, be they O'Brien, Mitsuiz, Ginsburg, or Smith. They came from the farms with a rifle. They came from the cities with nothing but their courage. Some were poor and some were rich. They were of all races and religions and they shared the greatest of all adventures. To them all, including you veterans, in and out of uniform, and especially to those who never came back, we owe our freedom. This annual observance of Veterans' Day gives us the opportunity to acknowledge our debt.

True to this tradition and heritage, the personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States today stand strong and ready to carry on. In numbers we are the greatest ever to serve in peacetime. In training, morale, and equipment, we are also the best fitted. It is well that this be so. Never before has freedom been so totally threatened. Across the world a tough competitor, an alien ideology called communism, continues with relentless pressures its timeless march on world domination. All of the people of America are involved in this struggle. Yet we are not alone. This burden is shared by our friends and allies, by the people of the countries of NATO, of SEATO, by those with whom we have bilateral agreements, and by millions of yet uncommitted people of the world, all of whom seek and cherish freedom. Many of these people are free and can speak out. Some are rising in their struggle for self-expression, for a better way of life. Some are silent, speaking only with their eyes and their hearts, for they lie behind a curtain of darkness.

The grave responsibilities of this battle for the minds of men and the serious threats to our security and freedom, are things shared by all of these millions, including our own people who live in these islands of strength of the free world. No one can hide in his shell, leaving the job to others. No one can go away. No longer is there any place to go. The cold war belongs to us all and the effort toward peace is indivisible. There is no one answer. No taxes will pay the price. Each life and mind must be mobilized and dedicated to service. We cannot change this godless communism, but we can change ourselves, so that with strength and a belief in God we can continue to enjoy the free sunshine of living.

Strength comes from many sources. Most of all, it is deep within man himself. Let us, therefore, look at this strength. Let us not look too long at the vast organization, the missiles, the ships, or the aircraft. Let us look rather at the people. The weapons are awesomely new and different. Great technical changes have been unfolded and continue to occur almost every day. For instance, one need only to note the nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*. Missiles that can span oceans and continents, and satellites orbiting the world, indicate the profound change. Just ahead is the exploration and conquest of space.

Suffice it to say, our technical progress is remarkable, almost mysterious, and bows to no other. We must be thankful for it and continue its progress, making certain we never stifle the basic research that springs from the mind of man and grows to make these wonders possible.

But, we should bear in mind that men will succeed on land, in the air, over and under the sea, in space itself, only to the extent that they succeed as men. Without moral growth, technological growth is but the tinkling of cymbals and the clang of brass.

Our weakness as a Nation, our Achilles heel, is not in material things. Our danger lies elsewhere in the realm of the spiritual, in the weakening of moral fiber within our youth.

Like the Nation in general, the armed services have been plagued by a deterioration in the quality of the manpower upon whom we must depend. The services are but a cross section of our country, and we inherit inevitably some of the juvenile delinquency, cynical attitudes, greed and laziness, and even open crime that have eaten into parts of our Nation. While the percentage of our delinquents is small, we must remember that the virus of cancer starts from a tiny cell.

We of the services are facing these problems and finding solutions. Moral issues have now been clarified; the responsibilities of leadership have been impressed on each person in authority, to the end that each man may be imbued with zeal, pride in his work, efficiency, devotion to duty, and a feeling of genuine patriotism. And as a bonus, greater happiness and success in his job.

These principles of leadership are equally applicable to the civilian community, whose responsibility it is to teach our young the basic virtues of citizenship. While the process of moral decay is a vicious cycle, with each person and each level in society afflicting the others, the antidote of moral revitalization also works in ever-widening circles. Trends of moral decay can be reversed. Steps toward moral greatness can be taken. Let us then rise to the challenge and resolve to meet our obligations as citizens.

You veterans, now out of uniform, have a tremendous potential for good, both as individuals and as organizations. You are the respected citizens of your communities. Your horizons have been widened by your service. Your responsibilities as citizens are accordingly increased. It is your duty to set an example to the youth of our land, an example of patriotism, unselfishness, and moral integrity. By so doing, you will make easier our task of shaping and training our future citizens in arms. You will, by example, demonstrate to our youth that patriotism is more than 4th of July oratory, more than the pageantry of Veterans' Day. We of the armed services consider the veterans to be our most effective link with the civilian community. We depend on you to keep that link strong and effective.

Only through such effective leadership can we become strong as individuals and grow stronger as a Nation. Amid the perils and opportunities of a greatly troubled world, our strength is the shield of our freedom.

We can rise to moral greatness in peace as in war, and in that greatness lies our strength.

Distinguished Service Award Presentation to Harry F. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it was very pleasing to all Virginia, as well as to a large national group of friends and admirers of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, when the American Farm Bureau Federation presented to him at its meeting in Boston on December 10, 1958, its Distinguished Service Award. Throughout a long and successful political career, farming and the welfare of the farmers have been major considerations with Senator BYRD. He well merited the honor conferred upon him by the American Farm Bureau Federation, and I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the presentation.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SHUMAN. Senator HARRY F. BYRD's long and distinguished record in the Senate of the United States has earned him the respect of all who are concerned about the fiscal solvency of our Republic, the rights of States and individuals, and traditional American liberties.

In the Senate, he has been chairman of the Rules Committee, chairman of the Select Committee on Government Reorganization, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, and the powerful Finance Committee. He has served also on the provisional committee to draft the original atomic energy legislation, the Finance Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Taxation, and on the preparedness subcommittee which investigated Korean ammunition shortage. He has served on the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation since 1949.

Senator BYRD has been a successful apple grower since before he was 20 years of age. His public career began as early and has been even more outstanding. He was elected to the Winchester, Va., city council before he was 21, to the State senate at 27, and Governor of Virginia at 38. He has been U.S. Senator from Virginia since 1933.

A foe of nonessential Federal spending and socialistic proposals—regardless of the political party proposing them, Senator BYRD is one of the Nation's most forthright advocates of the philosophy of decentralized as contrasted with centralized government.

The noted historian and Pulitzer prize winner, Douglas Southall Freeman, wrote of Senator BYRD: "National solvency, national honor, national defense and as moderate a level of Federal taxation as decent administration permits—these are part of HARRY BYRD's approach to his supreme goal of public service. That goal is to have government interfere as little as is possible with the citizen's effort to make a decent living, to rear and to educate his children, and to maintain a respectable home."

In the spring of 1958, HARRY BYRD announced his intention to retire from the U.S. Senate. The spontaneous and overwhelming reaction of people from all walks of life—not only from Virginia but from throughout America—caused him to reconsider and to allow the insistence for his continuance in public service to prevail over the personal considerations that prompted his plans to return to his home in Virginia. HARRY BYRD was drafted in the fullest and best sense of the word—one of the rare occasions in the history of American politics when this was literally and completely true.

Criticism of U.S. Supreme Court by Conference of State Chief Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there has been a certain amount of uncertainty surrounding a portion of the report on the Supreme Court which was approved last August by the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices of the State courts. The confusion, which arose as to whether or not the report was directed toward the Supreme Court's decisions in the school desegregation cases, recently was clarified by a newspaper article written by Mr. Gerald Griffin, Washington bureau chief for the Baltimore Sun. Mr. Griffin's article was based on an exchange of letters between Attorney General William P. Rogers and the Honorable Frederick W. Brune, Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, who was chairman of the justices' committee. Because of the importance of the original report and the great value of this clarification, I request unanimous consent that Mr. Griffin's article, which appeared in the Sun of January 7, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT CRITICISM NOT AIMED AT RACIAL CASES,
BRUNE SAYS

(By Gerald Griffin)

Washington, Jan. 6.—New light on a critical report on the Supreme Court, approved last August by the Conference of State Chief Justices, has been provided by an exchange of letters between William P. Rogers, Attorney General, and Frederick W. Brune, chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals.

In a letter to Judge Brune, Rogers asked whether the report was directed at the Supreme Court's decisions in the school desegregation cases, and what bearing the report was intended to have on the effect of those decisions to date.

KNOWS OF NO EXCEPTION

In reply Judge Brune, who was chairman of the Justices' committee which submitted the report, said the report was not directed at the school desegregation cases.

He said further that he knows of no exception to the rule that Supreme Court decisions are binding on questions arising under the Constitution. The report suggested no exceptions to that rule, he pointed out.

Judge Brune noted that before writing his letter he had confirmed these statements by consulting, by telephone, with members of the committee.

U.S.-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

Although the judges' report did not mention the school cases, it was regarded at the time, in some quarters, as a criticism of the Supreme Court's action in declaring that school segregation was contrary to the Federal Constitution.

The report dealt with Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions. It held that the Supreme Court had adopted the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. It said the Nation's highest court was showing an unwillingness to wait for Congress to exercise its own law-making functions.

A resolution approving the report urged the Supreme Court to exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers, the power of judicial self-restraint, in determining questions affecting the allocation of Federal and State powers.

Under date of October 1, 1958, Rogers sent this letter to Judge Brune:

"I am writing to you with respect to the recent report of the Committee of State Chief Justices, of which you are Chairman. That report comments upon a number of Supreme Court decisions in the field of Federal-State relationships.

"WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL

"Although the report is silent on the unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation cases, some of the letters that I have received criticizing these decisions appear to imply or to assume that the report was nonetheless directed at them.

"It would be very helpful in dealing with the subject of such letters if you could indicate what bearing, if any, the report was intended to have on the school cases or on their effect as law under our constitutional system."

On October 4, Judge Brune replied:

"This letter is in reply to yours of October 1, 1958, with regard to the report of the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices, of the State courts, on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions, of which committee I was chairman.

"FOUR SEPARATE GROUPS

"This report was presented at the meeting of the conference in Pasadena, Calif., on August 20. It was later discussed in four separate groups of the conference on that same day and was debated and voted upon on August 23 by the conference as a whole.

"As your letter notes, the above report did not mention the school desegregation cases; and it did not undertake to deal with them. In this connection, may I call your attention to the composition of the committee and its unanimity, and to the widespread geographical (as well as numerical) support which the report received in the general vote of the conference.

"COME TO QUESTION

"Insofar as the effect of the school segregation or desegregation cases as law under our constitutional system is concerned, I am sure that you have not overlooked two passages of the above report dealing generally with the power of the Supreme Court to determine questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"Under the heading of 'Background and Perspective,' in item second the report states that 'when we turn to the specific field of the effect of judicial decisions on Federal-State relationships we come at once to the question as to where power should lie to give the ultimate interpretation to the Constitution and to the laws made in pursuance thereof under the authority of the United States.

"By necessity and by almost universal common consent these ultimate powers are regarded as vested in the Supreme Court of the United States. Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to chaos.

"Then follows a reference to Judge Learned Hand's lectures on the Bill of Rights. As you will recall, he sets forth reasons for the controlling effect of decisions of the Supreme Court in constitutional matters.

"ARE BOUND BY THEM

"In item sixth of the committee report, under the same heading above referred to, it is also expressly recognized that even though we may find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court we are bound by them.

"I know of no basis for any exception to the rule under which decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on questions arising under the Federal Constitution are binding, nor does the above report suggest any.

"I may add that I have confirmed the above statements as to the scope and effect of our report by every member of our committee except one, who is ill. I am confident, however, that his is in agreement."

CONDEMNATION MOVE SEEN

Besides Judge Brune, the committee was made up of judges from New York, Michigan, Georgia, Texas, Wisconsin, Oregon, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and Minnesota.

During the discussion of the justices' report last August 23 at Pasadena, before the approving resolution was adopted, Chief Justice Charles Alvin Jones, of Pennsylvania, charged that the real purpose of the report was "to condemn the integration decision."

Chief Justice Theodore G. Garfield, of Iowa, took exception to this, saying that he failed to see the integration issue in the resolution.

AMOUNTS TO CLARIFICATION

Judge Brune's letter to Rogers amounts to an official footnote to clarify the committee's intent. It is expected to put at rest the suggestions, which have been taken up by some of the southern segregationists, that the State justices were attacking the school decisions.

Rulings of the Supreme Court in the civil-rights field—in cases dealing with antisubversion laws, security risks, contempt of Congress, and arraignment of prisoners by police—were under strong criticism in Congress during the last session, with southerners taking an active part.

Congress took no final action on the numerous bills which were put forward to restrict the Supreme Court or revise the effect of its decisions, but new bills may be introduced in the session which opens tomorrow.

The Injustice of Public Law 84-676

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to call my colleagues' attention to the injustice caused some Reserve officers because of the effective date of Public Law 84-676. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter with respect to this matter which was written by Hon. Robert W. Collins, of Yazoo City, Miss., an attorney and Reserve officer, to the editor of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register. Mr. Collins' letter was

dated July 15, 1958, and it appeared in the August 2, 1958, edition of that publication.

I include, also, an editorial which appeared in the September 13, 1958, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Register entitled "They Were Left Out."

The letter and editorial follow:

URGES CONGRESS CORRECT OWN MISTAKE

DEAR SIR: The magnificent and prompt action of the President in sending a sizable marine force to rescue the integrity and independence of Lebanon brought many serious thoughts to many like myself who was privileged to serve in the Korean war as a career reservist. Perhaps the whole Nation can now get the meaning of the Korean war in a better sense of appreciation. Reappraisals are now being called for. Congress will be expected to and will support the actions commenced today. At this time of sober reflection on the Korean war the White House and the Congress can now correct an injustice to the two-war, former Reserve career officers who were released involuntarily after the end of those recent hostilities by applying the following remedy, to wit:

Reenact and approve Public Law 84-676 with one very simple and justiciable addition, as follows: "(1) This section shall be effective on July 1, 1954."

The Congress should reenact this public law on its own motion as a simple matter of correcting an injustice. Public Law 84-676 shows on its face why it fails in its stated purpose; to provide a lump-sum benefit to the members of the Reserve components who had served in World War II and the Korean war and were released involuntarily. The fact of the matter is that on the effective date of this statute, approved on July 9, 1956, practically all of the members of the Reserve components intended by the stated purpose of the legislation to be so benefited had already been released involuntarily in 1954 and 1955.

Sad to relate this anomaly is written into the hearings on H.R. 6725 and H.R. 9952 (both of the 84th Congress), to which attention is invited. Public Law 84-676 is identical to H.R. 6725 save in one particular. It provided an effective date of July 1, 1954. H.R. 6725 was approved by the Armed Services Committee of the House on July 26, 1955. In the meantime it was withdrawn from the Rules Committee and the effective date of July 1, 1954, was deleted. On February 3, 1956, a new set of hearings commenced on H.R. 9952. What the responsible committee-men thought of the changed version was expressed by the chairman, as follows: "The committee went into the question of cost. It was a financial situation rather than wisdom." Thusly, H.R. 9952 was enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate and Public Law 84-676 became law on approval by the President on July 9, 1956.

Congress can correct its own mistakes, particularly its admitted and recorded errors of resort to false economy in place of its stated wisdom in the premises. Accordingly, it is strongly urged that the Congress on its own motion reenact Public Law 84-676 with a change in its effective date to July 1, 1954.

ROBERT W. COLLINS,
Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, Yazoo
City, Miss.

[From the Army Navy Air Force Register,
Sept. 13, 1958]

THEY WERE LEFT OUT

When Congress returns in January it will probably get letters once again from supporters of a measure to give a lump-sum payment to Reserve officers involuntarily released between July 1, 1954 and July 9, 1956 when the basic readjustment pay act became effective. These letters should be heeded.

When Public Law 84-676 was being considered in 1956, Congress was planning to make payments to those released as early as the 1954 date. But because the lawmakers were in a money-saving mood, the final law states the pay will be given to those released after July 1956. The law provides one-half month's pay for every year of active duty. Many officers who served in World War II and Korea were left out.

This affair points up the need for a strong term retention contract bill. One has been in the works for some time. While the lawmakers are considering this bill, they should reconsider the plight of the two-war reservists released before the present readjustment pay was authorized.

Washington Robs States of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "Washington Robs States of Rights," delivered by Hon. M. T. Phelps, justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, and published in the Arizona Republic for November 19, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON ROBBS STATES OF RIGHTS

(By M. T. Phelps, justice, Arizona Supreme Court)

Our forefathers sought to create a government with such checks and balances incorporated therein as would insure that all public officials should forever remain subservient to the will of the people.

Unfortunately, they provided no checks against the exercise of excessive powers by the Supreme Court, although most of them agreed that this constituted a great weakness in the framework of the proposed new government and expressed fears of the potential dangers that lurked therein. The only restraint that exists today against the exercise of excessive power by the Supreme Court is that restraint which the conscience dictates to the individual members of the Court. Congress has the constitutional power to limit its appellate jurisdiction but it refused to exercise such power at its last session.

It was the fear of the inadequacy of the limitation provided that prompted immediate adoption of the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment to the Constitution reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution. This was done to serve as a check against all the branches of the Federal Government, and it served its purpose splendidly for 150 years, but if the present Court is aware of its existence, it has shown no evidence of it in recent years. The present Supreme Court apparently does not feel itself bound by either precedent or by the Constitution itself. Without any qualms or apologies they have set aside previous decisions of the Court recognized by the Court itself as binding upon it for nearly 60 years.

The Supreme Court's decisions are as unstable as the shifting sands of the desert and are as unsound as they are unstable. Many of the greatest judges and lawyers in

the United States condemn these decisions as being purely legislative in character, and wholly beyond the power and jurisdiction of the Court to pronounce.

The Attorney General of the United States and the President and others tell the people of the Nation that decisions of the Supreme Court are the supreme law of the land and that it is the duty of every citizen to obey them. The Supreme Court itself, in a supplemental opinion in the segregation cases, stated that the decisions in those cases are the supreme law of the land. The fact is that no individual has to obey these opinions except the parties who were litigants in court any more than you have to obey a decision of the Supreme Court of this State unless you are a party to the cause of action in which the opinion is rendered. And it has been the declared law of all courts for 150 years until Mr. Warren established his arbitrary rule of being bound neither by precedent nor the Constitution.

The Constitution, acts of Congress, and treaties with foreign nations alone constitute the supreme law of the land by which the sovereign States of the Union and the people of the United States are bound.

Not until the Supreme Court reverses its philosophy of government and takes the position that it is bound by a previous decision of that Court on the same constitutional question and that such decision is integrated into the Constitution and becomes a part of it as much so as if originally written therein, can any one justifiably and truthfully say that the decisions are the law of the land. It will then become the supreme law of the land not because it is a decision of the Supreme Court, but because it has been integrated into and become a part of the Constitution.

The Supreme Court is not alone to blame for constitutional violations and the continued centralization of power in the Federal Government. Congress enacted a law in 1935 providing that anything which affects interstate commerce is a part of an interstate transaction which has been interpreted by the court to cover window washers and elevator operators in a building where there happens to be located a business engaged in interstate commerce subjecting them to the provisions of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and therefore under the control of the Federal Government. The Constitution only gave Congress the right to regulate interstate commerce. By the use of the term, "affect interstate commerce," it broadened its own powers, which has been construed by the Court to empower Congress to regulate transactions wholly within a State upon the theory that it affects interstate commerce.

Both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government are deliberately violating the Federal Constitution. The President violated the Constitution when he sent Federal troops into Little Rock to picket a high school there and to order citizens off of their own front lawns and that of their neighbors. There wasn't a semblance of legal authority for this action.

In 1934, at the request of President Roosevelt, Congress passed a law commonly known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, in which Congress delegated to the President the power to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations. Under the present arrangement with these nations, known as GATT, tariffs on commodities imported into the United States are fixed by these 37 nations and we have only 1 vote in 37 in fixing our tariff on imports.

The power to lay taxes, imposts, duties and excises and to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in the Congress of the United States by the Constitution, and Congress unlawfully abdicated its constitutional powers and its Members violated their oaths of office when Congress gave the executive

the power either to lay a duty on imports, or to regulate trade with foreign nations, and the President is violating his oath to support the Constitution when he urges its violation by Congress and in exercising that power.

Perhaps one of the most outrageous of all wrongs in further centralization of power has been the creation of dozens of Federal administrative agencies, giving to them the power to adopt rules and regulations which have the same force and effect of laws.

We are now exacting of our citizens income and other taxes to meet exorbitant budgets, billions of which are wilfully wasted. Other billions are being given away even to Russian satellites. This, too, is without constitutional authority. None of the branches of the Federal Government make any attempt to function within constitutional limitations.

The collapse of constitutional government is inevitable in this country if present trends continue. The officials in the higher echelons of government have repudiated the principal concept upon which our Government was founded and the creature has become master of the creator.

Whatever States rights are left are being rapidly lost.

Please let us, through the conservative thinkers of both national parties, try to preserve America. This can only be done by demanding an adherence to the principles embodied in the declaration of an abiding faith in God.

The New Carpetbaggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, hate-bred violence is abhorrent to the South, as it must be to persons of good will everywhere. We have been shocked profoundly by vicious use of explosives against places of worship and schools. We have been shocked because we have not been calloused to such senseless violence.

Outbreaks of deadly hate have not been part of the day-to-day pattern of life in the South. We have been unable to understand that assaults and killings bred of racial animosities apparently have disturbed little those in the great cities of the North who have been quick to point fingers of scorn at us.

Let there be no mistake—we will do our utmost to bring to justice the strangers among us who give increasing evidence of malicious direction from afar. Who is behind the John Kaspers, the dynamiters, and their fellow inciters of interracial and interfaith hatreds? Could it be that the strings of these malevolent puppets stretch to Moscow?

In any event, the South is committed to calm determination in resisting the persistent attacks on the constitutional rights of its States and its people. It will not embrace violence. It will strive to provide swift justice to the scorpions in its midst.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a straightforward and praise-

worthy statement included by President Philip M. Klutznick, of B'nai B'rith in his annual report to the board of governors. The statement follows:

If we examine the situation in its proper context we find that community tensions arising out of synagogue bombings and other expressions of anti-Jewish violence in the South have not changed the fundamental good relations between southern Jewry and its neighbors. There is no real rupture in the religious harmony and interaction of the southern community that southerners would share with their Jewish neighbors the same contempt and sense of outrage over the recent wave of anti-Semitic violence.

But one stubborn fact persists: the southern atmosphere will be clouded with anti-Semitic tensions so long as organized Jew-baiting movements are free to exploit the region's dilemma over desegregation.

The anti-Semite and the hate mail publisher fish in troubled waters. The social upheaval that has been sweeping across the South is tailored to the disruptive patterns of the professional bigots. It is an interesting commentary that much of the hate literature now being widely distributed throughout the South is carpetbagging stuff—northern in origin and trying to disguise itself with a southern accent.

The anti-Semitic movements by themselves are of little consequence. The danger lies in their ability to spread distrust and religious dissension in the right setting. That setting exists today in many parts of the South. It will not blow away hurriedly, not so long as a resistance to desegregation remains and it can be distorted by hate movements. The problem, then, for our ADL is to keep the anti-Semitic movements in check; to probe constantly their practices and expose their purpose. This is likely to be a drawn-out affair and we have to face up to that fact.

Address by Vice President Nixon Before the English Speaking Union of the Commonwealth at the Guildhall in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during November the Vice President made a trip to England to represent the President of the United States on the occasion of the dedication of the American Chapel at St. Paul's Cathedral.

On that evening the Vice President addressed the English Speaking Union of the Commonwealth at the Guildhall in London. The Vice President made one of the best speeches of his career in explaining the responsibilities of English-speaking people in international affairs, both on home soil and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this very thoughtful and enlightening speech is herewith appended in full:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE ENGLISH SPEAKING UNION OF THE COMMONWEALTH, NOVEMBER 26, 1958, GUILDHALL, LONDON, ENGLAND

In the 6 years in which I have had the honor of serving as Vice President of the United States, it has been my privilege to

visit many countries and to participate in many significant events. I can assure you that no occasion in that period will live more indelibly in my memory than the dedication of the American Chapel at St. Paul's which I attended this morning and the gathering in this historic hall which I am privileged to address this evening.

This meeting of the English Speaking Union dramatizes the enduring character of the friendship and alliance of our two countries. The activities of this organization have been most vital in cementing our bonds of comradeship.

I consider it a particular privilege to pay tribute to the thoughtful and inspiring leadership of His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, who has spared no sacrifices in this dedicated work. His recent visit to Canada was only one of many activities which indicate his vital interest.

You all may be justly proud, not only of the contribution you have made to better understanding between our two countries, but also the even greater work of building an enduring basis of friendship among all English-speaking peoples.

The dedication at St. Paul's this morning dramatizes the unity you have worked so hard to achieve. It was symbolic of the enduring ties that bind us. It brought to mind the dramatic events of earlier and more trying days—the magnificent leadership and the great sacrifices that made possible our victory in the Second World War.

Our thoughts went back to our great national leaders, Sir Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt, working together in intimate harmony. They will receive the ungrudging tribute of history for their capacity to marshal the forces of democracy.

Our thoughts turned also to our incomparable generals and admirals—Eisenhower and Montgomery, Cunningham and King. They were more than brilliant strategists and commanders. Because of their unwavering devotion to the concept that military ingenuity must be combined with recognition of civilian authority, they rank indeed among the great military leaders of all times.

But above all today we honored brave men, whose names are legion and whose sacrifices can never adequately be repaid. British and American—farmers and laborers, from cities and countryside, from offices and classrooms—these were the men who made possible our victory in the greatest war in history. Many events of that war will be forgotten as we turn our eyes to other tasks, but their deeds will live forever. They bequeathed to us a spirit, a sentiment, a national memory that will never fail to capture our admiration as we move side by side in the path of friendship and alliance.

As Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

What is the unfinished work they leave for our generation? I believe that two American Presidents speaking in this same Guildhall have simply, but eloquently, answered that question.

Woodrow Wilson on December 28, 1918, said, "The peoples of the world want peace, and they want it now, not merely by conquest of arms, but by agreement of mind."

And Dwight D. Eisenhower, 27 years later on July 12, 1945 said "To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit subject only to provisions that he trespass not upon similar rights of others, a Londoner will fight. So will a citizen of Abilene."

To preserve freedom, to keep the peace, not only for themselves but for all people—this, then, is the cause for which the brave men we honored today gave their lives. It is the challenge and opportunity of our generation

to further the ultimate realization of this noblest goal of mankind.

Let us examine the policies we should follow if this goal is to be attained. We begin by recognizing that the free world must be militarily stronger than any potential aggressor. The existence of our military strength and our determination and ability to maintain it are the basic elements without which the objectives we seek would be impossible to realize.

But we recognize that military strength in and of itself will not keep peace unless it is combined with a wise and judicious diplomatic policy. Let us see what some of the guidelines for our policy should be.

We must retain the armed strength needed for security in a troubled world, but we should speak with the calm assurance of those who are not afraid.

We know that to the extent the law of the jungle prevails in any area of the world, weakness and indecision lead to disaster. Yet, firmness is not and should not be arrogance.

We will shun assurances based merely upon naive hope or even self-deception. But we must never tire in our search for enforceable agreements which will reduce tension.

We know that little is lost by discussion but that all may be lost by war. Yet, even in our tireless striving for peace, we must always be prepared to say that freedom and the rights of man are even more ultimate values.

Above all, our policies must represent the best thinking the free world can produce. We are indeed fortunate in the fact that in men like Macmillan and DeGaulle, Adenauer and Spaak, Fanfani and Eisenhower we have the kind of dedicated and experienced leadership which is superbly qualified for the difficult task of keeping the peace with honor for the free world.

In this connection, I wish to pay special tribute to your Prime Minister for his initiative in developing the enlightened concept of interdependence which has proved so useful in bringing about closer understanding between our two nations and which points the way for improving consultation and cooperation among all the countries in the free world.

If the struggles for peace and freedom were to be decided solely by the adequacy of our military strength and by the quality of our diplomacy, we could look to the future with justifiable confidence as to the prospects for our eventual success. But we must recognize that this is only one phase of the struggle.

Our military strength and our diplomatic policies are designed to avoid a war we might otherwise have to fight in the future. We must not overlook the fact that other policies must be designed to avoid losing the nonmilitary battle which has already begun and which is being waged in many areas of the world today.

Let us examine the battleground where this conflict is taking place—in Asia, in the Near East, in Africa, and in parts of Latin America. A great revolution is taking place among the people in these areas of the world. What I refer to is not a military or political revolt, but the revolution of peoples' expectations, the assertion of all peoples of their claim to a greater share of this world's goods.

Millions of people in these newly developing nations are determined to break the bonds of wretchedness and poverty that have enslaved them through the centuries. They wish to achieve in this very generation a decisive breakthrough in the struggle against misery and disease.

They would prefer to attain these objectives and retain their freedom. But we must make no mistake about it, if they believe they are offered no other choice, they will choose progress even without freedom.

What is their choice? On the one hand, they have the example of the Soviet Union and the Communist satellites. Here is a pattern that promises quick results. Thousands of leaders of these countries are being invited to visit the Soviet Union to see the very real changes accomplished in the 40 years since the Communist revolution.

It is not an adequate answer to this challenge to cite the far higher material standards in most western nations. To the newly developing nations of the world, this is not the point. They are not particularly impressed by achievements primarily accomplished in the century of the industrial revolution. They are for more interested in what can be accomplished in the last half of the 20th century.

What must be made clear and unmistakable for all the world to see is that free peoples can compete with and surpass totalitarian nations in producing economic progress. No people in the world today should be forced to choose between bread and freedom.

To shape the world of tomorrow in a pattern compatible with freedom and human rights we must all take our part in a great offensive against the evils of poverty, disease, and misery. We cannot, for example, afford to allow the free Government of India to fall in its heroic effort to produce economic progress and retain freedom at the same time.

We need to apply in this field the same determination, willingness, and cooperation which enabled us to build the military strength which deters aggression today.

We must not be miserly, smallminded, and negative in our approach to this problem. And while it is wrong to favor change solely because it is change, it is worse blindly to insist that we have nothing better to offer than maintaining the status quo.

We must associate ourselves with the decent aspirations of people everywhere for the better life to which they are entitled.

Just a few weeks ago, Premier Khrushchev promised his people a revolution in living standards within the next 12 years. He claimed that the Communist system would overtake and surpass the economies of the Western World.

We should be happy that such claims have been made. We would be eager to match the Soviet leaders in putting less emphasis upon armies, military research, and the costly lethal weapons of modern warfare, and more stress upon better housing, food, clothing, and the other necessities for a good life.

If Mr. Khrushchev wishes to consider these steps as a form of competition or contest, I am sure that all of us would be delighted to accept the challenge. In such a contest no one could really lose. The world would be infinitely better off if man's energies were used for the welfare of families rather than the building of armies.

But our answer to the Soviet challenge should not stop here. We say, broaden this competition and include the spiritual and cultural values that have distinguished our civilization.

Material achievements, while necessary, do not meet the deeper needs of mankind. Man needs the higher freedoms, freedom to know, to debate freely, to write and express his views.

He needs the freedom that law and justice guarantee to every individual so that neither privilege nor power may make any man subservient before the law.

He wants the freedom to travel and to learn from other peoples and cultures.

He wants freedom of worship.

To us, these are the most precious aspects of our civilization. We would be happy if others were to compete in this sphere and try to surpass our achievements.

The free world is too often made to appear to be relying on our superior military power

and economic strength. It is not worthy of those with the heritage of freedom we share to appear to be resting our case on materialism alone.

I know of no better example to illustrate the point I am trying to make than through an analysis of that much-maligned institution—British colonialism. It is understandable in view of the surging rise of nationalism that we have heard all that is bad and little that is good about colonialism in the past few years.

Colonialism has had its faults, but it also has had its virtues. I speak from some knowledge on this subject. I have visited 12 countries which at one time or another have passed through the status of British colonialism.

I have known personally and admired the dedicated and effective work of your superb colonial administrators. You can indeed be proud of the contributions that have been made by men like Grantham in Hong Kong, Templer in Kuala Lumpur, MacDonald in Singapore, Crawford in Uganda, and Arden-Clark in Ghana.

Let us examine some of the benefits British colonial policy has produced in the areas in which it has operated. It brought the military strength which provided the security from external attack. It brought in many areas the technical training which assured economic progress.

But more important than either of these, it brought the great ideas which provided the basis for progress in the future, ideas which will live on for generations after the nations concerned have acquired the independent status for which an enlightened policy has prepared them.

The common law, the Parliament, the English language, freedom of speech, assembly, press, and religion, these are the institutions which are the proud legacy of the British people in lands throughout the world.

And so today let us never forget that in the momentous struggle in which we are engaged our major advantage is not in the strength of our arms or even the productivity of our factories. It is in the quality and power of the great ideals of freedom which have inspired men through the ages.

Our responsibility then is clear. Here is a cause worthy of the descendants of brave men and women who crossed boundless oceans and settled in every area of the globe.

Once again we must venture forth not to seek untitled lands, but rather to bring encouragement, aid, guidance, and partnership to those peoples who want to live in freedom and decent prosperity.

We come to them as friends, as brothers in a shrinking world. We do not seek to impose upon them our economic system or our culture. It is theirs to choose the path to the future. But it is our responsibility to see that this choice is an informed one and a free one.

Let it never be said that because of our failure to present adequately the aims and ideals of freedom others chose the often irreversible path of dictatorship.

Let us speak less of the threat of communism and more of the promise of freedom.

Let us adopt as our primary objective not the defeat of communism but the victory of plenty over want, of health over disease, of freedom over tyranny.

With such a goal we shall give the lie to those who proclaim that we are witnessing the twilight of a dying western civilization. Rather we shall see the onset of a glorious dawn of a new world based on the immortal ideals for which men have sacrificed their lives through the ages.

In this very hall, a century and a half ago an English Prime Minister gave a brief address that has been ranked by Lord Curzon as one of the indisputable masterpieces of English eloquence. After the news of Nelson's glorious victory at Trafalgar, William

Pitt was toasted as the savior of Europe. He responded in these words: "I return you many thanks for the honor you have done me. But Europe is not to be saved by any single man. England has saved herself by her exertions and will as I trust save Europe by her example."

Here is a challenge worthy of the brave men we honored today. May we, the English-speaking peoples, proud in the heritage we share, join with the friends of freedom everywhere and by our example save the cause of peace and freedom for the world.

The Sovereignty of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, our constitutional form of government, with its inherent concept of checks and balances, has been under heavy attack in recent years.

The legislative function has been invaded by the judiciary. The powers clearly reserved to the States and to the people have been seized by those having contempt for the written law.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a significant address by J. Sloan Kuykendall, distinguished attorney of Winchester, Va., delivered last fall at the annual meeting of the Virginia Bar Association on the occasion of Mr. Kuykendall's retirement from the presidency of the association.

The address follows:

Perhaps the most momentous chapter in American history deals with the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The drama of the origin of the Constitution has frequently been overlooked, so confidently have the American people taken the Constitution as a matter of course. The Constitution of the United States is not a document divinely inspired; it was born of the travail of long, bitter debate. No one will claim that it is perfect or that its draftsmen had that degree of prophetic wisdom that would have enabled them to provide solutions to problems yet unborn.

Paramount in the deliberations of that Convention was an ever-present concern for the sovereignty of the States. Happily, those contending for a Central Government with strictly limited and defined powers prevailed. Thus, a Central Government of general powers was deliberately rejected in favor of one of limited powers. The validity of this statement is vouched for not only by the record of the proceedings of the Convention, but by a reading of the final instrument itself.

The framers put first things first. The limitations upon the three branches of the new Central Government were placed in the very first three articles, article I, section 8, specifically, in detail, and in unmistakable language defined, and thereby limited, the powers of the legislative branch of the new Government. Article II defined within narrow limits the authority and duties of the Chief Executive. Article III, section 2, established and thereby limited the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary.

It seemed hardly necessary, therefore, to do more to assure the retention by the States of the sovereign status so recently acclaimed

for them in the Declaration of Independence and won by them in war. Nevertheless, out of an abundance of precaution article IV, section 4, was included, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government and continued sovereignty.

This would seem to be assurance enough for the people, but not so. Upon the adjournment of the Convention the delegates returned to their respective States entrusted with the responsibility of procuring the approval and ratification of the proposed Constitution. Serious opposition was encountered, largely because of the fear that the proposed new Government would eventually wrest from the States the power to govern and direct the relationships of their citizens.

For the moment they felt secure in the enjoyment of those personal liberties and freedoms referred to as unalienable rights. The people were assured and reassured that the proposed constitution would not deprive the States of their jealously guarded sovereignty.

Perhaps the anxieties of the people of that troubled time should have been allayed by the forthright and unmistakable clear appraisal of the instrument of union by that extreme Federalist, Alexander Hamilton. He said:

"In the first formation of government, by the association of individuals, every power of the community is delegated, because the Government is to extend to every possible object; nothing is reserved by the inalienable rights of mankind; but when a number of these societies unite for certain purposes, the rule is different, and from the plainest reason; they have already delegated their sovereignty and their powers to their several governments; and these cannot be recalled and given to another, without an express act."

Notwithstanding that statement, and other assurances emanating from men of equal caliber and persuasion, objections to ratification still prevailed in many of the States because the Constitution failed to include a bill of rights. It was only upon the representations of many of the advocates of ratification that a bill of rights would be added by amendment that the Constitution was finally approved.

In keeping with the promises made to the people, James Madison of Virginia in 1789, proposed to the House of Representatives a bill of rights preceded by a preamble which began:

"The conventions of a number of States had at the time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added." Ten of the twelve amendments proposed were accepted and finally became part of the Constitution. All are important, but the one having the most direct bearing upon the sovereignty of the States is the 10th amendment, which reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Thus, the record of the convention of 1787, the records of the State conventions for ratification, the unmistakable language of the instrument itself, the appending of the Bill of Rights—all these make clear that powers and authority not expressly conferred by necessary implication remained with the sovereign States.

Today it is the fashion of the uninformed to refer to decisions of Federal courts, however erroneous, as the law of the land. On the other hand, a prominent lawyer and legal scholar epitomized the doctrine of State sovereignty when he wrote: "As the Government under the Constitution commenced and the United States of America took their place as a nation, it was with the

constitutional doctrine of States rights as the 'law of the land'."

So, with the adoption of the Constitution the sovereign States entered into a compact whose clarity and meaning was limited only by the inadequacy of the English language. It should not be restricted or enlarged except in the manner provided in the Constitution itself and with the approval of three-fourths of the States. It is conceded, of course, that all provisions could not be expressed in hard and fast rules of law. Some standards of law had to be used, such as due process and equal protection of the laws.

Even here everyone knew what the framers had in mind. These were not newly coined phrases. They had well-defined, definite, and generally accepted meanings. Although these standards had to be interpreted and applied to specific sets of facts, it was supposed that they would be interpreted, not prostituted.

It has primarily been by the prostitution of such provisions as these that the Central Government has usurped from the States their sovereign rights and unlawfully arrogated these powers to itself. The Federal Government has performed the feat of lifting itself by its own bootstraps.

This is the only instance that I know of in any of the world's system of law, past or present, where the grantee has the exclusive, unfettered power to construe the grant of his own authority—restricted only by an exercise of self-restraint. It seems they engage in a lot of exercises in Washington these days, but the exercise of self-restraint is not one of them.

Self-restraint requires character and integrity of the highest order. One who occupies a public office is a fiduciary, upon which devolves the burden and responsibility of administering the trust, in strict compliance with the limitations upon his authority. Those who direct and administer the affairs of the three departments of our National Government have the paramount responsibility of acting within the scope of limited and prescribed authority.

Only a short while after the new experiment got underway the three departments of the Central Government began inter se struggles for power. The Supreme Court asserted its right to interpret our basic law and to decree limits upon the authority of both the legislative and the executive branches. The legislative branch considered that it had the right to legislate within the limits of its own construction of the basic law. The executive proclaimed the independence of his department and insisted that neither by legislation nor by judicial fiat could his constitutional authority, as he construed it, be confined or limited.

Each department claimed not only that it had the power to construe its own authority under the Constitution, but that it was the final authority, on the limits of the constitutional powers of the other branches of Government.

President Jefferson's distrust of the judiciary resulted in his abolition of the circuit courts, impeachment of those judges who questioned his supreme authority, and a bitter contest with Chief Justice Marshall. The philosophy of the supremacy of the executive which caused Jefferson to assert his authority over the courts was later also shared by President Jackson, who sought to assert the supremacy of the executive over the legislative branch.

History records other examples of the struggle for power within the Federal Government. These repeated, bitter, and sometimes protracted contests played important roles in the formulation of checks and balances between the departments, but one of the most significant results was that each struggle had the effects of enlarging the powers of one or more branches of the Federal Government, not at the expense of the other

branches, but at the expense of State sovereignty. The States were the primary losers.

Amaury deReincourt, a French scholar, recently published a book entitled "The Coming Caesars in America." In October 1957, a highly respected national periodical published an article by deReincourt dealing with the subject of his book, and that magazine posed these questions: Is democracy dying in the United States? Is this country heading toward rule by a Caesar? It should alarm us that these questions were answered in the affirmative. I quote briefly from that thoughtful article:

"Our Western World, America and Europe, is threatened with Caesarism on a scale unknown since the downfall of the Roman Empire. In order to see this threat in its proper perspective, we have to assess the relationship between America and Europe, and define their historical destinies. It is the contention of this book that expanding democracy leads unintentionally to imperialism and that imperialism inevitably ends in destroying the republican institution of earlier days; further, that the greater the social equality, the dimmer the prospects of liberty, and that as society becomes more equalitarian, it tends increasingly to concentrate absolute power in the hands of one single man.

"Caesarism is not dictatorship, not the result of one man's overriding ambition, not a brutal seizure of power through revolution. It is not based on a specific doctrine or philosophy. It is essentially pragmatic and untheoretical. It is a slow, often century-old, unconscious development that ends in a voluntary surrender of a free people escaping from freedom to one autocratic master.

"The power and prestige of the President have grown with the growth of America and of democracy within America, with the multiplication of economic, political, and military emergencies, with the necessity of ruling what is virtually becoming an American empire—the universal state of a Western civilization at bay.

"Caesarism is therefore the logical outcome of a double current very much in evidence today: The growth of a world empire that cannot be ruled by republican institutions, and the gradual extension of mass democracy, which ends in the destruction of freedom and in the concentration of supreme power in the hands of one man. This is the ominous prospect facing the western world in the second half of the 20th century. But just as the Caesarism could rise only in classical Rome and not in Greece, it will, if left free to develop unchecked, arise in modern America and not in Europe."

This dire prediction of an eminent political thinker of our day will not come true if we employ the tried and true system of checks and balances. There have been incidents in our history when one branch has effectively checked another. But there have been other periods when the people, clamoring for a change, have been so overwhelming in their demands that the judiciary has been ineffective in its efforts to check the legislative and executive branches by requiring them to stay within constitutional limits.

There have been still other times when the legislative and executive branches have failed to coordinate in restraint of the judiciary. Had the Supreme Court adhered to precedent it would have justified James Bryce's regard for the judiciary as "America's greatest and most original contribution to the science of government." Although some of the renowned judges of that Court have felt bound by precedent, the majority of the Court during some of the critical times in this country have departed from precedent for one stated reason or another—all too often to further their own political philosophies.

It is in the departure from precedent that the Court has failed to perform its function as a checkrein against the violation of the

Constitution and clearly established principles.

If it be conceded that the Supreme Court through its power to interpret the Constitution is a policymaker, this does not justify its self-assumed power to be a policy changer. Once the Supreme Court has announced to the people what the Constitution means, by what logic should it be permitted to change its mind and say that it means just the opposite?

Would it not be more consistent with democratic constitutional processes to follow the English doctrine that once a constitution is interpreted by the courts, that interpretation can be altered only by the people through their elected legislative representatives or, in the United States, by proper amendment of the document itself?

Although the departure from precedent has been most flagrant in recent years, time will not permit review and consideration of the cases involved. It cannot be successfully denied at this time that the Supreme Court has, of necessity, the right to adjudicate violations of the Constitution. The only limit upon this authority is the clear and unmistakable meaning of that document. The Constitution was drafted with care and its words were carefully chosen so that doubt and uncertainty might be avoided.

Where doubt has arisen in the interpretation and application of our basic law, the judicial resolve of that body is as binding upon the Court as it is upon the people and the States. The personnel of the Court may change, but the Court remains the same institution.

The Constitution may not legally be interpreted and applied so as to carry us beyond the meaning and purpose that have acquired certainty in historical and judicial precedent. Only by gradual and studied process may we progress and justify a better and fuller life. If tradition should be abandoned for the sake of progress and the betterment of human relationships, let it come within the framework of that solemn pact wrought by the labors of our liberty-seeking forefathers.

No human sitting on the Supreme Court of this land should indulge in the feeling that he has been endowed with a superior ability to judge our present and foretell our future. His course has been clearly marked, and he is constrained by the document that created the tribunal upon which he sits. When he assumes the duty and responsibility of interpreting * * * and apply our Federal Constitution, the laws made pursuant thereto, and the prior decisions of that Court, he should feel absolutely constrained by the rules prescribed for his judicial conduct as contained in the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association. Canon 20 provides:

"A judge should be mindful that his duty is the application of general law to particular instances, that ours is a government of law and not of men, and that he violates his duty as a minister of justice under such a system if he seeks to do what he may personally consider substantial justice in a particular case and disregards the general law as he knows it to be binding on him. Such action may become a precedent unsettling accepted principles and may have detrimental consequences beyond the immediate controversy. He should administer his office with a due regard to the integrity of the system of the law itself, remembering that he is not a depository of arbitrary power, but a judge under the sanction of law."

That our forefathers contemplated that the urgency of changing times would require a course not envisaged by them is clearly recognized in the last article of the Constitution, which provides for its amendment to meet the exigencies of a changing world. It is by this process that you and I are afforded the opportunity to give studied consideration to suggested changes. If we by the exercise of our democratic franchise decree a

change, we will be better prepared to live with it.

Some have suggested that amendment is too slow and tedious to effect needed changes. This is not true. There have been twenty-two amendments to the Constitution. The average time required for adoption was less than one year. Only one amendment, the fourteenth, has taken more than 2 years. It took only 10 months to adopt the 13th amendment abolishing slavery.

It is significant to note that Congress and the people of the United States felt it necessary to amend the Constitution by adding the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote. Can it now be said, within constitutional limits, that racially-integrated public education is one of the unalienable rights within the terms of the 14th amendment, when it was so openly conceded that the right to express one's voice in free government by the exercise of the franchise was not one of those rights?

In a rash of recent judicial opinions by our highest court, which I need not enumerate, the states have been shorn of many of the powers reserved by them. The Constitution has been given a meaning never intended by those who wrote it and certainly not justified by its language. Those opinions, reflecting the political and social philosophy of their authors, have effected radical changes in our social order—changes that admittedly could not possibly have occurred by the process of amendment.

Whatever may be our philosophy and predilections respecting the trends of rapidly changing times, we are bound to respect the conservatism and traditions of an earlier era until such time as an informed public, acting within the framework of a constitution prescribed by the wisdom of their ancestors, decrees a change.

Our Mounting Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, December 2, 1958. I do not agree with this editorial, as I think we in the Congress have suffered terribly because of the lack of leadership on the part of the administration. The present administration keeps talking economy, and then recommending record budgets after budgets, which are the highest in peacetime history. Whenever Congress tries to economize, the President or some of his captors cry, "Wolf, wolf," except that they use the term "emergency," instead of the term "wolf."

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we Democrats, having the majority that we are going to have this year, are going to have to be careful to make sure that we are not to blame for the extravagances of a misinformed and misguided Executive.

The article follows:

THE CAUSE OF OUR MOUNTING DEBT—DEMOCRATS BLAMED FOR BIG EXPANSION OF NON-DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

(By David Lawrence)

What would be thought of a man who kept on borrowing money and never paid back a dollar of it?

What shall be thought of a government that keeps on borrowing billions over a period of years and has a bigger debt today than it has ever had at any time in its history?

The annual interest now amounts to one-tenth of the United States budget. It adds up to between \$7,500,000,000 and \$8 billion a year. This interest payment will continue to grow unless somehow there is a beginning made toward reducing the principal.

It will be said that governments never pay off their debts. That's true. What they do instead is to cheat the citizen by devaluing whatever the purchasing power of the monetary unit happens to be.

If the millions of citizens who are thus being cheated understood it, they would not regard inflation as just a big word whose meaning they don't know. They would realize they are being robbed of their savings.

Today the dollar is worth 28 cents in comparison with what it was at the turn of the century 58 years ago.

In terms of 1930 values—when the public debt had been reduced to about \$16 billion—the dollar today is worth 58 cents.

In terms of the dollar of 1939—just 2 years before America's entrance into World War II—the present dollar is worth only 48 cents.

This is a shrinkage of more than half the purchasing power of the American dollar in a period of less than 20 years.

It's true that two world wars and the Korean war have materially increased the public debt. But that's not the reason it is bigger today than when the Korean war spending was at its height in 1951 and 1952. Actually, nondefense spending also has gone up very rapidly. The politicians in both parties have been insisting that the Nation can afford guns and butter, too.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., of which Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, is chairman, says in its November review that the "widely held" impression that defense spending is responsible for the growth of the public debt in recent years is inaccurate. It is pointed out that current expenses for defense are \$350 million less than they were in 1954, whereas non-defense spending is up \$12 billion higher than 6 years ago.

The President doesn't control the purse strings. Congress has the final word. One of the illusions spread generally is that the Chief Executive is responsible for the budget. He may suggest and recommend, but the Congress writes the appropriation bills.

As long as Congress thinks the public wants more and more spending on what is generally called welfare or social benefits, the tendency will be to spend more and more and send the public debt higher and higher.

But who is going to be cheated? There are in America more than 15 million citizens who are 65 years old or over. Of these, 11,640,000 are receiving benefits of some kind from Government. An additional 1.5 million get "old age" income from private pensions, annuities or interest or dividends on savings invested for retirement. Even allowing for some duplication, this is a sizable number.

Then there are the persons below the age of 65—the widows and orphans—who are dependent on fixed incomes from insurance policies or death-benefit funds. As the dollar fluctuates, these persons lose purchasing power each year.

The number of human beings affected directly or indirectly by the cheating process, whereby dollars originally saved are curtailed in purchasing power, may amount to at least 30 million persons.

The Congress has never felt the pressure it should from these voters, because they are unorganized. But someday the citizens will know where to put the blame for the drop in the purchasing power of the dollar, and they will express their opposition to the policy of "guns and butter, too."

Defense is all important for national safety. Luxuries and extravagances are not so essential. Yet the lobbies in Congress for bigger and better welfare appropriations are very powerful. The Democratic Party today has to accept the responsibility for the budget because, no matter what the President suggests, it is the Congress that must decide on how much shall be spent.

Supreme Court's Record on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the fight against subversion in the United States has been carried forward against the cunning and determined opposition of the disciplined Communist apparatus and its fellow travelers. The subverters have had the benefit of a peculiar ally—the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Staunton (Va.) News-Leader performed a public service in its issue of January 4, 1959, by reprinting an article from the American Legion magazine, quoting a report of the American Bar Association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include this evidence of how valuable an ally the Supreme Court has been to the preachers and practitioners of the Communist ideology.

The article follows:

We should like to present, without comment, a report of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives. This deals with the Supreme Court's decisions on communism during the past 2 years:

1. *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board.* The Court refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and delayed the effectiveness of the act.

2. *Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson.* The Court held that it was unlawful for Pennsylvania to prosecute a Pennsylvania Communist Party leader under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, and indicated that the anti-sedition laws of 42 States and of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be enforced.

3. *Yates v. United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and ruled that teaching and advocating forcible overthrow of our Government, even "with evil intent," was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end," and ordered 5 Communist Party leaders freed and new trials for another 9.

4. *Cole v. Young.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 gave the Federal Government the right to dismiss employees "in the interest of the national security of the United States," it was not in the interest of the national security to dismiss an employee who contributed funds and services to a not-disputed subversive organization, unless that employee was in a "sensitive position."

5. *Service v. Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts which had refused to set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department. The FBI

had a recording of a conversation between Service and an editor of the pro-Communist magazine *Amerasia*, in the latter's hotel room in which Service spoke of military plans which were very secret. Earlier the FBI had found large numbers of secret and confidential State Department documents in the *Amerasia* office. The lower courts had followed the McCarran amendment which gave the Secretary of State absolute discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

6. *Slochower v. Board of Education of New York.* The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it was unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the fifth amendment when asked about Communist activities. On petition for rehearing, the Court admitted that its opinion was in error in stating that Slochower was not aware that his claim of the fifth amendment would ipso facto result in his discharge; however, the Court denied rehearing.

7. *Sweezy v. New Hampshire.* The Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question Professor Sweezy, a lecturer at the State university, concerning a lecture and other suspected subversive activities. Questions which the Court said that Sweezy properly refused to answer included: "Did you advocate Marxism at that time?" and "Do you believe in communism?"

8. *United States v. Witkovich.* The Court decided that, under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which provides that any alien against whom there is final order of deportation shall give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the attorney general may deem fit and proper, the attorney general did not have the right to ask Witkovich: "Since the order of deportation was entered in your case on June 25, 1953, have you attended any meetings of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.?"

9. *Schwartz v. Board of Examiners of New Mexico.* The Court reversed the decisions of the New Mexico Board of Bar Examiners and of the New Mexico Supreme Court which had said: "We believe one who has knowingly given his loyalties to the Communist Party for 6 or 7 years during a period of responsible adulthood is a person of questionable character." The Supreme Court ruled that membership in the Communist Party during the 1930's cannot be said to raise substantial doubts about his present good moral character.

10. *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California.* The Court reversed the decisions of the California Committee of Bar Examiners and of the California Supreme Court and held that it was unconstitutional to deny a license to practice law to an applicant who refused to answer this question put by the bar committee: "Mr. Konigsberg, are you a Communist?" and a series of similar questions.

11. *Jencks v. United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Jencks, who was convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, must be given the contents of all confidential FBI reports which were made by any Government witness in the case even though Jencks "restricted his motions to a request for production of the reports to the trial judge for the judge's inspection and determination whether and to what extent the reports should be made available."

12. *Watkins v. United States.* The Court reversed the Federal district court and six judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and held that the House Un-American Activities Committee could not require a witness who admitted, "I freely co-

operated with the Communist Party" to name his Communist associates, even though the witness did not invoke the fifth amendment. The Court said: "We remain unenlightened as to the subject to which the questions asked petitioner were pertinent." The Court did not question "the power of the Congress to inquire into and publicize corruption, maladministration, or inefficiency in agencies of the Government." The Court did question the right of Congress to inquire into and publicize communism and subversion, and suggested that this "involved a broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens."

13. *Raley, Stern, and Brown v. Ohio*: The Court reversed the Ohio Supreme Court and lower courts and set aside the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.

14. *Flaxer v. United States*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Flaxer of contempt for refusing to produce records of alleged Communist activities subpoenaed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

15. *Sacher v. United States*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Sacher of contempt for refusing to tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee whether he was "a member of the lawyers' section of the Communist Party." In the second Sacher appeal, the Court again reversed the court of appeals and said that this question was not pertinent to the subcommittee's investigation of Communist witness Matusow's recantation. The Court refused to hear any argument from the Government lawyers representing this Senate subcommittee.

16. *Yates v. United States*: In the second Yates appeal, the Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the refusal of Communist Party member Yates "to answer 11 questions about Communist membership of other persons" did not constitute 11 contempts. In the third Yates appeal, the Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Yates' contempt sentence of 1 year should be reduced to the 15 days already served for this contempt.

17. *Bonetti v. Rogers*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that any alien, who "at any time" after entering the United States shall have been a member of the Communist Party, is deportable, Bonetti, an alien who became a Communist after entering the United States, was not deportable because he had reentered after quitting the party. The dissenting judges charged that this construction reads "at any time" out of the act and the word "last" into the statute, and "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

18. *Consul General for Yugoslavia v. Andrew Artukovic*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Artukovic, an anti-Communist refugee from Yugoslavia who is living with his wife and children in California, could not claim political asylum in America, but had to submit to an extradition hearing which would be based on Yugoslavia's political charges.

19. *Rockwell Kent v. Dulles*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department could not require every applicant for a passport to file a non-Communist affidavit.

20. *Dayton v. Dulles*: The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department had to give a passport to a research physicist whose passport application to accept a job in India had been denied for security reasons. The Secretary of State had found that Dayton had lived for 8 months with a Communist who "was involved in the espionage apparatus of Julius

Rosenberg" and that Dayton was going to work in India with another Communist "who recently renounced his American citizenship."

Tax on Long-Term Capital Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that revision in our tax structure is a must if we are to encourage the individual capital investment so necessary for providing jobs for our ever-increasing working force.

The amount of new risk capital required to keep our economy healthy at any given time is obviously related to population—to the demographic facts of births, deaths, longevity, retirement, and other germane matters over a period of time. As I read the figures, it now requires over \$15,000 of new risk capital to bring one new little job into the world. An examination of the available data on babies growing up and wanting jobs, on automation's replacement of old jobs with more costly new ones, and on inflation's toll on the cost of maintaining and replacing wornout or obsolete machinery, it would seem that we now need annually not only over \$40 billion of new risk capital to meet our new job needs, but also at least another \$40 billion of new capital each year to keep in good repair the tools of the jobs we already have.

This new capital can come directly or indirectly, from only one source—the invested savings of the individual citizen. And high taxes and unwise taxes which impede incentives to thrift, savings and investment, pose a serious threat to economic growth and full employment.

On the other hand, I well realize the fiscal plight of a Federal Treasury faced with a budget deficit of \$8 billion and the inflationary consequences that might result at this time from intemperate tax reduction schemes that would merely shift our tax burdens from one group to another and thereby stifle economic growth and further choke off the reservoir from which all taxes must be paid—the excess margin of real productivity over consumption, which we call savings.

Nevertheless, there is one area of Federal tax reform which would go far toward encouraging equity investment in new and small businesses, creating new job opportunities and providing additional revenues to the Federal Government. This area exists in that portion of our Revenue Code which deals with taxation of so-called long-term capital gains. To begin with, this tax is a very poor revenue producer because of its voluntary nature and because of its unrealistic high rate.

It is my firm belief that this is an unwise, and an unfair tax. It is largely a levy on capital and not on income. It

penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms who wish to sell and retire into smaller and less expensive quarters. It penalizes owners of investments who wish gradually to shift their holdings into more conservative securities as they gradually attain their less productive years. It prevents many constructive business transactions that would be in the public interest, especially the ability of small and weaker enterprises to merge with stronger organizations rather than be forced to discontinue operations which provide our citizens with jobs. And last, but not least, it has sterilized vast pools of risk capital, substantial portions of which otherwise would find their way into risk investment in new and small business ventures and thereby afford vast new employment opportunities, new productive capacity, and new sources of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing today a resolution which provides that the alternate rate of tax on long-term capital gains be reduced from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

It is my firm conviction that this bill is a revenue producing measure.

If this tax rate were so changed, investment in our economic system would receive substantial encouragement, new jobs would be created and the Treasury would actually gain revenues as a result thereof. After all, no one has to sell his capital assets, but a great many would willingly do so if the tax rate were made more realistic.

I welcome the bipartisan support of my colleagues in bringing this bill to early committee consideration, separate and apart from other revenue measures. I am sure the evidence produced before them at the attendant hearings will convince them of the wisdom of enacting this legislation.

General Practitioner of the Year, Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last month the American Medical Association's house of delegates meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., named as the general practitioner of the year Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin of Farmington, Iowa.

The tribute was most highly deserved. Dr. Coffin has spent most of his 68 years working for the welfare of all residents of the Farmington area beginning in his youthful days when all trips were by horse and buggy. He has brought into this world some 2,500 babies and has been of immeasurable service to thousands of other persons.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the Record an Associated Press story about Dr. Coffin

and the honor paid him as printed in the Des Moines Register for Wednesday, December 3, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE STORY OF IOWA DOCTOR: CARE FOR ALL, AT ANYTIME

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The Nation's new outstanding family doctor of the year wishes that all physicians would practice medicine from the humane side, caring for any patient needing their services.

And that's the life story of Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin, 68, a kindly mannered doctor from Farmington, Iowa.

He was named general practitioner of the year Tuesday by the American Medical Association's house of delegates at a meeting here.

"I am worried that a small minority of doctors look at their practice from the commercial side," he told a news conference. "But it is a very small minority. The majority of doctors do a good job."

SEVEN DAYS A WEEK

To Dr. Coffin a good job has meant working days and nights as needed, 7 days a week, during his 44-year medical career in Farmington, a community of about 1,000.

When he started practice in the horse-and-buggy era he was 1 of 5 doctors serving the town. Now, with the automobile simplifying the transportation problem, he serves the area alone.

Since suffering a heart attack 8 years ago he has limited the number of night calls. But he still works on Sundays.

Dr. Coffin, who said he doubts he ever will retire, recalled he has delivered 2,500 babies—2,000 of them in their own homes—and he has helped handle many kitchen table operations, because Farmington never has had a hospital.

What's the difference between today's medical patients and those seen nearly a half century ago?

FAST-CLIP LIVING

More of today's patients suffer from psychosomatic complaints.

"It's tension caused by fast-clip living," he thinks the family doctor is well he said.

equipped to handle complaints of this type.

The patient is close to his family doctor and comes to him naturally for treatment, advice, and assurance, Dr. Coffin said.

"What is the most outstanding case or event that has occurred to you?" he was asked.

His answer was nothing more dramatic than the injecting of a hypodermic needle into a boy critically ill with tetanus infection.

But while tetanus was an old story for him even then, it was his first experience with antitoxin. The boy lived. All the others had died.

FIRST IOWAN

Dr. Coffin, a widower, was flanked at the news conference by his two daughters, Mrs. William Hols and Mrs. Floyd Miller of Farmington.

Dr. Coffin is the first Iowan to win the award.

He was born on a small farm in Clark County, Mo., and moved to Iowa at the age of 5. He was graduated from Farmington high in 1909 and 4 years later was a member of the last medical class graduated from Drake university in Des Moines.

He served as president of the Iowa Medical Society in 1956.

Cotton: A "King" in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, two of Texas' top morning and afternoon newspapers, the Austin American and the Austin Statesman, published in their Sunday combination—the American Statesman—of December 14 an alarmingly graphic feature involving the bleak status of our Nation's ailing cotton-producing industry.

Captioned, "Cotton: A 'King' in Trouble," the analytic feature was written by State Editor Dave Shanks, columnist and authoritative analyst of agricultural and ranching matters.

Mr. Shanks' report represents a skillfully drawn literary portrait of despair, based not on the intangibles of theory, but on the hard facts of economics, the kind of economics which are day-to-day facts to a great body of American farmers. The tragedy of agriculture, or the small farmer's share of it, simply is that farmers are expected to perform as free producers when the things they buy and sell are subject to various controls, governmental, industrial and union. Of equal importance is the threat to an agricultural culture that has given this country the only overall farm abundance enjoyed by any nation on earth.

Surely, there is a better approach than the one we now have for restoring stability and incentive to the farmers of America—prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress should be given opportunity to read and study Mr. Shanks' article; and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Dec. 14, 1958]

COTTON: A "KING" IN TROUBLE

(By Dave Shanks)

The long drought that shriveled the cotton economy of central Texas' "black waxy" region was succeeded by another weather cruelty.

Rains, welcomed in the dormant winter season, stayed on too long. Chocolate-colored mud bogged tractors loaded with can-shaped planting rigs in the spring. A humid summer cheapened lint grades with rot and spots and drove impatient migrant-field laborers under barns and finally on to west Texas.

One day last week at Elgin, on the southern edge of prairie triangle spreading across Texas northward to the Red River, Ed Lundgren watched a work crew inch into place a heavy machine for a new cotton oil mill on the site of one gutted by fire just before New Year's. A frog voiced warning of the Katy's freight thundering through the crossing between the oil mill and the bank, two blocks west of Main Street, had interrupted his complaints.

"A new crop year begins, but we still have old cotton in the fields," lamented Lundgren, a short, bald man who has grown or processed cotton for most of his life.

On Monday, just as they have for the last 6 years, small farmers of the old Cotton Belt from Georgia to Texas and the newer "cotton ranchers" from Lubbock to Los Angeles will drift into courthouses and country schools to vote in another industry-wide referendum.

A CERTAIN OUTCOME

The election outcome is certain: 1959 will be cotton's seventh season of controlled acres and subsidy payments since the end of World War II.

The certainty of the outcome spotlights the precarious hold on sovereignty by King Cotton.

Vagaries of weather, dictionary-thick stacks of Government regulations, innovations of the technology that quadrupled farm output as well as launched a rocket moonward. All these plague cotton, making tragic the era for a crop once powerful enough to arm a Confederate nation with an economic weapon the equal of the Union's industries. Even now, the crop is the South's biggest industry and the West's biggest farming venture.

Squeezed round bale-to-round bale in compress warehouses across the South, the cumbersome surplus of cotton is only slightly less bulky than the commodity mountains of wheat in Great Plains elevators and bulging corncribs on Midwest farms.

The surpluses are symbols of the new farm problem just as they were of the old.

Next year, the symbols may be bigger, but the farm policy will be different.

AIMING FOR A LAW

Bearing the imprint of Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's philosophy of free choice for agriculture, the 1959 referendum triggers a historical policy change. Substituting a new flexibility for the older rigid-type programs, Benson has maneuvered the first breakthrough in U.S. farm policy in a decade.

The current complex of Federal farm law and bureaucratic regulation began as a Government-sponsored assurance to depression-scared farmers, offering them a guaranteed price floor to boost production for World War II.

The aim was a quasi-law of supply and demand. Simple arithmetic and more sophisticated statistical guessing were to enforce the law.

U.S. Agriculture Department experts would add up these figures: (1) Last year's crop carryover; (2) a stockpile for national emergency; (3) foreign export; (4) domestic consumption.

This sum would be divided by the average per acre cotton yields.

An answer-quotient would be the number of acres required to grow cotton to meet the demand.

The quotient, in acres, has ranged from 20 to 16.5 million. The land pool was divided among States, counties, individual farms. Allotments for each were based on the history of past plantings.

For restricting production by formula, farmers got the chance to hedge their crops. They could sell in the open market or borrow at a price floor through Commodity Credit Corporation loans. Theoretically, an accurate estimate of acres and demand welded supply and demand into unity.

A strange admixture of politics and the gadgets of technology set in motion a crisis that began with the peace treaties.

Politically, the congressional farm bloc—an alliance of cotton and corn State solons—insisted the acre pool be kept constant and big. The statisticians lost the battle with Congress.

Farmers eyed the price floor, then turned to try out the efficiencies of the war-created technology. This meant new machines, a fantastic new chemical industry that turned out tons of crop-boosting fertilizers and crop-saving insecticides, irrigation wells, and a host of other expensive capital items.

As it had in industry, technology paid dividends in agriculture. In 1958 producers could grow 469 pounds of lint (just under 500-pound bales) per acre, or 52 pounds more than the past alltime record in 1955.

In central Texas, growers used the new techniques to build acre yields from 175 pounds to 250 pounds in less than 10 years. John Vernon Stiles of Taylor, the region's economic expert for the industry, says Williamson County farmers planted 30,000 acres, hauled 57,000 bales to gins this season.

Added to the political decision and the science of production was a new market enemy.

Other U.S. chemists had built a synthetic fiber industry that produced without regard of weather or insects enough fibers to spin cloth equivalent to 5 million cotton bales, or a third of the nation's fiber consumption.

Across international boundaries, peons in Mexico and peasants in South America and Africa labored in the harvests on more and more acres planted to crop. Buyers at Tokyo, Hamburg, and Liverpool bid substantially less for foreign cotton than they did for the U.S. crop.

What had happened to cotton had occurred for most other U.S. staple crops, and the surpluses cost the Agriculture Department most of its \$5 billion a year budget.

After 6 years as the most controversial U.S. Agriculture Secretary in history, Benson gunned down the farm bloc. His arsenal included city-based Democrats, a Presidential veto, and a self-asserted public opinion. His victory already has forced cornrowners to discard Government controls, which may incur tremendous corn stocks next year, and will force cotton-growers to make a new choice in 1959.

Next year, a farmer can—

(1) Plant within a base acre allotment, receive a guaranteed loan of 80 percent parity (33 cents per pound, Middling 15/16-inch class);

(2) Plant the base allotment plus 40 percent more acres, receive a guaranteed loan of 65 percent of parity, or about 27 cents per pound.

Ostensibly, the choice for a farmer is simple, or if complicated, the degree is arithmetical and not algebraic.

But in the beer parlor at Niederwald, at the Farm Bureau meeting at Hutto, even after church on Sundays, central Texas farmers are making calculations for a choice they know is not simple or satisfying.

Essentially, these calculations could be typical:

A farmer with a 100-acre base allotment and prospects of growing half a bale of cotton per acre could—

(1) Plant within his base allotment, receive \$8,250 for his 50 bales worth \$165 a bale, or 33 cents a pound.

(2) Plant 140 acres (40 percent more than his base allotment), receive \$9,450 for his 70 bales worth \$135 a bale, or 27 cents a pound.

Another calculation must intervene. Farmers estimate harvest costs ranging from \$35 to \$45 per bale, based on paying hand labor \$2 per hundredweight for the 2,000 pounds of "bollies" needed to make a 500-pound bale of lint.

Deducting these charges, 50 bales would still yield \$6,250 with higher subsidy rates

and 70 bales would yield only \$6,650 at the lower rate.

Involved in this last calculation are all the complexities of economic theory and fact that distinguishes agriculture from most other industries.

The assumption is that harvest charges will be more and more expensive, since farm labor wage rates are tied to rising urban wages and salaries. Moreover, most farmers reason that the bulk of their other production costs (tractors, gasoline, planting seed, etc.) are fixed at a per unit level that would not vary for 1 bale, 10 bales, or 100 bales.

UNIT COST INCREASE

In short, a technology that increased production by as much as 20 to 30 percent in a decade has failed to achieve a decreasing cost production pattern that would lower unit costs less as production increased. Despite the machines, or maybe because of them, unit costs not only are constant for large or small output levels, but they are getting higher and higher.

This assumption represents a conflict, even a paradox. For strange and different results have been counted over the expanded Cotton Belt that extends now ocean to ocean. For one thing, the production units range from patch-sized farms to ranch-big factories. Typically, central Texas, in the center of the continental industry area, is characterized by middle-sized units described by agriculturists as the family sized farm.

The Texas blacklands, however, encounter two important problems in matching the technological advances: The family sized farm's optimum size is getting bigger and bigger (to use four-row instead of two-row tractors); about half the farm operations are by tenants on year-to-year tenure agreements, making impossible either long-term soil conservation practices or other investments.

Few farms in the area can utilize \$6,000 cotton harvesting machines that cut harvest charges or \$20,000 irrigation wells that bolster production.

Despite this snag, a piece of machinery may change the cost structure, bolstering farm income in this area. Cotton strippers have been used by some farmers in the area. Most give the machines an A-1 rating, claim they can cut harvest charges 60 percent as compared to a hand-harvested crop. Typical cost estimates are about \$15 per bale (instead of \$40).

This sort of saving could widen the margin of profit for a larger crop, even as soon as 1959.

THE CHOICES FOR 1959

The choices for planting a crop in 1959 have an even longer range importance than next year's production.

Some experts say the 1959 crop will be grown on more acres than the 1958 crop. This means that production will be stepped up, creating an even larger cotton surplus and requiring new cuts in acre allotments.

The record of crop controls is one of acre retrogression already. For central Texas growers this year sustained a 10- to 12-percent acre cut. Over a longer period, cotton expert Stiles cites the Williamson County acre history.

Prior to the control years, Williamson farmers planted from 175,000 to 200,000 acres of cotton. The decline has been steady. Next year, farmers in this county can plant 102,000 on base allotment acres. Even that is 13,000 acres less than there were allocated in 1958.

What choice will farmers actually make?

A poll of growers in three central Texas counties indicates that most area producers will plant fewer acres to get higher subsidies.

There are exceptions. R. H. Brookshire of Thrall and R. W. (Dusty) Rhoades of Taylor

both plan to plant the maximum number of acres.

Explains Brookshire: "I would plant more acres because it would be more profitable. A cotton farmer's biggest cost is harvesting his crop. With machine harvesting, I can make more profit per bale with more cotton."

Rhoades favors planting more cotton acres "to get away from planting so much milo, which really cuts down on land production."

But Rudolph Kovar of Circleville says he plans to "plant within the base allotment to get a better price for the cotton I grow."

In Williamson County, Correspondent Vera Allan found that farmers intended to plant for the higher loan rate by a 4-to-1 margin.

One, Robert Riske of Walburg, even advocated complete abandonment of government programs. "I'd like for them to turn the farmer loose. If it ever comes to a vote on that, I'll vote to let farmers be free again."

A OPTION FOR MOST

But most others, though dissatisfied, will use the A option.

Said Martin Bergstrom of Georgetown: "The program is a mess. It's not functioning like it ought to. Seems to me the little fellow is being taken advantage of. But I don't want to plant too much cotton and get a low price for it."

Frank Simek of Jarrell believes that a farmer "will have it rough" unless he stays within the lower allotment plan.

Correspondent Henry Martindale at Lockhart said farmers favored 7-to-1 the A option. But County Agent Steve Lindsey reported farmers who had used cotton stripper machines were satisfied and some may plant under the B option.

American Investments in Foreign Ventures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee recently completed a series of extremely important hearings designed to gain information that will be helpful to the House in determining what should be done legislatively to encourage productive American investments in foreign ventures and the reinvestment of foreign earnings.

The committee has received a great many useful and constructive suggestions from representatives of industry and Government which have been helpful to us in preparing legislation for the consideration of the House. However, time did not permit the committee to hear representatives of all the groups interested in this vital aspect of the world's economy.

However, I have a statement from Mr. Chad F. Calhoun, vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp., and many of its affiliates, which contains a number of excellent suggestions with respect to a possible approach to this problem. Consequently, I would like to have this statement made a part of the Record of the

House so that it will be available to many individuals in Government and industry who are interested in this problem.

The Kaiser companies are active in many areas of the world and have had practical experience in this field. I am extremely pleased that Mr. Calhoun and his colleagues have given us the opportunity to gain from their vast experience in this area of international economics.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the statement, as follows:

My name is Chad F. Calhoun, of Washington, D.C. I am vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp. and its various affiliated companies, including Henry J. Kaiser Co., Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., Kaiser Steel Corp., and Willys Motors, Inc.

Like many other American business firms, the Kaiser companies are working today in all parts of the world. Our engineering and construction division is presently building a large hydroelectric project in Australia, a steel plant in India, a steel plant and an automotive manufacturing plant in Brazil, and a power plant in Puerto Rico. We are making a study of the proposed Volta River dam for the Government of Ghana, and are in the planning stages of numerous other engineering projects throughout the world. Willys Motors, Inc., a Kaiser wholly owned subsidiary, is now manufacturing Universal Jeep vehicles, Jeep trucks and passenger cars, either through affiliated companies or licensees, in every continent except Africa, and we believe that an African manufacturing project is not far off. Kaiser Aluminum is now mining or searching for bauxite in many countries. It is also planning to invest in reduction and fabricating plants in India, and is considering participating in similar projects in Argentina, Brazil, and Spain. Kaiser Steel is seriously studying the feasibility of participating in the development of the rich iron ore deposits of Brazil. Permanente Cement, also a Kaiser company, obtains the raw material for its gypsum products in Mexico.

We have also joined other American investment and business firms to contribute part of the initial capital for foreign development banks sponsored by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We are stockholders of Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation, and with the approval of the Indian Government, we are now arranging a similar investment in the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India.

The Kaiser management is aware not only of the business opportunities that may be found abroad, but also of the risks that surround these opportunities. We are equally aware that the choice between doing business at home and doing business abroad is no mere matter of dollars and cents, but a matter of the survival of our basic economic and governmental institutions. Both as businessmen and as citizens, we realize the urgent need to stimulate the greatest possible flow of western capital and technical skills to other parts of the world in time to channel the "revolution of rising expectations" into economic and governmental forms that are compatible with western ideas of a free society.

It is not our purpose to dwell on this urgent need, which has been clearly recognized by the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and by virtually all of the witnesses, both Government officials and businessmen, who have testified before this committee. We take it there is general agreement that the flow of private American capital and know-how to the underdeveloped areas must be increased as a matter of primary national interest, and that

any Government measures which can help speed that flow deserve serious and urgent consideration.

Like many other American industrial firms, the Kaiser companies can contribute a part of the required capital and skills, and want to do so. We are interested not merely in the export of goods and services, but in investment of physical assets and individual skills in partnerships with foreign firms and investors in the underdeveloped areas with any financial return to us dependent on the ultimate financial success of the venture. We have found, however, that our ability to make such investments is sometimes seriously hampered by the need to pay American taxes in cash at the time the investment is made, long before the investment has created any earnings. We have also found that when foreign earnings do come in, our ability to reinvest them in other productive activities in the same or a different foreign country is seriously curtailed by the need to first pay an American income tax, even though the earnings are not being brought back to the United States, but are instead being reinvested abroad.

We therefore warmly support the objectives of H.R. 12368, and we suggest that its scope be widened as indicated below. We propose that, in order to encourage productive investments in foreign ventures and the reinvestment of foreign earnings, the United States tax on the making of such investments or on the resulting earnings be deferred until the earnings are realized and brought back to the United States for distribution. We have three specific suggestions, and we have attempted to illustrate the reasons for each of them by incidents from our own experience.

Summarized briefly, our suggestions are as follows:

(a) In order to encourage the making of productive foreign investments in the form of services, know-how, and equipment, we have the following suggestions:

1. Paper profits resulting from investment of engineering or construction services, technical assistance, or know-how in productive foreign manufacturing firms, in exchange for shares or in exchange for a deferred-payment obligation, should not be subject to United States tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

2. Paper profits or increase in values resulting from the investment of machinery and other assets in exchange for shares or deferred payment obligations of a foreign manufacturing firm should not be subject to U.S. tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

B. In order to encourage the reinvestment abroad of realized foreign earnings (including but not limited to those described in the first two suggestions), we have this third suggestion, which has already been made by Chairman Boggs and by several other witnesses at these hearings:

3. A new class of corporation, to be known as a U.S. Foreign Business Corporation, should be established under the Internal Revenue Code. To be so classified, it would have to engage primarily in the active conduct of business abroad. Its profits and gains from such foreign business activities would not be subject to U.S. taxes until they are made available to its U.S. shareholders as ordinary or liquidating dividends.

It goes without saying that all of these suggestions should be embodied in legislation so drafted as to stimulate the flow of bona fide investment in active foreign business operations, without creating loopholes for tax avoidance and without creating tax havens for investments that have no useful purpose in the struggle to improve world living standards.

We would now like to cite some specific examples from our own experience which in our opinion illustrate the need for the measures we suggest:

1. Paper profit resulting from investment of engineering or construction services, technical assistance or know-how in productive foreign manufacturing firms, in exchange for shares or in exchange for a deferred payment obligation should not be subject to U.S. tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

Kaiser engineers designs, engineers and supervises the construction of industrial plants in many countries. We want to expand this business. We have the men and the skills that are the true ingredients of capital formation in underdeveloped countries, often more important than the physical plants themselves. We will take the risk of participating in a project by accepting minority shares or deferred payment obligation payable in local currency for part of our engineering fees. A joint venture participation of this type is clearly a valuable contribution to the economy of an underdeveloped nation, since it not only reduces the immediate foreign exchange burden, but also brings all the tangible and intangible benefits of continuing partnership. Under present law, however, the acceptance of shares or deferred payment obligations would require us to make an immediate cash payment in dollars of income tax to the U.S. Treasury based on our anticipated engineering profit, and computed as if we had been paid in cash, instead of in securities which we cannot, or, in the interest of the project, should not immediately sell.

The tax law considerations which normally lead the Treasury to consider the receipt of marketable securities or obligations as the equivalent of cash clearly ought not to be applied to the type of transaction described above. Whether and when it will be possible to sell the securities or obligations, and for how much, is usually a matter of conjecture. Moreover, our national interest in promoting foreign investment makes it highly undesirable to liquidate the investment the moment it is made, in order to pay United States taxes. Accordingly, it would seem to be in the national interest to permit the payment of tax to be deferred until such time as a sale or liquidation, or the payment of dividends or interest, gives rise to tangible and convertible cash income.¹

2. Paper profits or increase in values resulting from the investment of machinery and other assets in exchange for shares or deferred payment obligations of a foreign manufacturing firm should not be subject to United States tax until such time as the shares are sold or the deferred obligation is paid.

The need for such a provision is illustrated by the experience of our wholly owned subsidiary Willys Motors, Inc. Willys Motors, Inc., makes the world-famous Universal Jeep line of vehicles. The principal natural market for Jeep vehicles is in the underdeveloped countries, where the lack of paved roads creates such formidable obstacles to economic growth. Since most of these nations lack the foreign exchange to import American-made Jeep vehicles, Willys has adopted the policy of establishing foreign manufacturing plants, wherever a sufficient market and industrial base exists to support an adequate volume of production. In order to establish a firm base for the plant's operation through the participation of local investors, Willys has organized these foreign manufacturing plants with Willys owning a minority stock interest. The majority ownership, and often the principal voice in management, is held by the local people. Willys is thus in partnership with more than

¹ If this tangible income is received by an eligible U.S. foreign business corporation of the type described in our third suggestion, the tax would be levied only when the income is distributed to the shareholders of the foreign business corporation.

10,000 local stockholders in Argentina, more than 15,000 in Brazil, almost 10,000 in India, and with responsible local businessmen in Australia, Israel, Turkey, and other countries.

The principal Willys contribution to these foreign manufacturing operations has been to invest American machinery and to arrange machinery investments by others, and to supply management and technical skills and know-how under license.² The American equipment invested has usually been taken from an existing operation of Willys or one of its automotive suppliers in the United States, and the fair value of this equipment to the foreign manufacturing firm has been substantially above its so-called basis for United States tax purposes, because of depreciation charges during its past useful life. On some occasions the equipment has been specially made by a machinery builder and has been invested by the builder for shares in our foreign affiliate, with the investment value being the sale price of the machinery, which includes the builder's profit. In all such cases, a transfer of equipment in exchange for shares gives rise to a taxable capital gain or taxable income when the shares are received, unless the transaction qualifies as a tax-free reorganization under section 351 of the Internal Revenue Code and has the prior approval of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 367 of the code.

For the transaction to qualify as tax-free for the American investor, all of the persons (including foreign associates) investing money or property in the venture as part of the same transaction must end up owning at least 80 percent of each class of stock of the foreign company. This test is automatically met when the foreign company is first organized. However, after the venture has gotten started, the time almost inevitably comes to make a second or third investment of additional machinery required as the foreign plant widens the extent of its manufacturing operations. By that time, well over 20 percent of the foreign company stock may be in the hands of thousands of local investors who hold bearer shares, and it may not be feasible to arrange matters so that enough of them participate as a matter of record in the second or third investments to meet the 80-percent test. Accordingly, when the time comes for Willys or its suppliers to make a follow-up investment of machinery in one of these foreign ventures, they may face the need of paying a United States capital gains tax or income tax, not on an assured profit in hand, but on the doubtful privilege of holding new shares in a foreign company, shares which may be difficult to sell and convert into dollars, and which in any event cannot be sold and converted immediately without prejudicing the success of the venture.

Similarly, Willys has at times found it necessary to contribute working capital to its foreign affiliates by making an investment of component manufacturing parts produced in the United States, in exchange for shares or long-term deferred payment obligations of the foreign company. The component parts are then assembled by the foreign company together with locally manufactured parts and sold as completed vehicles, with a portion of the sales price representing the Willys parts thus providing a source of local working capital needed for expansion purposes. In such cases, under present tax laws, Willys faces the need of paying a United States income

tax on its paper profit on the component parts, even though the reality of a cash return is a long way off in the future.

Once again, the policy reason for deferring U.S. tax until the profit has actually been realized by liquidation of the shares, discounting of the long-term deferred payment obligations, or by receipt of dividends and interest, seem very strong indeed. The present policy of taxing when shares, particularly, are received strongly discourages the making of such investments in the first place, and, when the investments are made, tends to produce the undesirable result of forcing their liquidation.³

3. A new class of corporation, to be known as a U.S. foreign business corporation, should be established under the Internal Revenue Code. To be so classified, it would have to engage primarily in the active conduct of business abroad. Its profits and gains from such foreign business activities would not be subject to U.S. taxes until they are made available to its U.S. shareholders as ordinary or liquidating dividends.

American business firms, including our own companies, could do far more if they were permitted to take the income received on one foreign investment and reinvest this income in the same or another development project abroad in the same or another foreign country without first having to pay a U.S. tax on these earnings, even though the earnings are not being brought back to the United States.

Under present law, any dividends or royalties received by a U.S. company from a foreign affiliate are subject to tax when received in whatever currency, so long as the currency can be converted into dollars or otherwise utilized. The amount of the U.S. tax is often substantial even after credit is taken for foreign taxes on the same income. The need to, in effect, prepay the U.S. tax greatly reduces the amount available for productive reinvestment abroad. Moreover, this need to prepay the tax tends to force the conversion of the dividend or royalty into dollars in order to provide the means, even though the exchange rate may be unfavorable at the time, and the temptation to keep the discounted balance in the United States rather than risk it abroad again is very great.

Instead of this negative disincentive to foreign investment, it would appear to be much wiser to create a positive incentive for the reinvestment of foreign earnings by subjecting them to tax only if they are brought back to the United States and distributed and not reinvested abroad. In this way, the income on U.S. foreign investment abroad would be kept at work through reinvestment abroad, thus greatly enhancing the amount of U.S. capital and know-how effectively being used to help raise the living standards of the underdeveloped peoples.

A specific example will illustrate. Through Willys Motors we own a minority interest in a Brazilian manufacturing affiliate. We are also interested in doing engineering work and iron ore development work in Brazil. We cannot use the income of our manufacturing affiliate for these purposes, because we cannot commit our fellow Brazilian shareholders to a completely different venture of our own. Accordingly, we can commit to these new ventures only our share of the dividends and royalties actually paid out to us by this manufacturing affiliate. But once the dividends and royalties are paid out to Willys, they become subject to a substantial U.S. tax. We must convert a large part of the dividends and royalties into dol-

lars in order to pay this tax, and when we make a decision on reinvesting the balance, the decision really becomes one of deciding whether to risk fresh dollars on which we have already paid U.S. tax. We have no incentive to keep the earnings working abroad in a new investment instead of bringing them home.

We could conceivably form a foreign holding company to hold the stock and license agreements of our Brazilian subsidiary, receive the dividends and royalties free of U.S. tax, and reinvest the profits. Some firms have foreign subsidiaries which serve this very purpose. But serious U.S. tax problems would arise if we formed a foreign company to hold these foreign securities and license agreements. Furthermore, it would be much less artificial and much more convenient if we could form a domestic rather than a foreign corporation to receive and reinvest abroad our profits from our foreign subsidiaries.

Accordingly, we wish strongly to endorse as our third major recommendation the idea of a U.S. foreign business corporation to serve this purpose. A U.S. foreign business corporation would be a domestic corporation. If it met tests requiring it to engage actively in a trade or business abroad, directly or through subsidiaries, with strong safeguards against loopholes, its foreign earnings would not be subject to U.S. tax until distributed to the U.S. stockholders of the U.S. foreign business corporation. This would apply to the following major types of income:

1. Profits from the sale of merchandise for use, consumption, or resale outside the United States;
2. Royalties from the use of patents, know-how, and the like outside the United States;
3. Compensation for technical assistance rendered outside the United States;
4. Interest and dividends from a foreign corporation which is engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business outside the United States and in which the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation has at least a 10-percent interest; and
5. Gains from the sale of stock or securities of a foreign corporation which is engaged in the active conduct of a trade or business outside the United States, provided the stock or securities have been held as an investment by the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation for 2 years or more.

When the U.S. Foreign Business Corporation made a distribution to its parent, it would then include in its taxable income the amounts which had been previously deducted and deferred. Deductions and credits related to the deferred income would also be deferred so as clearly to reflect the net income over the years. Thus, the ultimate tax paid, if and when profits are repatriated, would be the same substantially as would currently be paid by United States corporations and stockholders not allowed the deferment privilege. This would create a strong incentive for foreign investment by permitting the full use of foreign earnings for reinvestment abroad.

If incentive measures along the lines we have recommended are adopted, we believe that American private industry can play a much more effective role in helping other peoples to develop their economies along western rather than totalitarian lines. We do not mean to suggest that this will be a cure-all, or a panacea. There will remain great need for protection against the risk from currency devaluation, expropriation, and other foreseeable hazards inherent in doing business abroad. Also, no matter how much can be achieved by private industry, there remains a vast area of basic public works, such as transportation and power, beyond the present means of private industry, in which investment and development must remain the primary responsibility of

² If patents, trademarks and know-how are invested for shares instead of being furnished on a royalty basis, the problem of a taxable capital gain arises in the same way as in the machinery example described in this paragraph.

³ If this tangible income is received by an eligible U.S. foreign business corporation of the type described in our third suggestion, the tax would be levied only when the income is distributed to the shareholders of the Foreign Business Corporation.

governments. But a well-aimed program of incentives for private foreign investment can do a great deal to stimulate the outward flow of American capital, know-how, and enterprise. It deserves a serious try.

Gratuitous Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the Nation's Capital, where the public schools were integrated at a headlong and headless pace in a burst of official enthusiasm following the proclamation of its new legal philosophy by the Supreme Court, editors seemingly have a permanent far-away look in their eyes.

Oblivious to juvenile crime and moral laxity at home, they stare intently across the Potomac, where they see a mirage of disorder and decay in the efforts of the people of Virginia to educate their children in the face of Federal judicial interference and threats.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a pertinent editorial on this a peculiarity of editorial vision in the District of Columbia which appeared in the December 16, 1958, issue of the Northern Virginia Daily, published at Strasburg, Va.

The editorial follows:

ADVICE FROM WASHINGTON

Some of our esteemed contemporaries across the famous "line," having fully exploited the legal, moral, social, and religious aspects of racial segregation in the public schools, have now trained their guns on the economic phases of the problem. Thus the Washington Post, in an editorial captioned "Closed Schools Cost Money," discusses the economic dislocations threatened by Virginia's massive resistance program, and says the blunt facts furnish further dramatic illustration of the debacle into which the State's present official policy inevitably leads. It quotes a University of Virginia professor as warning that closed schools would halt the State's economic development.

If there have been any serious economic dislocations in Virginia, they are not observable in Front Royal, where the first school to close under the State's massive resistance program is located. There has been no wholesale exodus from the city, such as they have had in Washington, the model integrated city, where white citizens are moving into the nearby areas of Maryland and Virginia to escape the blight of integration. Bank deposits are normal, and merchants report an excellent pre-Christmas business. The entire business outlook is considered good. If the Post seeks support for its economic dislocations theory, it will have to look elsewhere than Front Royal to find it.

George Massey, secretary of the Front Royal Chamber of Commerce, says there is no tangible proof of economic dislocations, and no evidence of employee dissatisfaction or existing industries threatening to move out because of school conditions. The Post, as usual, is exercising a very vivid imagination and setting up a strawman at which to shoot in its bitter warfare on Virginia's segregation policy. And what is true in Front Royal is true throughout the State. There have been

no serious economic dislocations in Virginia, and it seems very unlikely that there will be. Virginia is conducting an honorable and lawful resistance to what it believes to be both unwise and unconstitutional.

If the Post would fix its sight a little closer home, and see the moral filth and degradation in its own backyard, it would have less time to criticize what it regards as the shortcomings of Virginia, particularly in respect to racial segregation. The racially mixed schools of Washington have become notorious as hotbeds of immorality and crime. Rape and illegitimacy are of common occurrence. Educational standards have dropped. Teen-agers roam the streets in wild and reckless gangs and beat and rob innocent citizens. It would seem that the Post would have its hands full if it attempted to correct the faults in its own city, without spreading its integration propaganda into nearby Virginia.

Twenty-five Percent Minimum Pay Hike Asked—Textile Man Seeks Boost by United States Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the attached story from the Columbia (S. C.) The State, of Wednesday, December 3, 1958. It is the story in which the head of the Nation's largest textile company called for a 25 percent boost in the minimum legal wage permitted by the Federal Government for textile workers. I think the story will be of interest to everyone who might be thinking about the subject, and certainly either this issue, or ones similar, is going to be before the 86th Congress. The article follows:

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT MINIMUM PAY HIKE ASKED—TEXTILE MAN SEEKS BOOST BY UNITED STATES LAW

GREENSBORO.—The head of the Nation's largest textile company called Tuesday for a 25 percent boost in the minimum legal wage permitted by the Federal Government for textile workers.

J. Spencer Love, chairman and president of Burlington Industries, declared in a statement that the only fair and just way of raising textile wages would be a law requiring all textile companies to fall in line.

Otherwise, he said, companies raising their workers' pay would be at a competitive disadvantage.

Competitive conditions are such, he said, "that a general wage increase cannot be made at this time, because all producers would not follow any pattern, even if set by a few leaders."

Love's company has more than 50,000 employees. The present local minimum wage is \$1 an hour. Love proposed that it be increased to \$1.25 in two steps.

"Our industry is operating today on much too narrow a profit margin to permit any producer to risk being seriously out of line in competitive costs," he said.

Boosting the minimum wage to \$1.25 would further widen "the enormous competitive advantage held by foreign producers," the Burlington chairman said. Therefore, he declared, "realistic quotas on imports would

be even more necessary to protect the job of American textile workers."

The minimum wage law applies to industrial and other workers in addition to textile employees. Some groups, including retail employees, are exempt.

In New York, President William Pollock of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, said: "We welcome the news that Burlington Industries recognizes the need for a \$1.25 minimum wage. Our union has been working for such an objective since 1956. But this is no excuse for delaying an increase until Federal legislation is enacted. Nor does it remove the necessity for an immediate general wage increase for all American textile workers."

"In resisting such a step on grounds that there is no assurance his competitors would place such an increase into effect, Mr. Love is admitting that the textile industry is undisciplined and incapable of doing the right thing by its employees. * * *

"The auto, steel, oil, and rubber industries do not have this problem because they freely accept collective bargaining. Wages are not a major factor in competition."

Pollock said the times "clearly call for a general increase in the textile industry. The cost of living has gone up 5.1 percent since the last raise in the fall of 1956 and productivity has risen 18 percent in the same period. Textile workers have not been compensated on either score."

Reached at his company's New York sales office, Halbert Jones of Laurinburg, N.C., president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and head of Morgan-Jones Inc., declined immediate comment on Love's proposal.

Other southern textile officials, however, did comment and some of them had questions to ask Love about his statement.

Amendment of Senate Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Santa Fe New Mexican, of which Mr. Robert McKinney is the editor, published a very thoughtful editorial yesterday entitled "What Limits to Debate?" The editorial supports the position taken by our majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Senators. Mr. McKinney is a very able and unusually progressive editor. I know that the editorial will receive wide attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Santa Fe New Mexican,
Jan. 8, 1959]

"WHAT LIMITS TO DEBATE?"

One of the U.S. Senate's first orders of business will be to decide whether to amend its rules and, specifically, rule XXII, which governs requirements for limiting debate.

Unfortunately, many of us lose sight of the extreme importance of the prompt and sound resolution of this question, because we see it only as a tactical maneuver fore-running a showdown on civil rights legislation.

It is true, of course, that there is danger, under rule XXII in its present form, that the North versus South struggle over school integration could grow into a long battle of attrition between immoderates on both sides, destroying chances for effective congressional action on a mass of other important legislation during this critical year when we are on the defensive not only on the earth but in infinite space.

The so-called filibuster issue is at heart the question of how to modernize the machinery of legislation without taking the governor off the steam engine, without destroying the historic safeguard of minorities against sometimes fleeting and often impulsive majorities.

Traditionally, the Senate has been the open forum of the world's most successful republic—the chamber where the American philosophies of government were fully, carefully weighed. Six-year terms and the designation of only a third of the Senators in any one election are provided in our Constitution, not through chance, but to give this deliberative body insulation from the whims and tides tossing on the surface of that sea of people which the 175 million of us make up.

So it's easy to understand by moderates supporting the proposed cloture amendment have been careful not to go too far—not to destroy the last defensive beachhead of minorities.

For tomorrow's burning issues are bound to be different. The West may find itself defending a minority position on public lands; the Senator from Illinois and his neighbors may be battling the majority on inland waterways. The day could soon come when those now most anxious to cut off debate could find themselves in desperate need of the traditional open forum to stave off legislation they know to be unwise.

There have been times when unlimited debate has proved immensely valuable. As Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona points out, New Mexico and Arizona would have been a single State these past 46 years had not a handful of farsighted and determined Senators maintained by filibuster that their minority view was the proper one, insisted on admission of each territory under its own constitution, and finally won over the majority after long debate.

We believe that the present rule, which requires the assent of two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate to limit debate, has been outdated and should be revised.

We agree with those backing an amendment to rule XXII to permit cloture by a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting.

While the amendment would not abolish the filibuster, it would mean that an effective segment of the Senate would have to hold the minority view or a filibuster could be broken with relative ease.

We hope the moderate Senators representing the Western States will assert their leadership and bring an immediate vote—rejecting the Douglas proposal to apply cloture by a simple majority and adopting the compromise amendment—without allowing the situation to develop into the spectacle of a filibuster on the filibuster rule.

This newspaper supports LYNDON JOHNSON and the other statesmen of the Senate who are willing to face up to the civil rights issue, are purposed to modernize the Senate machinery without changing its character, and are determined to get down to the mass of other important business on which our world position demands action.

Proposed Amendment of Senate Rule XXII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann concerning rule XXII of the Senate.

Mr. Lippmann has long been one of the most profound observers of the American scene. He has given serious consideration to rule XXII and how it affects our Government for many years, and I do not believe there is anyone in this country who better understands the forces which affect the operation of our Government than Mr. Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann knows from long and deep study that the complex system of Government which we operate in this country cannot be reduced to simple mechanical formulas which ignore the varying intensity of human emotions. He knows that simple principles such as majority rule, which may be quite appropriate for a city council or for the board of directors of a corporation, or even a social club are not adequate for decisions concerning the vital interests of a great federation of 49 States.

I urge my colleagues to give most careful consideration to the reasoning of Mr. Lippmann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJORITIES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Presumably, the first business before the 86th Congress which opens on January 7 will be the question of amending the rules to prevent filibusters. Under the existing rules which were adopted in 1949, debate can be ended by what is called cloture only when two-thirds of the entire Senate—or at least 66 Senators—vote in favor of it.

There is one exception. If the question is on amending the rules of the Senate, there can be no cloture.

Probably not more than 20 Senators in the new Congress will want to keep rule XXII exactly as it is. A great and overwhelming majority will support amendments to rule XXII. But they differ on how far they want to go. There are two main choices. The one is supported by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas and the other by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Under the Johnson proposal debate can be ended by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. In theory, this could mean that cloture might be applied by as few as 34 Senators, that is to say two-thirds of a quorum which is 50 Senators.

The proposal of Senator DOUGLAS, which has the support of men like JAVITS, KEATING, HUMPHREY, and CASE, also provides that within 2 days of the filing of a cloture peti-

tion debate can only be closed by a two-thirds vote of those present. But if debate continues for as long as 15 days, cloture can then be voted by a simple majority of the whole Senate, or 50 affirmative votes. Under the Douglas proposal there could be a long debate, perhaps as much as 8 or 9 weeks, but in the end 50 Senators could bring the bill to a vote.

The choice will be between the Johnson and the Douglas proposals, and in all probability the Johnson proposal will prevail. The real issue at the bottom of this complicated argument about the rules of the Senate is, I believe, a constitutional question. It is not what the letter of the Constitution says. For it says nothing. It is about what is in accord with the spirit of the Constitution.

The question is how big a majority must there be in order to overrule the opposition of a determined minority. Rule XXII, as it now exists, says that 66 Senators must favor the legislation before a determined minority can be overruled. The Johnson proposal says that a determined minority can be overruled, in theory at least by as few as 24 Senators. In practice, on a controversial measure there is, of course, likely to be a very full attendance. So, the Johnson proposal is not substantially different from the existing rule. There is one exception to this. It does not contain the indefensible provision of the present rule, which is that there never can be cloture on any proposal to amend the rules.

The Douglas proposal, while it permits extensive debate, allows 50 Senators to close the debate and to pass a controversial bill.

Having read carefully the material being circulated by Senator DOUGLAS, I have come to think that he has not dealt with the real issue. The real issue is not whether measures shall be fully debated. The question is how they can be passed. There is no doubt that 8 or 9 weeks of debate is quite sufficient for any measure, and that after that there is no hope of anybody's mind being changed by the debate itself. The real question is what are you to do with a minority which is not open to being converted by a debate. Under what conditions should you override it?

In my mind, the proposal to decide highly controversial questions by a vote of no more than one plus one-half of the Senate is not good enough. While the Constitution itself says nothing about the question, it is a fact that the Constitution is by no means devoted to the principle that a simple majority should rule. Treaties and impeachments require two-thirds of those present and voting. Constitutional amendments, the expulsion of Members, the overriding of the President's veto, require two-thirds of all the Senators elected. What is the reason for these exceptions to simple majority rule? Is it not that what is at stake is of such great moment that it should have the concurrence of more than half of the representatives of the States?

Why should it have this concurrence? Because when controversial matters are decided by a too narrow majority, the prospect of resistance and nullification is increased. To enforce difficult laws, there should be a very large majority which concurs in them.

The issue of the rules is a hot one because filibuster is a principal instrument of obstruction against Federal legislation on behalf of the civil rights of Negroes. The substantial question is whether the indisputable rights of Negroes can be achieved

and maintained by simple majorities which overrule the South, or whether progress depends on winning the assent of the rapidly growing enlightened opinion in the South.

In addition, we must not forget that majorities are not always liberal, and may indeed be quite tyrannical. It is a short view of history to equate simple majority rule, as does Senator DOUGLAS, with the defense of civil rights. He might ponder, for example, the case of President Truman's emergency strike legislation which proposed to break the railroad strike by drafting the railroadmen into the Army. The House was stampeded into passing this bill 2 hours after the President's message by a vote of 306 to 13. But Senators Taft and Wagner held it up in the Senate, and after 6 days of debate its sponsors were compelled to omit the provisions for a draft.

That too, was a civil rights case, and a very striking example of why simple majorities are not necessarily the guardians of civil rights.

**Prizewinning Essay by Miss Peggy Neal
of Huntsville, Ala.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Miss Peggy Neal, a high school student in the junior class in my home town of Huntsville, Ala., won a statewide contest in writing a paper on the subject "I Speak for Democracy."

It is an excellent statement, one which I believe will challenge the thinking of those who read it. Peggy is to be commended for the excellency of her work and the clarity of her thinking.

I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Peggy Neal)

I speak for democracy when I say that down the street from me lives a German family, one of several families who came to this country as part of the missile development program. Across the street lives a family from California. And in the same block there are families from States as widely separated as Florida, Maine, Texas, Michigan, and Colorado.

This is true of every section of the city where I live because as the site of Redstone Arsenal it has drawn on the supply of technical people from all over the country.

Each family brought its own ideas and ideals. Each family's ideas and ideals were different in some respect. But, fundamentally, the merging of those different ideas makes up a better community than was here before these families came. These families are all individual, with individual tastes, individual talents, individual hopes, and yes, individual prejudices. Prejudices that to us seem strange. Strange at least, until we look into ourselves and find our own prejudices that must seem as strange to them.

And the taste is as varied as the prejudice—more so, if possible. Painters, music lovers in all degrees, botanists, bird watchers, gardeners, sports car enthusiasts, tennis players, football fans, soccer fans, and even

wrestling fans. These are only a few of the many tastes that make up the community.

There are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and probably representatives of every political idea. Religion is the same: Catholic, Baptist, Episcopalian, Methodist, Christian, Scientists, Jewish, probably an agnostic, and even possibly a Hindu.

With this much variation in personality, taste, religion, prejudice, and geographical background, there must be constant and profound difference of opinion as to what is best for the entire community. There is. And those differences sometime seem bitter. No civic leader pleases the whole population at all times. No elected official travels an easy road.

But democracy is not an easy road. It is not the road of least resistance with every turn marked clearly for the idea traveler to follow at the direction of one central committee. It is a road on which every road change is the call to discussion, disagreement, argument, and finally, admission of the majority choice.

And therein lies democracy, the respect for majority will in the major community, and the respect for minority choice by the individual.

My community is no different from thousands of communities throughout the United States. The same prejudice, taste, religion, and background exist in them all. But with them all the one common denominator pulls them together, respect for the majority will in the community and national thinking, and respect for the individual choice and right to live within the overall community frame.

We are what we are, and we shall continue to be so unless by so being we interfere with the rights of others to be the same.

Support for the TVA

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "TVA Deserves Support for Value to Nation," published in the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of January 5, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial sets forth in summary form the great contribution which the TVA has made to our defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA DESERVES SUPPORT FOR VALUE TO NATION

Proposals to sell the Tennessee Valley Authority have been rejected unanimously by directors of the Jackson-Madison County Chamber of Commerce.

Not only have sale proposals been rejected by the local chamber's directors, but they are calling for adequate financing of the TVA's operations through revenue bonds.

The local chamber of commerce by this action joins many other valley organizations in defense of TVA.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, it would be well for its opponents to know, is not just another public power project.

That charge forms the basis for attack on TVA and is the means being used to try to destroy the Authority.

Were TVA just a public power project, there would be little to commend its retention other than the low rates it charges for power.

But TVA is far more than an electric power producer.

The Tennessee and other rivers on which TVA dams have been built belong to the people.

These rivers as far back as memory goes have overflowed and damaged millions of fertile acres of land, land upon which thousands of families depend for a living.

No person nor group of persons in private business could afford the cost of harnessing these floods. Nor should individuals be called on to pay for damage caused by public agencies.

So the Federal Government properly planned a series of dams to control floods from rivers owned by the public.

In so doing, it became apparent that building of dams would make it possible to make of the Tennessee and other rivers a great waterway for industry and business. That, too, is in the public domain just as are the superhighways now being built.

With water impounded and navigation assured, it took little imagination to discover that electric power could be produced from these lakes—and thereby pay for the cost of the entire operation.

Thus were the basic functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority incorporated in the act.

With the construction of TVA dams went efforts to eliminate disease, just as they did when the Panama Canal and other Government projects were built.

Availability of low-priced electric power enabled the people of the valley to use household and farm equipment for which no power had been available. And they bought that equipment. It was no gift.

Low-priced power also served as the one element which had been lacking to make of the valley the ideal place for industry.

These factors, and more too numerous to list here, have produced in our valley an economy which yields high tax returns to the Government, which has enabled TVA to remain far ahead on its debt repayment schedule, which produced atomic fission materials to win World War II, which day by day benefits all parts of the Nation.

Dismemberment of TVA would damage our valley. It would prove disastrous to our Nation.

With the new Congress elected and soon to start its deliberations, let us make our voices heard. Let us insist that TVA be preserved, and be permitted to continue its growth by giving it adequate financing.

More Farming Capital

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Hugh Cosline, appearing in the American Agriculturist of January 3, will be of interest to those who, like myself, are deeply interested in the plight of the neglected farmer of the Northeast.

This article is constructive in that it shows that by facing the future with courage, and adapting himself to modern methods, the farmer can still not only have a good life, but can even have a better life than his fathers had before him.

The article follows:

MORE FARMING CAPITAL

(By Hugh Cosline)

It has been said that an investment of \$20,000 is necessary to keep one man employed in industry, but that the investment needed to keep one farmer profitably employed is nearer \$60,000.

This rapid increase in capital needs raises serious problems. It becomes increasingly difficult—almost impossible—for a young man to start farming from scratch and hope to save that kind of capital.

It has been suggested that one solution of the dilemma is to interest outside capital in farm investments, with the idea that it will be a permanent or semipermanent debt, that the interest will become an operating expense, with little or no attempt being made to repay the capital.

It may come to this, but the question then arises as to who or what agency is to supply this permanent type of capital? One source of additional farm capital which is receiving some unfavorable comment is that provided by some agency which either sells supplies to farmers or markets farm products, in other words, what we have come to call vertical integration. Personally, I am inclined to think that the need for additional capital has caused many farmers to become interested in some type of contract farming, rather than the supposed benefits of smaller risk and less responsibility for management.

It has even been suggested that farm co-operatives and other farm organizations might be called upon to supply capital to members and patrons. To date farmers have supplied the capital to operate their co-operatives, but it may be that in years to come co-operatives will be able to tap some source of outside capital and to act as a middleman, to supply much-needed capital for farm operations.

More and more commercial banks are becoming interested in supplying farm credit, and some are doing a good job. The Farm Credit System, of course, has filled a real need. But in spite of all the good work done, the growing need for larger and larger capital investments on farms is worthy of the best thought of farmers and farm organizations.

OPPORTUNITY—NOT TRAGEDY

One result of rapid change is the necessity of unlearning much that we once considered gospel truth. For example, when I was in college I was taught that 1,000 laying hens were a full-time job for 1 man. Now, with modern poultry houses and the application of power to eliminate lifting, a man can take care of 5,000 hens without even raising a good sweat. And there is talk of a 1-man, 10,000-hen business.

Change requires dropping the old, adopting the new. For example, we have the trend toward fewer and bigger farms, a trend which we may not like, but which won't disappear because we ignore it to argue against it. To me the new lesson this teaches is that the path to satisfactory income on a family-sized farm lies in splitting up the total market for farm products among fewer producers.

To the man who plans to stay in farming, the trend to fewer farms, so long as farmers are free to stay or change, presents no tragedy. It's an opportunity. This is the American way, the path that has led to the world's best standard of living.

Of course, with changes coming so rapidly it is difficult to adjust quickly enough. But there's never a change that cannot be met. It is still possible to make a satisfactory living from full-time farming by meeting change as a challenge and an opportunity, and adjusting operations to take advantage of that opportunity.

Changes Wrought by the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article, in the nature of a report, entitled "Report Lists Miraculous Changes Wrought by TVA," and published in the magazine *Labor* for January 10, 1959. The article summarizes the last report of the directors of the TVA.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT LISTS MIRACULOUS CHANGES WROUGHT BY TVA

The Tennessee Valley Authority this week issued a report on its 25th anniversary year, citing the achievements of the great river-development system since it was created during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The report pointed out that TVA grew out of the natural resource conservation movement founded by another President Roosevelt—F.D.R.'s cousin, Teddy.

Thus, the report said, "TVA, in the fiscal year 1958, marked a double anniversary—the golden anniversary of the conservation movement and the silver anniversary of TVA."

All three members of the TVA Board—Chairman Herbert D. Vogel, A. R. Jones, and Frank J. Welch—signed the report. Their favorable account was regarded as surprising and welcome, particularly since all were appointed by President Eisenhower, who has shown hostility toward TVA.

Speaking first of TVA's success in ending floods in its seven-State area, the report says, "This farflung flood control mechanism does more than ward off disaster. It protects land having immense economic potential. Now safe from devastating waters are waterfront sites for factories and business, for parks, resorts and homes."

HUGE GROWTH

As a result of this safety from floods, the report adds, private investment in Tennessee riverfront industries has grown from only \$8 million in the first 13 years of TVA to \$676 million in the 13 years since then.

Moreover, control of the river has brought a huge recreational industry into being, a teeming fish and wildlife development, and improved water supplies for municipal and industrial use.

The report points out that two of Uncle Sam's atomic plants, and other Government uses, take more than half the power produced by TVA. Also that other demands are rapidly increasing for TVA power because its low cost makes it practical for use even in heating homes.

In attempts to meet the rising demand and avert a power shortage, the report says, TVA in recent years has been forced to depend solely on its power revenues to finance new plants and facilities, because the present administration has not asked Congress to appropriate any money to lend to TVA for new construction, as always had been done in the past.

Eisenhower in 1958 proposed that Congress authorize TVA to finance expansion by selling revenue bonds to private investors, the report recalls, but it was bottled up by the House Rules Committee.

The revenue-bond bill will come up again in the new session of Congress, with its chances improved by the fact that last November's elections tossed out some strong TVA enemies and put more liberal Democrats in the House.

Among other achievements of TVA, the report declares that it has wiped out the former plague of malaria in its region, and has attracted thousands of visitors from foreign countries, who go back home telling about the wonders of Uncle Sam's great multipurpose river program of developing the resources of an entire river, its tributaries and the vast surrounding area.

TVA TAX FIGURES

With figures and facts, the report answers the Power Trust propaganda charge that TVA pays no taxes and is costly to the taxpayers of the rest of the country.

In its 25 years of operation, the report says, TVA has earned for Uncle Sam a 4 percent average annual return on his investment in the public power system itself. TVA has paid into the U.S. Treasury \$250 million of power revenues and \$39.6 million of nonpower income. TVA is far ahead of schedule in paying back the money it borrowed from the Government.

In addition, TVA in its 25th year paid \$5.3 million in lieu of taxes to the State and local governments in its area. They also got \$8.5 million taxes from the municipal and farmer co-op systems which distribute TVA power. Thus, the report points out, the TVA system as a whole paid \$13.8 million in taxes and tax equivalents, which are taxes in everything but name.

That \$13.8 million, says the report, was 6.4 percent of all the power revenues received by TVA during the year from all its non-Government customers. And the 6.4 percent is more than the taxes paid by many of the Power Trust companies whose propagandists shout that TVA pays no taxes.

Physicians to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the inspiring discourses of 1958 was Dr. Gunnar Gunderson's given as his presidential address before the 107th annual meeting of the American Medical Association in San Francisco on June 24 last.

Dr. L. H. McDaniel, of Tyronza, Ark., past chairman of the American Medical Association's section of general practice, was kind enough to bring this splendid statement of principle and dedication to my attention—and, because it speaks so eloquently of the high aspirations of our American medical profession, it deserves to be more widely known. Dr. Gunderson, a resident of La Crosse, Wis., truly expresses the devotion of all our doctors and medical men to the ideals of "concern for human life and health, a respect for personal freedom and dignity" and of the "clear, logical mutuality of interest" of this concern.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, June 28, 1958]

PHYSICIANS TO THE WORLD

(President's address by Gunnar Gundersen, M.D., La Crosse, Wis.)

In accepting the office of president of the American Medical Association, I do so with deep feelings of appreciation, humility, and responsibility. My sense of responsibility is heightened by realization of the tremendous number and variety of challenges which medicine faces today. As individual physicians, members of organized medicine and citizens in the community and the Nation, we have in recent decades encountered an ever-increasing complexity of demands on our time and thought. Now, like all of our fellow Americans, we find our problems compounded by the world struggle for survival and freedom—in the new age of hydrogen bombs, ballistic missiles, and earth satellites.

In recent years the individual physician has had an increasingly difficult time in trying to keep up with the accelerated scientific advances in medicine. Now, with man probing into outer space, it appears that our scientific future will be further complicated by the development of still another specialty—space medicine. Nevertheless, right here on terra firma it is more than ever true that medicine is a lifelong study—one which actually is just beginning when the young doctor receives his doctor of medicine degree or completes his graduate training.

Meanwhile, we also are reemphasizing the emotional, personal, and spiritual factors in medical care. The age-old art of medicine—that intangible element made up of compassion and warmth—is regaining its proper place. In medicine, as in all other phases of American life, we are rediscovering that philosophy is just as important as technology, that the human personality cannot be subordinated to crisp efficiency.

The challenge of how to apply the science and art of medicine is formidable enough in itself. But it, too, has been further complicated by the changing backdrop on the American scene. Over the past 20 years we also have been called upon to consider a snowballing trend of social, economic, and political developments affecting medicine.

These problems are related to still another area—one in which we have obligations and responsibilities shared by all our fellow Americans. This is the broad arena of citizenship. We as individuals have the duty to bring our weight to bear on the vital question of whether the individual or the state shall stand supreme in America's future.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE PHYSICIAN

Certainly, one might say, all of that should be more than enough to ask of a physician or his profession—scientific excellence, concern for the patient as a human being, active effort to solve medicine's socioeconomic problems, and full discharge of the responsibilities of citizenship. I would, however, call your attention to still another challenge, still another set of demands. In this day and age—a time of terrible decision—we also must consider our obligations to all of humanity. As both physicians and citizens we must see that medicine plays its full role, not only in promoting better world health but also in helping the search for brotherhood and peace.

Some of you may be saying to yourselves, "With all our local, State, and national problems, how can we possibly find time to do anything about world health? What is the connection?" That, of course, is a natural reaction in view of the growing complexity of our professional life.

I would answer in two ways—one dealing with tradition and one with the realities of the present. The traditions of modern medicine began many centuries ago with Hippocrates, the Greek physician and teacher.

Students from all over the Aegean area gathered around him on the island of Cos. From there they returned home to spread the knowledge and ethics which Hippocrates had taught them. And it is important to remember that when Hippocrates wrote the medical oath which all of us have taken he was speaking not just to and for Greeks; his words speak a universal language that applies to all men. So, ever since those distant days on the island of Cos, dedicated physicians have made their knowledge and compassion available to all who needed them.

Turning to present-day realities, I am convinced by personal experience that our medical heritage—which stems from Hippocrates—can be applied more widely, more effectively, in today's troubled world. As many of you know, I have been active for several years in the affairs of the World Medical Association. As a delegate in its General Assembly and a member of its Council, I have had the opportunity to meet hundreds of physicians from more than 50 countries. And I have learned that they sincerely desire closer understanding and cooperation—not only on scientific and professional matters but also on a human basis. There is growing recognition that medicine, with its resources and influence fully mobilized, can perhaps do more for world peace than the billions of dollars being poured into armaments. There is mounting conviction that the time has come when medical statesmanship must be used to augment the methods of political diplomacy.

I firmly believe that we can and must expand our vision and face up to this new challenge. The problems which trouble us here at home exist also for the physicians and peoples of other lands. The knowledge, ideas, and experience which we have gained can help them. But we also can benefit from learning more about their difficulties—how they might have avoided some, how they are trying to solve others. Our international obligations are simply extensions of our local responsibilities.

The common thread is a concern for human life and health, a respect for personal freedom and dignity. In my opinion, there is a clear, logical, mutuality of interest.

If we think we have difficulty in keeping up with medical advances, let us consider the thousands of physicians, nurses, and technicians throughout the world who carry on their work with only a fraction of the facilities, equipment, journals, books, exhibits, and other aids which are available to us. For many of them, just this 1-week meeting in San Francisco would be the professional event of a lifetime.

If we think that our patients should have more sympathy and understanding, we who are bestowed with the blessings of our country must consider the millions of persons in other parts of the world who are diseased, undernourished, crippled, or dying. To them, just one kind word, one gentle word, one soothing drug would be like a miracle.

If we think that we have socioeconomic problems in American medicine, let us consider the plight of physicians and patients in those countries where there are extreme shortages of doctors, where people still pay medicine men and witch doctors for their incantations, or where medical care long has been used as a political football. In the latter case, let us learn well the lesson of medical unity.

If we think that our freedoms are threatened here at home, let us consider the millions who already have been subjugated by authoritarian philosophies or who are being victimized by constant, ruthless pressure and exploitation in the cold war between communism and democracy—a war that really can be won only by ideas, not by missiles or bombs.

As physicians, our first obligation is, of course, to our patients. But as members of

the medical profession, our obligation extends to all mankind.

THE PHYSICIAN AND WORLD PEACE

As American citizens our first duty is to this country. But as members of a civilization which believes in the brotherhood of man, we also have a duty toward all men who yearn for freedom, dignity, peace, and health. Physicians in America should never forget their responsibilities to all humanity or neglect their opportunities to promote the brotherhood of man.

We physicians have a unique opportunity to provide a spark of leadership which can help bring the world closer to the dream of world brotherhood. If you do not feel the compulsion of that task, I can only remind you of the sputniks, explorers, and vanguards whirling overhead. They in themselves are but the toys of grown men, compared with the potential engines of destruction which put them into orbit. If our alternative is destruction or a dream, the only sensible choice is to make the dream work.

Medicine can play a vitally effective part in bringing reality to the dream of world peace. For medicine, despite the designs of politicians or dictators, is above the harsh conflicts of ideologies and power politics. Medicine, like religion, speaks a universal language which passes all barriers of race, creed, color, and nationality. Already, great work has been accomplished by individuals, private organizations, medical associations, and official agencies. In fact, the brightest chapter in the international story since World War II is that on health and medicine. This is no uncharted course; the way is well marked.

San Francisco is a particularly appropriate place in which to stress the challenge of international cooperation. For it was here in 1945 that the United Nations was formed and the first suggestion was made for establishment of a new international health organization. Three years later the World Health Organization came into being.

While the World Health Organization was going through its formative stages, the physicians of many countries were meeting informally to discuss the need for an international medical organization. As a result, the World Medical Association was officially established in September 1947, with the American Medical Association as a founding member.

Thus, both organizations—rooted in post-war ideals of world collaboration—have just recently completed their first decade of service. From the beginning, they have maintained close liaison with one another and with many additional international groups interested in various phases of medicine, health, and general welfare. They are the main avenues for mobilizing and coordinating world medical resources for the common good of humanity.

Whereas the World Health Organization represents governments and the field of public health, the World Medical Association speaks for the medical profession. It now is composed of 53 national medical associations representing about half a million physicians throughout the world. Its principal objectives are to maintain the standards, ethics, and traditions of medical practice; to raise the standards of medical education; to promote the mutual exchange of information and ideas among the physicians of the world; to help raise the level of world health; and to promote world peace.

In pursuit of those objectives, the World Medical Association has carried out a wide variety of activities. As just one example, in 1953 the World Medical Association sponsored the First World Conference on Medical Education. More than 600 participants from over 60 countries and 127 universities and medical schools attended that London meeting, which focused attention on under-

graduate medical education. The proceedings have been widely distributed throughout the world. The Second World Conference on Medical Education—spotlighting the theme of "Medicine as a Lifelong Study"—will be held next year in Chicago, where we of the American Medical Association will be hosts to our medical colleagues from other lands.

Another new avenue of approach to help the cause of international peace is the Medicine and Health Professions committee of the people-to-people program, initiated last year by President Eisenhower. This program is designed to promote close contacts and friendships among individuals and groups who share professional, cultural, and economic interests. It is based on the idea that if the people of the world could begin to know one another—to meet, talk, correspond, and exchange visits—many of the world's troubles would be over. We might then begin to use the knowledge of the atomic age for humanity rather than in an attempt to destroy our civilization.

American doctors, medical missionaries, nurses, and technicians—serving humanity in far flung parts of the world—are contributing immeasurably to this great cause. The work of some of them was beautifully reported last January in the March of Medicine telecast called "M.D. International." They were described as unofficial American ambassadors of good will—men and women who are demonstrating the forceful good that lies in the basic brotherhood of man, who are revealing our greatest hope for the future—man's humanity to man.

President Eisenhower recently pointed out that the Armed Forces of the United States are only supports for the much larger purpose of a just peace and the advancement of human well-being at home and throughout the world. In the struggle for peace, he said, "the strength that endures rests with those who live in freedom." And he added that "tyranny is too brittle—too insecurely based—too dependent upon force and brutality—too contrary to the hopes and ideals of humanity—to last over the long pull."

Physicians, alerted here and abroad, can do much to advance the cause of freedom and human well-being. For medicine, by its very nature, speaks a universal language dedicated to scientific truth, humanitarian service, individual dignity, and world peace. In medical science there are no secrets, no iron curtains, no cold war. To physicians everywhere, atomic energy means a new way of fighting disease, not a new way of conquering the world. Medicine exists to save life, not destroy it.

The demands of these troubled times require that we perform at only one level—our very best. The time has come for medical statesmanship which will help point the way toward better health—and a better life—for all the peoples of the world.

Twenty Years of Court "Packing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the December 12, 1958, issue of U.S. News & World Report, by David Lawrence:

TWENTY YEARS OF COURT "PACKING"

(By David Lawrence)

For 20 years now the Supreme Court of the United States has been "packed" with justices selected from a cult that believes the Constitution can be rewritten at will by the judiciary.

The late Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, once proposed a constitutional amendment "to curb the power of the Supreme Court over Congress, the Constitution, and the rights of the individual citizen." He wrote in 1924:

"Labor and the Progressives do not attack the Supreme Court or any court. Their proposal to check the present assumption of power arises wholly from two facts: first, that the Supreme Court, whether by usurpation or by a sound interpretation of the Constitution, has exercised supreme power over our entire governmental structure; and, second, that this Court is selected in the most undemocratic manner conceivable under our governmental system, namely, appointment by the President for life. . . .

"According to Thomas Jefferson, the danger to our Constitution lies, not in lessened power of the courts, but in their augmented powers. He said:

"The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the judiciary—the irresponsible body working like gravity, by day and by night, gaining a little today and gaining a little tomorrow and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped."

"If this process of judicial usurpation outlined by Jefferson should continue, it would inevitably lead to a revolutionary explosion. For a judicial autocracy is no better than any other form of tyranny."

Mr. Gompers pointed out that the Supreme Court is not supreme over the Constitution because Congress can at any time increase the number of Justices and, by this means, a Congress and the President "can overthrow this judicial autocracy." But the labor leader said this was a "very dangerous" method and he preferred instead a constitutional amendment limiting the powers of the Court.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, however, did propose in 1937 just such a plan to increase the number of Justices. He hoped to be able to appoint Justices sharing his viewpoint so as to achieve a new majority. This move failed in Congress, but Mr. Roosevelt won his victory anyway. It was a victory for the philosophy that believes in "adapting" the Constitution to the demands of the hour—ignoring the amending process.

Mr. Roosevelt gloated over his victory. Having made several appointments to the Court to fill successive vacancies, he wrote in 1941, in the introduction to the 1937 volumes of his public papers, as follows:

"By the time the Court term was over in June of 1937, it was very clear that the entire approach of the Court to the many problems confronting us had completely changed. The views of the liberal minority of 1935 and 1936 were being gradually adopted by the one or two Justices on the other side necessary to make them the views of the majority. . . .

"It was not until after the end of the judicial term in June 1937, that a single vacancy on the Court actually occurred. The about-face in the decisions of the Court had come from the very same personnel that had been on the Court since my first inauguration. The victory, therefore, cannot be attributed to the new Justices. It was rather a realization by one or two members of the Court that the Court had exceeded its powers, that it had strayed away from the Constitution itself, and that the liberal minority of the Court had been correct in its conclusions."

But the fact is that the few decisions of this brief period which did represent a

change were not as fundamental as those that came afterward from the Court that Mr. Roosevelt did "pack."

This writer in 1936 wrote a book in defense of the Supreme Court as an institution and particularly emphasized the long line of decisions that had affirmed and reaffirmed what Abraham Lincoln once described as "settled law". The Court decisions prior to 1936 were commended as in accord with basic constitutional principles. But by 1941 it was apparent that settled law was being tossed aside by a new majority made up in large part of Justices appointed by Mr. Roosevelt. In an editorial here on June 13, 1941, this writer commented on the change as follows:

"The opinions handed down in the session of the Court just ended are amazing in their deviation from accepted principles of constitutional law. Words not written in the statute have been supplied by the Justices. What Congress meant to say or did not mean to say—though not revealed in the statute—are glibly interpolated through judicial legislation. Principles that have stood the test of time in their thoughtful balance of relationships between the Government and the citizen are demolished overnight. The lower courts are bewildered. The bar is stunned. The basic guide to human intercourse—that principles once settled are immutable but that details and applications of principles in specific cases alone may change—is now brushed aside. . . .

"The members of the bar who have been reading the decisions of the five 'yes men' stand aghast. For they see a Court 'packed' with men who are engaging in the very practices Mr. Roosevelt so vehemently condemned—the writing of legislation. . . . They see the Court voting almost always as a unit on New Deal issues."

There has been a lot of misrepresentation of the current criticism of the Supreme Court. It is mistakenly argued that the attack is against the Supreme Court as an institution and that this tends to undermine the prestige of the Court.

Nobody can undermine the prestige of the Supreme Court of the United States except the Justices themselves.

By their decisions they twist the Constitution out of its accustomed and natural meaning, as they assume the power to legislate or as they supply words to the law and to the Constitution which never were there in the first instance. When they do this, they provoke widespread condemnation.

An effort is being made nowadays to make it appear that the criticism of the High Court is due wholly to its decision in the desegregation cases. This simply is not true. The report which was approved last summer by a vote of 36 to 8 by the chief justices of the State supreme courts did not even mention the segregation issue. It did accuse the High Court of a lack of judicial self-restraint and cited a long list of decisions in recent years to back up the indictment.

The trouble is not wholly in the Court itself. It is in the law schools, too, where many of the new cult hold sway. Students are taught that the Supreme Court need not respect the intent of Congress nor the decisions of the past but instead can at any time ignore the law of the land and issue its own amendments to the Constitution.

Up to recent years it was accepted that the Supreme Court should make an initial interpretation of the Constitution and, once this was proclaimed as the law of the land, it would not be changed unless some new legal point was raised or new legislation passed by Congress or a new amendment added to the Constitution.

America didn't depend on Supreme Court decisions to change the Constitution in order to permit a Federal income tax to be levied

or woman suffrage to be adopted or prohibition to be imposed and later repealed. The people had an opportunity in each instance to vote on a constitutional amendment. This is as it should be.

But today we have what Judge Learned Hand of New York—perhaps the ablest of the Federal circuit court judges of our times, now retired—recently described as a "third legislative chamber."

Criticism of the Supreme Court is not only legitimate but essential to a free republic. There are voices heard which would stifle criticism and require of everybody a sycophantic obeisance.

It is healthy to discuss all phases of public questions. The American people have not yet been aroused to the dangers of judicial tyranny that face them. It is time to expose the true meaning of the philosophy of the cult which is teaching our youth that we no longer need to amend the Constitution and that the Supreme Court—nine Justices appointed for life—hereafter will perform that task for us.

How easy it is to fall into the ways of totalitarianism—to let an autocracy rule the people because presumably the people are unable to rule themselves.

The fight for constitutionalism must go on. Sam Gompers won his fight by public agitation, as Congress in 1932 passed the Norris-La Guardia Act curbing the courts' jurisdiction over labor disputes by prohibiting injunctions in a large variety of cases.

Franklin Roosevelt won his fight when he appointed only those Justices that he knew were believers in an elastic Constitution which could be altered at any time to satisfy the whims of so-called liberalism.

Unfortunately, the Presidents who have followed him, misled by some of the same cult in the Department of Justice, have selected several Justices known to be dedicated to the belief that the Supreme Court can rewrite the Constitution at will.

Thus, we have had 20 years of Court packing and the time has come for the people to checkmate that practice by limiting its effects. This can be done by a constitutional amendment prescribing a limited tenure for Justices and requiring that, among their qualifications, they be experienced, not in party politics but at the bar or on the bench. Also, it should be provided in the Constitution itself that, once an initial interpretation is made by the Supreme Court, this interpretation can be changed only by a constitutional amendment when a provision of the Constitution is in dispute—or by a valid act of Congress when a previous Federal statute has been declared unconstitutional. This is the historic doctrine—known as *stare decisis* or settled law—bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers.

U.N.'s Empty Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald while the House of Representatives was not in session.

It seems a good time to call the question of Hungary and her martyrdom, so well pictured by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, to the attention of the new 86th Con-

gress at the very beginning of its deliberations.

Certainly both the United Nations and the United States have little to be proud of in this matter. We have both passed by on the other side of the road with pious platitudes on our tongues and emptiness in our hearts:

The article follows:

U.N.'S EMPTY GESTURE—SOME MEANINGFUL ACTION ON HUNGARY IS URGED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When it comes to taking any meaningful action whatsoever on Hungary, the United Nations General Assembly is now showing all the firmness of a cream puff in a heat wave.

And the present evidence is that the United States delegation has itself caved in and isn't even prepared to stand up for its own convictions.

It is bad enough for the United Nations to wilt and refrain from taking the one, single, practical step to show the Hungarian people that the U.N. doesn't support their Moscow-imposed government any more than they do.

It is worse still, it seems to me, for the United States to toss its convictions aside, abdicate its leadership and go quietly along with a pious resolution designed to get the Hungarian issue off the agenda and under the rug as painlessly as possible.

This is what is happening at the U.N. in New York.

It ought not to be allowed to happen without somebody protesting and I think that most Americans at least, will want to protest to President Eisenhower, to Secretary Dulles, to Cabot Lodge, and to anybody at the U.N. who will listen.

What can the United Nations do that would mean something to the people of Hungary—at least a little something?

It can perform one positive act. It can refuse to accept the credentials of the Hungarian puppet delegates to the U.N.

The U.N. is powerless to enforce a judgment against this pseudo-Hungarian regime. But it is not powerless—unless it wants to make itself powerless—to render its judgment against the regime. And it is not powerless—unless it makes itself so—to deny this imposed regime a voice at the U.N. It cannot lift this regime off the backs of the Hungarians, but it can lift from itself the opprobrium of accepting the credentials of its spokesmen.

In the judgment of Hungarian refugees and others, such an action would do these things:

It would reduce the prospect of further internal terror within Hungary.

It would provide some deterrent influence if the Kremlin should be tempted again to ride roughshod inside Hungary—or other satellites.

It would salvage the moral authority of the U.N.

It would give some moral encouragement to all peoples locked behind the Iron Curtain of satellitism and let them see that the U.N. was not neglecting at least the one thing it could do, however modest.

And what, with the good—or the bad—offices of the United States, is the U.N. headed toward doing?

It is headed toward what it calls an alternative. This means naming a U.N. agent whose duty it would be to call upon the Hungarian Government to hold free elections, and respect human rights, and to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces.

That's what it appointed Prince Wan Waithayakon to do 1 year ago. He called upon and called upon and called upon—and he couldn't even get a visa to visit Budapest. He is now being thanked for trying.

The naming of a successor to Prince Wan to do what Prince Wan couldn't do is pointless, useless, empty, and futile. It is a way of appearing to do something while doing absolutely nothing. It puts the U.N. in the worst possible light.

To deny the Hungarian puppet regime a voice at the U.N. is a small thing; but it is something. It is honorable and meaningful and within the authority of the U.N.

Then, at the next meeting of the General Assembly the name of a brave nation would stand in front of an empty chair, a blazing symbol of what Soviet force has done to a people who committed the crime of seeking their freedom. And that chair could be reoccupied any time the Hungarian Government met reasonable conditions—free elections, political amnesty, and no more persecution.

Perhaps the U.N. cannot be persuaded to do even this much. But for the United States not to stand up in the open and try seems to me disgraceful.

How the Electric Cooperative Helps Its Members To Live Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following prize-winning essay, which was presented by Miss Judy Wood, of Centerville, Tenn., at the 1958 annual convention of the Tennessee Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In my opinion, Miss Wood's essay is interesting, instructive, and presents a concise picture of the growth in electrical usage and its value to rural homes.

The essay follows:

HOW THE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE HELPS ITS MEMBERS TO LIVE BETTER

(By Judy Wood)

(The Meriwether Lewis Electric Co-op, typical of its sister rural electric co-ops throughout Tennessee in the rendition of services to its members and area in addition to that of distributing electricity, has for a number of years sponsored an essay contest in all high schools in its service area. The winner of this year's cooperative-sponsored contest was Miss Judy Wood, of Hickman County High School. The following is her prize-winning essay.)

Occasionally a powerline is blown down or a fuse burns out at our house. Only then do I realize how much a part of all our activities electricity is. No lights. No radio. No refrigeration. I want to iron a dress; I said, "I'll do that now." But how silly of me. The iron is also electric. At least maybe I can eat lunch. What time is it? Naturally, the clock's stopped. And I can't fix any lunch, because the hotplate is electric. So I, who ignore electricity just as I ignore the usefulness of my 10 fingers, I sink into a chair—helpless without it.

Now this is a magnificent discovery—this magic little current running through our homes. Certain manifestations of it have been known by man for centuries (e.g., lightning). Our own Franklin showed the "sameness of frictional electricity and lightning." Watson, Gilbert, Lesage, Gal-

vani, Volta, Faraday, Morse, Edison—all these and many more contributed invaluable findings in the identification of electricity. Man today uses various other kinds of energy to generate the electric current which is superior because of its lack of bulk and its efficiency. It has been harnessed to manipulate almost any mentionable household tool, even down to eggbeaters and shavers. However, perhaps as magnificent as its development and practical application is its mass distribution.

Today in America power lines are strung down our highways and are congregated in all our towns. They are the commonest of sights. Also, they are common gracing the vast miles of rural area in the United States. Needless to say, electricity first became practically utilized in cities. And there it found its main business for some time. Now, though, and at reasonable rates, country people enjoy its benefits.

As the power was transmitted further, generating plants grew larger and less numerous. A tying together of systems has lowered the costs of electricity to the consumer and has made service to him more dependable. These great regional schemes are comparable in their work to the mass production technique in manufacturing. They have the capital to provide good service and by means of their consolidation, can furnish both it and the current more cheaply than otherwise. It is true that electricity, which is furnished to cities cheaply, is more costly for rural consumers. By pure logic, the higher the number of consumers per square mile, the less the individual rate: "It has been found that the cost of serving the average farm with electricity is about five times the average cost of serving the average city customer."

Therefore there was a great need for more inexpensive rates on farms. Farmers had a hard time; their operational costs were high, their inconveniences many—they, if anyone, needed the current. Congress, in the thirties, created an agency concerned with this problem and in 1936 farmers throughout America began to congregate and to discuss the feasibility of electric co-operatives. These spread across America and they are, in fact, so recent in evolution that many of us on farms still have coal oil lamps stored away in some dusty corner. The co-ops started as local organizations and consolidated, thusly increasing efficiency and service just as the great private power schemes had done for the cities. I myself remember the lines being built in my neighborhood and the occasion of having our house wired. A great saving in farm expenditures has been in evidence. Here, for instance, are some statistics compiled from Rural English life: light; 81 lbs. saved—pumping; 684 lbs. saved—milking; 540 lbs. saved by the use of electricity.

And so we see how the farmers' co-ops, among them our own Meriwether-Lewis (which covers Hickman, Perry, Lewis, Humphreys, and Houston Counties), have brought us the electricity which otherwise would have been beyond our reach. These co-ops are nonprofit organizations. That is to say, their profits are all used for the good of the project. For example, Meriwether-Lewis takes some of its profit for a reserve fund, the rest for repaying Rural Electrification Administration loans. And of course money must be allowed for salaries, etc.

Now let's summarize the ways in which electricity has helped us live better. In every household, rural and urban, we find lights, washing machines (in most), irons, water systems (in some rural homes), refrigerators, ranges, milking machines, clocks, radios, televisions, phonographs and ten thousand other priceless items. All these devices, needless to say, are improvements over

their hand-run counterparts. They are great time savers and, in the long run, are vastly more economical. And what has made such advantages possible for us of the farming areas? In 1935, only 1 out of 10 farms received electrical service. By 1950, more than three-fourths of the American farms were using electricity. This amazing increase in the use of electric power came about largely through effects of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936." Under it, private power companies, power districts, cities, and co-op groups were given funds to distribute electricity in rural areas. Over 92 percent of the funds set aside has been borrowed. And a further quote: "The REA program (of which Meriwether-Lewis is a part) has added several billion dollars worth of production goods to the national wealth of the United States."

Those of us who have seen electricity come to our homes and who remember the coal oil lamp days, can certainly appreciate the pricelessness of our shadow, the magic little current which is so very powerful, and which might not have been ours to use except for the work of the electric cooperative.

Salute to Ground Observer Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of December 4, 1958:

SALUTE TO OBSERVER CORPS

It is a high privilege for this newspaper to salute members of the Ground Observer Corps, a civilian volunteer unit of the civil defense, which will be inactivated on January 31 after 8 years of service.

The purpose of the Ground Observer Corps was to augment radar surveillance of air approach zones to the continental United States.

In 1956, the peak year, 388,000 volunteers manned 17,000 observer posts, reporting to 73 filter centers. Pennsylvania has had 511 active posts with 6,500 volunteers. In Luzerne County, there were 11 posts with 325 volunteers. Many individuals put in as much as 10,000 hours on duty in cold and heat, frequently in isolated districts and at no little personal sacrifice. Until 1955, these posts were manned by volunteers 24 hours daily.

Their devotion to their country, which they served so faithfully and unselfishly, will remain always as an example of patriotism in the finest American tradition. And that is saying a great deal in view of what has transpired since 1776.

Now it is possible to dispense with the services of these volunteers in this field and utilize them in other phases of civil defense, as the addition of the distant early warning line in northern Canada and the inclusion of our seaward extensions of radar with navy radar ships and aircraft make it possible to detect enemy-manned bomber strikes and identify them before they reach the borders of the United States. To meet the increasing speed and effectiveness of the various types of aerial weapons, the Air Force has installed and is presently using a new semiautomatic air defense system.

In a country, known for its peacetime lethargy, the record of the Ground Observer Corps is a refreshing exception to the rule.

Former Senator Davis Elkins, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, former U.S. Senator Davis Elkins, of West Virginia, died today from an extended illness. Death came in his sleep at a hospital in Richmond, Va., where he had been a patient.

With the death of Senator Elkins there passed from the industrial scene of West Virginia one of the last of a long list of pioneers in the development of much of the natural wealth of the State. The former U.S. Senator Stephen B. Elkins, father of Davis Elkins, had collaborated with former U.S. Senator Henry Gassaway Davis, his father-in-law, in processing and marketing timber and coal and in building many of the original railroads of the State.

It was from the late Stephen B. Elkins that the city of Elkins received its name.

Senator Elkins is survived by his widow, three children and six grandchildren. His children are Mrs. Charles J. Kelly (Katherine), of New York City; Davis Elkins, Jr., of Elkins, W. Va.; and Mrs. A. Thomas Zirpolo (Maureen), of Cleveland, Ohio.

The family has been active in Republican politics in West Virginia and the Nation for three-quarters of a century.

Davis Elkins was born in Washington, D.C., in 1876 while his father was serving as a Delegate in the United States Congress representing the Territory of New Mexico. His mother, the former Hallie Davis, daughter of the then U.S. Senator Henry Gassaway Davis, met and married his father when he came to Washington as a Congressional Delegate.

He attended Lawrenceville, N.J., preparatory school; Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.; and Harvard University.

He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War, having served as a first lieutenant with Company E of the First West Virginia Volunteer Infantry. He reentered the active service of his country during World War I and served as a major in Europe. It was during his service in the Army that he was elected to the United States Senate from West Virginia in November of 1918. He did not seek reelection at the conclusion of his term in 1925.

Upon leaving the U.S. Senate, Senator Elkins undertook the active management of his coal and timber holdings, principally in northern West Virginia. He actively pursued this interest until his retirement due to ill health several years ago.

He had helped shape the Republican Party activities at the end of World War I and had played an important role in the party's financing during the period from 1920 until his health no longer permitted his active participation.

It was upon this withdrawal from a leading role that his wife, Mary R. Elkins, began to represent him in active participation on the political stage and was sent from their home Congressional District in West Virginia as a delegate to the 1952 Republican national convention. Following that Mrs. Elkins was twice a candidate for Congress in the Second District.

The Elkins family has been one of the political and social leaders in the Nation since Stephen B. Elkins came to Washington in the 1870's. During the period of Davis Elkins' business career in West Virginia, he also maintained a home in Washington and most of the Nation's political leaders were frequent guests with him and his family.

The Davis and Elkins College in Elkins, W. Va., was an original joint gift to the Presbyterian Church by the two families who had lived in and developed that part of the State. Their original homes still serve as dormitories on the campus of the school.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete, but the body will be interred in the family plot at Elkins.

Tribute To J. L. Boal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, most of us will consider that we have enjoyed a full and successful life if we distinguish ourselves in one field of endeavor. Today I want to pay my respects to an outstanding Texan who recently retired after having rendered his neighbors and friends great service in two professions, and who has actively worked until he reached the age of 4 score years, and 15.

I refer to the Honorable J. L. Boal, who at age 95 years retired from the practice of law in Yorktown, De Witt County, Tex. He had served with distinction as county judge of De Witt County. Prior to his practice of law he was a highly respected teacher in the public schools. Thus his career of public service embraced two learned professions, and in both he did a job that won him the love of his neighbors.

Upon Judge Boal's retirement, the Bar Association of De Witt County passed a resolution to express the high esteem in which he is held.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the resolution adopted by the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., on January 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable J. L. Boal has retired from the practice of law after a half a

century of honorable service to the people of Yorktown and of De Witt County; and

Whereas the said J. L. Boal has served the people of this county with distinction as county judge of De Witt County; and

Whereas, prior to his service as an attorney and judge he was a teacher in the public schools, so that his career in public service has embraced 2 learned professions in 2 centuries; and

Whereas, upon his retirement the said J. L. Boal donated his law library to the De Witt County bar for the use of the attorneys who practice and the judges who preside in the courts of this county; and

Whereas throughout his long career he has distinguished himself both by his legal attainment and by his devotion to duty; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., That the Bar Association of De Witt County, Tex., express to the Honorable J. L. Boal the sentiments of high esteem in which he is held by the members of his bar; that it extend to him sincere good wishes for his continued good health and happiness in his well-earned retirement; and that it express to him the bar's deep gratitude for the generous gift of his law library to the bar of this county, and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to the said J. L. Boal by the president and secretary of this association and that a copy hereof be spread upon the minutes of this association as a permanent testimonial to the said J. L. Boal.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the association in regular meeting assembled at Cuero, in De Witt County, Tex., this the fifth day of January 1959.

FRANK B. SHEPPARD, President.

Bills Designed To Empower the U.S. Government To Deal With Certain Crimes of Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, January 9, a group of seven bills designed to empower the Federal Government to deal with crimes of violence such as hate-bombings, hate-mail, and threats directed at, or attempts to intimidate, Federal officers in the performance of their duties. These bills are substantially identical to a group of bills which the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS and the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING have advised me they intend to introduce in the Senate today. I wish to express here my wholehearted accord with those honorable gentlemen in the policy which these bills seek to effectuate. There may appear, upon committee examination and exegesis, the need for some technical revisions in some of these proposals in the interest of conformity to established Federal criminal law patterns. Such changes as may be necessary will not, I am sure, derogate from the fundamental thrust of these bills in the prevention and punishment of a program of conduct which has shocked and revolted us all.

Address by Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC, at a dinner held this past fall in Wilkes-Barre, by the Luzerne Columbus League: League:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. RALPH A. PALLADINO, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE AND ROTC

Judge Pinola, Congressman FLOOD, members of the Luzerne Columbus League and your guests, it is a great pleasure for me to be here this evening, and for this I must thank our good friend, Congressman FLOOD. I am highly flattered that he considered me for this splendid occasion.

I was happy to accept for at least three reasons:

First is for the opportunity to meet with the Luzerne Columbus League.

Second is for the sentimental reason that my father first settled in Pennsylvania when he came to America from the old country. I don't know what possessed him to move to Boston.

And third as an expression of my appreciation to Congressman FLOOD for his staunch support in strengthening America's defense.

Because of his efforts in behalf of our Reserve forces, my office has felt particularly close to him—and our working relationship with his office has always been excellent.

Some of this, I suppose, is because Mr. FLOOD is a kindred soul. As you know, I am a Bostonian, and Mr. FLOOD is a Harvard man.

In Boston we say there is little separation of the two. If you are a Bostonian, some of the Harvard influence is bound to rub off on you, and if you are a Harvard man some of the Bostonian influence is bound to rub off on you.

So you see, we in Boston make some claim to Mr. FLOOD. This much is certain, we understand each other, and this makes working with him a distinct pleasure.

When he asked if I could come to Wilkes-Barre there was some doubt that I could make it. As you know I was scheduled in Boston last night, and it looked like an extremely tight schedule might prevent me from accepting his kind invitation. However, everything developed in favor of my appearance here this evening, for which I am grateful.

For more than a year now since I joined the Army staff in Washington, I've been called upon to speak to many groups. I have talked to veterans' organizations, officer candidate schools, college students, local civic groups, Reserve Officers Associations, and many others. My talks have been on military subjects and confined generally to my work as the Army's chief of reserve and ROTC affairs. Until very recently I have had little opportunity to address Italian-American groups. Last night in Boston I addressed the Italian-American Charitable Society, and a month ago I talked to the Italian-American War Veterans at their national convention in Providence. Because I was among kindred folk, I felt that I could escape

from shop talk, and address myself to a subject close to my heart: that is, our Italian-American heritage. This is a matter which I believe commands our interest here tonight.

I developed my talks around the many Italian-Americans who made such a great contribution to America, to its culture, to its industry, to its economy, and to its character.

Much has been said and written about Italian-Americans. Some of it not good. Because it is true that wrongdoing attracts more public attention than good deeds, there has been a lot of public clamor about the small criminal element which detracts from the great contribution made to America by the millions of fine Italians like yourselves. Think what a terrific din there would be if we made as much noise when things go right as we do when things go wrong. Take your own organization, the Luzerne Columbus League—think of how much good you have done, the goodwill created, the patriotic effort you have put into community projects. Supposing all individuals, agencies and communities who benefited by your hard work applauded at once; it would be a cheer that would rock this great valley for months. But this is not likely to happen. But supposing my good friend here, Judge Pinola, makes off with your funds—then there will be a howl heard throughout the country. Of course, that's not likely to happen either.

I do not want to dwell tonight on that ugly element in our society, for whom I have no sympathy and whose way of life is abhorrent to all of us. All they deserve here tonight is this fleeting reference to point out that they are the exceptions—and few of them at that. Rather, when I consider our Italian-American heritage, as I frequently do, I am inspired by Dante's lines in the "Divine Comedy." "Consider your origin," he wrote; "you were not formed to live like brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge."

Surely one of the truly great among many great Italians—he had us in mind when he penned those famous lines. Italians are many things to many men, but none can disagree—this Dante knew—that Italians are creative, highly individualistic and have a gift for life. These are virtues to treasure.

One of our prominent contemporaries, Prof. Angelo Pelligrini, of the University of Washington, caught the spirit of our character in a recent magazine article. He wrote, "What is there about Italians that makes them unique in their power to attract. We can say that as the English have a talent for government, the Irish for revolution, the Americans for the accumulation of wealth, so the Italians have a gift for life."

See if you don't find in yourself, or in members of your family, some of the characteristics Professor Pelligrini points out in these lines, and I quote: "A people in whom there is so much sympathy, such an abundance of passionate interest, cannot let a single moment of life escape unobserved."

He goes on to say, "Even a minor traffic accident summons them to the spot, not as spectators but as participants in a moment of life. They ask questions; they dispense advice; they quarrel; they take sides; and when the traffic officer arrives, they forget their differences and instinctively combine against him, the symbol of restraint. Only life matters."

Because, as Professor Pelligrini tells us, life matters so much, the Italians have developed, against great odds, the gift for survival.

There is an old Italian legend about the importance of life and this gift for survival. Many of you may have heard it; but for those of you who did not, let me repeat it here: "Once there was a court jester named Bertoldo who for some misdeed was sentenced by the King to die. When he was condemned he asked for and received one grace: That he may choose the tree from which he was to

hang. He roamed Italy far and wide for 20 years at the King's expense, searching for just the right tree fit to be his gallows, but of course he never found it. Thus the fool Bertoldo survived." But this is legend. Let me give you a true life story closer to home.

In Japan a few years ago, a mine collapsed, trapping four Japanese coal miners. The Japanese, a fatalistic race by nature, conceded the loss. But nearby in a U.S. Army camp was a young soldier, a former Pennsylvania coal miner who heard about the disaster. He borrowed some of our Army engineer equipment and with the help of some Japanese laborers, worked without letup for 11 days. By driving a 90-foot shaft, he rescued the men who had managed to keep alive by drinking from a small stream of spring water that trickled into the trap. This dramatic rescue by a young American soldier was heralded in the Japanese press, and taught the Japanese a great lesson about Americans. That soldier's name was Salvatore Forte, an Italian-American from nearby Hatboro.

These anecdotes—one legend and one fact—tell us a lot about ourselves—the pathos and the humor, the pride and the passion, the sweet and the fortitude. To these we must add individualism, even an excessive individualism. Most of us want to be wheels rather than cogs. This is because we love life so dearly that we must be out in the sun; we do not want to be in the shade.

We resist restraint because we are a vibrant, expressive, creative breed. This accounts in large measure for why we are here today.

America offered our fathers the latitude, the freedom, the opportunity to expand, to express ourselves, to be creative. And we have responded by bringing to this great country our great vitality, our vibrance and our passion for life, our creative abilities. These have become an important part of the American character, an important part of the American scene. The Italian blood which flows here carries in its stream the stuff from which American sinews are made stronger, the stuff from which American industry and culture have grown. America gave us the opportunity for expression, and there never was a more grateful people than we.

I never think of the wonderful opportunity this land offered our immigrant fathers, without recalling the heartwarming story I once read, of Luigi Salzarulo. Some of you may know this story:

Luigi left his village of Bisaccia, Italy, about 50 years ago to come to America. When he left the village his neighbors rang the bell in the church tower. To Luigi, the bell seemed to say, "Arivederci." Later, Luigi heard that this bell had cracked in an earthquake and the village people were too poor to have it recast.

In the summer of 1953, Luigi then a gray-haired American, returned to Bisaccia to attend a festa. Life in America had been kind to Luigi Salzarulo who had now Americanized his name to Louis. From a penniless immigrant he worked hard to become a freight trainmaster for the Pennsylvania Railroad in Richmond, Ind. He sent all of his six sons to college.

Even at age 70 he kept busy in civic affairs, taking a fierce pride in his citizenship and his community. Now the people in the village of Bisaccia had assembled to hear the Bishop of Conza bless the bell that Salzarulo had recast for them in memory of one of his sons, an American major, killed in World War II.

After the speeches the bell rang clear and true. Salzarulo thought the ceremony was over, but there was a surprise in store for him.

In the town hall a priest unveiled a bronze plaque, and asked the guest to read the English words inscribed on the plaque.

With tears in his eyes the once illiterate immigrant read: "From the people of Richmond, Ind., to the people of Bisaccia, Italy, in recognition of the high esteem in which we hold your native son, and our fellow citizen, City Councilman Louis Salzarulo."

In his absence, and much to his surprise, he had been elected to the city council.

As I look about this room I cannot help but think how easily this story could apply to many of you present here today. In all but some details this is the story of most of our citizens of Italian birth and descent.

You cannot begin to name the many great Italian-Americans who, coming from another heritage, have made so great a contribution to our American heritage. There are many Luigi Salzarulos. One must begin with the great explorers, Columbus, whose name we honor tonight, and Cabot, to truly tell the story. Or one can turn to origins of American freedom to find there the words of Philip Mazzei, one of the early Maryland settlers, who first gave utterance to the words, "All men are by nature created free and equal to each other in natural rights," words used later by Thomas Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence. William Paca was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Today you can go down to the Jamestown festival in Virginia where the original colony has been restored. And there, a highlight of the colony, is a copy of the glassworks set up originally in 1622 by 16 Venetians to make glass beads for trade with the Indians.

It should be expected that a people who trace their heritage to the great giants of the renaissance, Leonardo da Vinci, Michaelangelo, and Machiavelli, would produce so many fine Americans. How far need we look for great leadership? To Senator Pastore, of Rhode Island, Governors Furcolo, of Massachusetts, and Rossellini, of Washington? Or to our cities for men like Mayor D'Allesandro of Baltimore, Mayor Cellerbreze, of Cleveland, or the late Fiorello LaGuardia, of New York? Consider for a minute the greatness of this man alone. One of his remarks which I recall most vividly—and this fully catches the character of the man—was in his tremendous appeal to the United Nations to expedite relief and rehabilitation for the war-torn countries of Europe. He was for less ceremony and more action when he said, "Ticker tape ain't spaghetti." Here again was another man of Italian descent who knew the importance of life.

There is no area in American life in which Italian-Americans have failed to make an important contribution. "The fine Italian hand" so frequently referred to, is evident everywhere.

We here are fully aware of the role played by Italian-Americans in our national defense. You know our own important role. In my own work I see everywhere, Italian-Americans working hard to develop the strength in reserve necessary to build up our Reserve components to such readiness that they would discourage aggression. It is this sort of strength I believe Machiavelli had in mind when he said, "Among other things which being unarmed brings you, it causes you to be despised." Americans will never be despised for weakness, and Italian-Americans will work hard and offer their sons that this strength be maintained.

Everyday in the Pentagon I am fully aware of the important role played in our Defense structure by these Italian sons. Just a fast review of the Army's recent promotion list to colonel reveals the following names: Sabatelli, Perella, Perrini, Grassi, Grondona, and many others. This past spring, I am proud to report, my own son graduate high in his class at West Point, and has now dedicated his life to the defense of our country.

Many times I am asked if I have achieved the highest military rank in the Army for a person of Italian descent. The answer is no. Italians have provided generalship in our Armed Forces for many years, and one of the most notable was Maj. Gen. Luigi Palma di Cesnola, a Civil War general, who not only was among the first of many Americans of Italian descent to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, but also was the first director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

There are other Medal of Honor winners—names like Capezio, Borrelli, Boglione Aiello and Allegretti. Perhaps the name that comes to my mind most readily is that of the great marine hero, Sergeant Baslone. I am reminded almost daily of the great sacrifice and heroism of these men, when on my way to the Pentagon I pass the Sergeant Baslone American Legion Post in Arlington, Va.

Rarely anything of significance and importance comes out of Washington without the influence of that fine Italian hand, legation from the Congress, or the model of isolation that will traverse, under ice, the North Pole. In the Navy's model basin in Washington there is a skilled wood-carver named Fiori, who makes to exact scale, such precise wood models of navy craft that scientific data can be obtained from floating these in a test basin. His brother, also a skilled woodcraftsman does similar work for Army. When asked how they acquired these skills, the answer is simply, our father brought the talent from the old country, and we have learned from him.

It is a great part of our pride in America that we have not been content to avail ourselves of American liberty without the work and sacrifice necessary to guarantee this liberty. Never have we taken for granted the benefits of citizenships, citizenship we regard as not just a right but a privilege.

Coming as many of us did from an afflicted area of the world, we have regarded Americanism as a great goal to achieve and maintain. We have been active in the community, the schools and at the polls, because we feel strongly our responsibilities as citizens and Americans, and are not content to sit by—in the shade so to speak—while others in the sun carry the burden. I like to believe that this is something else we learned from Machiavelli who said, "When neither their property nor their honor is touched, the majority of men live content." This cannot be said of the Italian-American who must not, as Professor Pelligrini said, let a single moment of life escape unobserved.

This passion for life was carefully observed and fully recorded by the American Letitia Baldridge when she was the secretary in Italy to Clare Booth Luce, our former Ambassador there. Miss Baldridge sees it from a different point of view, and I pass this on to you because it has so much meaning, and because I am sure your lovely ladies seated here tonight will appreciate these comments:

In writing about enchanting Italians in Italy, Miss Baldridge says, "There is no other country where 'he' feels more like a 'he' and 'she' more like a 'she'—and terribly glad of it.

"Here a woman's only qualification for being worshiped is that she be female."

Miss Baldridge gives the account of Italian men at a sidewalk cafe who on watching a 70-year-old woman go by, say "Ah, see how her legs are still good."

And then a few minutes later, a cross-eyed girl of 12 passes, hugging her school books, and the men say "Mamma mia, what a nice coit."

I can easily see among you that this appreciation for beauty in everyone and everything is another great quality Italians have brought to America.

This appreciation, this feeling for beauty, our creativity, our industry, our great sym-

pathy, our passion for life, which has found so much unbridled expression in America are the contributions we must continue to make to our adopted land. We must never withhold, in any degree, from America and Americans our ability to help, to achieve, to share in the great national ideals of peace and democracy. We are well suited for these. Let me repeat again from Dante who said, "Consider your origin, you were not formed to live like brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge."

Now we are Americans among the great American people to whom much of the world looks for leadership and inspiration. How much of that leadership and inspiration will again be contributed by those Americans of Italian descent depends on us, for the challenge to America is great. But borrowing again from the great Italian Machiavelli, "When the willingness is great, the difficulties cannot be great." We have that willingness.

Mindful again of our origin, that our forebears were once among the afflicted humanity of the Old World, and that now we have been so readily assimilated as Americans and so adaptable to American freedom, let us now consider the urgency and importance of the words of another great Italian—the late Pope Pius XII, the pope of peace, who left us this great thought which I would like you to take home with you:

"The American people have a genius for splendid and unselfish action, and into the hands of America God has placed the destinies of afflicted humanity."

Ladies and gentlemen, we are the American people and this is our challenge, the challenge for all Americans.

I thank you.

Herbert Kohler Named Man of the Year by Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin is an important industrial State because of the ability and high character of its business leaders. As a result of this leadership Wisconsin ranks tenth in the Nation industrially, employing nearly a half million production workers.

One of the business leaders who has made a great contribution to manufacturing in Wisconsin is Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co., located at Kohler near Sheboygan, Wis.

Recently, the National Association of Manufacturers gave deserving recognition to Mr. Kohler by presenting him with its Man of the Year Award. The event was ably described editorially and in a news account in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press. Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert these reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The articles follow:

HERBERT V. KOHLER NAMED MAN OF THE YEAR
TODAY BY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK.—Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis., today received the man-of-the-year award of the Old Timers' Council of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Wisconsin business leader was honored at the luncheon at the opening day session of NAM's 63d Congress of American Industry at the Waldorf Astoria.

In presenting the award, Cola G. Parker, director of the Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis., and head of the council, said that Kohler was being recognized because of "his devotion to protecting the rights of people as individuals." He also cited Kohler's contributions to education, his "awareness of the responsibilities of good citizenship," and his "fearless leadership in industrial relations."

Referring to the Kohler Co.'s long-standing difficulties with the United Automobile Workers, Parker said that Kohler has "refused to sign away his employees' rights."

"Some 6 years ago, Mr. Kohler began fighting—and is still fighting—for the principles he believes in as a citizen and a responsible industrialist. That principle is freedom from coercion—freedom for his employees and freedom for the management of the company that bears his name."

Parker said the principle upheld by Kohler is simple and basic—that a company has no more right to force an employee to join a union in order to get or hold a job than it has to prohibit an employee to join a union.

In responding to Mr. Parker and the members of the Old Timers' Council and the NAM, Mr. Kohler said in part:

"It is, indeed, an honor to receive this award. I accept it—not for myself alone—but for many men and women of the Kohler organization who stood with me.

"Especially I appreciate the significance of this award—that you endorse the principles for which I have stood—that individual rights and individual freedoms must be preserved at all costs.

"Our American constitutional form of government and our free enterprise system both depend entirely on the rights and liberties of the individual.

"If I have played any worthy part in the fight to preserve those rights—I can only say that I am grateful that circumstances have given me the opportunity."

HERBERT KOHLER HONORED

The National Association of Manufacturers presented its Man of the Year Award today to Herbert V. Kohler, chairman and president of the Kohler Co.

The ceremonies took place at the opening of the 63d Congress of American Industry in New York City. The selection of Mr. Kohler for the award was made by Old Timers' Council of the national organization.

In presenting the award, Cola G. Parker, Neenah, head of the Old Timers' Council, cited Mr. Kohler for his contributions to education, his "awareness of the responsibilities of good citizenship, and his fearless leadership in industrial relations."

Mr. Parker said that the principle upheld by Mr. Kohler is basic—that "a company has no more right to force an employee to join a union in order to get or hold a job than it has to prohibit an employee from joining a union."

While there is wide disagreement with this principle—within unions, and among Government officials, educators, and labor relations authorities—the right to enunciate such a principle and to fight for it cannot be denied. And persons or organizations who support such a principle certainly have the right to honor a man who has remained steadfast throughout what has become the longest strike in the Nation's history. Even the strongest opponents must recognize a man who has the courage of his convictions. Every person from his own experience knows that making decisions does not come easily; sticking to them, come what may, can be far more difficult.

In mentioning Mr. Kohler's contributions to education, Cola Parker undoubtedly had in mind the former's distinguished record of service in behalf of the University of Wisconsin. Although not a graduate of the university, Mr. Kohler has been a leader in fund-raising campaigns of the University of Wisconsin Foundation. Last April he was signally honored for the successful manner in which he directed the campaign for the Wisconsin Center, which houses adult education classes, short courses, and special institutes and seminars. Under Mr. Kohler's chairmanship, contributions totalling \$2,400,000 were received for the Center.

Mr. Kohler is the surviving member of the trio in whose honor plaques were erected at the Wisconsin Center during the dedication ceremonies. The other plaques are of the late Frank O. Holt, who conceived the idea for the adult education center and who served the university for 20 years, and the late Frank J. Sensenbrenner, who, as a member of the Board of Regents, regarded the Center as a personal crusade.

Mr. Kohler's deep interest in the cultural and civic life of the community, is of course, well known to the people of this area and the State as a whole. The Kohler Foundation, Inc., has been a vital factor in support of cultural projects, whether of a historical nature or for current affairs.

It is recalled that in 1955, Mr. Kohler received a special citation in behalf of the Kohler Foundation. The citation was given by the American Institute of Architects in recognition of the Foundation's restoration of Old Wade House at Greenbush.

The many friends of Mr. Kohler are greatly pleased, we are sure, that he was chosen by the National Association of Manufacturers as the recipient of the Man of the Year Award.

The Happy Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of December 29, 1958. All who knew him or read his columns mourn the passing of the genial and beloved Fred Othman who died in his sleep on Saturday, December 27, 1958, after having suffered a heart attack on December 16, 1958, while covering a news story on Capitol Hill:

THE HAPPY MAN

We mourn today the death of our colleague, Fred Othman, who died Saturday night in his sleep. He had suffered a heart attack December 16.

His passing is all the more poignant because he was such fun to be around; because, in his quiet and unfailingly good-humored way, he so enjoyed life.

As those who read his daily column in the World-Telegram knew, the way Fred made people smile was by reporting with astuteness and unfailing freshness, the didoes of scoundrels, rascals, and fakes in a way that revealed the pathetically humorous fact that cheaters cheat themselves most of all.

We're sure that the engaging qualities of our modest and able friend came through in his columns to his many thousands of readers and that they, too, will share with us a sense of deep personal loss.

Needed: A Bombing Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced my bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to make the transportation and/or possession of dynamite and other explosives in interstate commerce, with the knowledge and intent that such explosives will be used to damage or destroy any building for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, or civic objectives, or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives, a Federal crime. The bill further provides that any person guilty of these acts shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, and, if death results from a violation of this subsection, shall be subject also to the death penalty or to imprisonment for any term of years or for life. Other important provisions are set forth in the bill.

I want to further state, Mr. Speaker, that the shocking events of last year caused by the dynamiting of a grammar school and later a Jewish recreation center at Nashville, Davidson County, Tenn., prompted me to introduce H.R. 11806 on April 1, 1958. Subsequently, similar legislation was introduced by Representative CELLER, SULLIVAN and others, and the same bill was then introduced in the other body by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Since the introduction of this legislation I regret to say there have been other similar senseless acts of violence and destruction in many other sections of the country. And yet we do not have a Federal statute under which persons who committed these acts may be apprehended, tried and punished.

The bill I propose today contains all the changes and recommendations made by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary chairmanned by Representative WILLIS, of Louisiana, on the original bill. I want to take this opportunity to again urge the members of the Judiciary Committee, and the entire membership of the House as well as those in the other body, to act favorably upon this legislation without further delay. Time is of the essence, and it is obligatory that those of us in the legislative branch provide a Federal law to prohibit such dastardly acts of violence to life and property in our society.

I commend to your attention the following editorial from the Nashville Banner of November 15, 1958, entitled "Interstate Challenge: Needed—A Bombing Law":

INTERSTATE CHALLENGE: NEEDED—A BOMBING LAW

Bombed schools and religious institutions do come within the purview of public concern—and governmental concern, local, State, and Federal. The monstrous crime feeds on hate; beyond any question is in-

terstate in its ramifications, and justifies the proposal of Attorney General William P. Rogers of Federal law as a weapon to combat it.

Hermitage District Representative J. CARLTON LOSER presented one such weapon, adequate to its purpose, in the measure that would have made it a Federal crime to transport dynamite in interstate commerce for criminal purpose. That bill was offered in the 85th Congress. It died in committee.

Dynamite or other explosive used in bombings, whether of schools or churches or homes, or business institutions, is of criminal purpose. And in the vast majority of cases the exponents of that are not only "outsiders," insofar as community and State are concerned, but are "outsiders" in the matter of national and ideological allegiance. They are of the sponsoring party of insurrection—doing the job of hate and terrorism, to incite American against American, group against group, and race against race.

The basic premise of this law, proposed against outlawry as clearly needed in protection of life and property and decency, is entirely apart from issues of segregation or integration. It cannot rest upon that tenuous question, or be tied to it as a legislative package—or omnibus bill—to pass or fail according to acceptance or rejection of the whole.

Details of the conglomerate "civil rights" legislation proposed inevitably would have infringement aspects which constitutional concern forbids.

There is no reason adequate law could not be enacted on its own merits to arm and coordinate these units of Government against the bombers.

By enactment of the Lindbergh Law, the FBI was enabled to move—and successfully—against kidnapers.

The Mann Act is a Federal law against the transportation of women across State lines for immoral purposes. The Dyer Act forbids interstate transit of stolen automobiles. Etc. and etc.

Federal authorities, such as the FBI, can move effectively in the program of justice to bring bombers to account—and break up this crime.

A law justly and realistically drawn to that end, without ramifications giving it any other aim or inference, would be welcomed by the law-abiding element of America, North, South, East, and West.

Reappointment of Joseph T. Kennedy as Pennsylvania Secretary of Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of December 20, 1958:

KENNEDY APPOINTMENT

With the predominantly Democratic election returns in mind, retention of Joseph T. Kennedy, of Wilkes-Barre, as secretary of mining, a post he has held in the Leader administration, will be politically acceptable in large measure in Luzerne County. It is also acceptable on a broad community basis for Secretary Kennedy stands well personally with his fellow citizens.

His fitness for the post has been demonstrated and is further attested by the fact

that he has been associated with the mining industry and with the United Mine Workers of America since 1916.

This background was taken into account by Governor-elect David L. Lawrence. As he announced the appointment, he credited Kennedy with the able performance of his duties. The Governor-elect made the sound comment that everyone concerned with the activities of this department knows how important its functions are to the great mining industry in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Kennedy has had varied experience. He has known what it was to work in the coal mines, where his career began. Then he became secretary to the president of district 1 of the United Mine Workers of America and held other posts with the union, serving as a delegate to the International Labor Organization in Dusseldorf, Germany, in 1953. It was natural that he had the UMW endorsement for the cabinet post he now occupies and is now scheduled to fill for another 4 years.

A Citizen Speaks His Mind on the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days before I left my home district in Jefferson County, Ala., to return to Washington for the convening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, one of my constituents, a sincere, loyal, sound-thinking citizen, came to my office carrying an open letter to the Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives which he had prepared. This letter expresses in very forceful terms the views of this citizen and the vast majority of his fellow men in the Ninth District of Alabama on the decisions of the Supreme Court in the segregation cases.

I assured my constituent that I would be pleased to make his open letter available to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I insert same herewith, under permission heretofore granted, and commend its careful reading and study to the Members of this body:

To all U.S. Senators and Representatives:

Whether or not it is evident to the powers that be in Washington, D.C., nevertheless our Nation is in the throes of a dire emergency. Time is of the essence to save this Nation.

Isn't it time, and long past due, that the Senate and the Congress of these United States take into serious account this impending disaster and promulgate such laws as will leave to the States of this country complete control of the educational matters of their respective States? It appears that legislation to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court might well be the remedy.

Russia has only one dictator—the United States (in the form of the U.S. Supreme Court) now has nine in a combined dictatorship to force upon the sovereignty of the Southern States the ideas of these nine men.

Opinions are being written which disregard and abandon the law as written and interpreted for generations; and the Court

has no constitutional power to make a change in the law. It bitterly condemns those who are disposed to censure its usurpation of power; and yet its actions show that it has no regard or respect for the law.

For peace and tranquility to continue within this Nation, and particularly in the people of the Southern States, both white and colored, some immediate action is needed to make certain a constitutional provision which was certain in the minds of lawyers and laymen alike, North and South, for 86 years, until the day of this Supreme Court of the United States.

God forbid that this Nation shall be torn asunder as once it was.

A CONSTITUENT AND VOTER OF THE
NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF
ALABAMA.

Judge Lewis Fawcett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable John Cashmore, Borough President of Brooklyn, at the dedication of the Fawcett Memorial Garden of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden held on Tuesday, September 23, 1958. It is a privilege for me to insert this moving tribute to my late and beloved friend, Judge Fawcett, who served with great distinction as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. This beautiful garden to be enjoyed by all of the people of Brooklyn will keep ever bright the memory of the gentle, kindly man to whom it is dedicated:

This quiet and simple ceremony in which we dedicate this beautiful terraced garden to the memory of Judge Fawcett is one that fills me with a great deal of emotion.

I am, of course, keenly aware of the honor that is mine in being chosen to express the appreciation of the community for this lovely gift that Mrs. Osborne and Mrs. Frohne have made to the people of Brooklyn. But this dedication means something far more personal than that to me. It is an opportunity to pay a tribute—humble and sincere—to a man whom I loved and revered while he lived, and whose qualities of true greatness grow clearer as the passing years etch them in ever sharper tones upon the pages of my memory.

The personality of Judge Fawcett characterized as it was by such dignity, gentleness, and sweetness, will be well commemorated by this garden, that will in a subtle way convey the same impression of sweetness and gentleness to all people who can appreciate beauty.

Judge Fawcett and those of us who were of his time have lived in a changing world. In one brief lifetime we have seen a new civilization built from granite and steel. The world has seen the power and strength of that new civilization, but it was only the sensitive few among us like Judge Fawcett who could see that all that power and all that strength could not create the beauty of a single flower or match the priceless gifts of nature's countryside.

Today in the tradition of Judge Fawcett and his family, and in his memory, we try to preserve in this garden a concept of

beauty and gracious living that will be characterized by the gentleness and the dignity that were so much a part of him.

In all ages and in all generations there will be sensitive people who will flee the civilization of granite and steel. Here they may come to refresh their souls with the beauty provided by nature and nature's God, and as they find rest and new purpose may they be mindful, as we are, that this haven of peace was preserved for them by the vision and zeal of one who personified Brooklyn at its best—Judge Lewis Fawcett.

Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues confronting this Congress is the matter of balancing the budget for fiscal 1960. President Eisenhower has listed this as one of his chief objectives. Our economy cannot afford further inflation and I am convinced this should receive the most serious consideration from every Member of this body.

Our President's program is well described in an editorial which appeared recently in the Oshkosh (Wis.) Daily Northwestern, of which Mr. A. J. Mace is the chief editorial writer. I believe the editorial is of interest to all our colleagues and ask permission at this point to have it printed in the Appendix of the DAILY CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

BALANCED BUDGET

President Eisenhower, earlier this week, handed John Q. Taxpayer and his family an unexpected and welcome Christmas gift. It was an attractive package, prettily decorated with dollar signs in long green. Inside was the announcement of plans for reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget for fiscal 1960.

But, in the great American tradition that permits the return or exchange of gifts after Christmas, it had hardly been unwrapped before some members of the family, notably Senators and Representatives of Democratic persuasion, were suggesting that it be changed. Some of the parts—the revenue and the expenses—didn't fit, they complained, and they didn't like the suggested postal rate and gasoline tax hikes. So, although the gift was delivered before Christmas, it is unlikely Mr. Taxpayer will actually receive it for some time and, then, it probably won't look much like the original package.

Mr. Eisenhower, in a statement issued by the White House, said the budget he will submit to Congress next month has been decided and that expenditures and revenues will be in the neighborhood of \$77 billion. That is a pretty expensive neighborhood but it sounded good to Mr. Taxpayer because the budget for fiscal 1959 is running a deficit of more than \$12 billion and fiscal spending is figured at a minimum of \$79.2 billion. Revenues, considerably reduced by the economic recession earlier this year, are estimated at only \$67 billion.

The President's announcement that his plans do not call for any general tax in-

creases was pleasing to the public but the proposed hike in postal rates, coming on top of the one this year, and call for higher gasoline taxes did not find the same welcome, either from the public or Members of Congress. There was no particular comment on the President's announcement that added revenue would accrue from some new user taxes for Government services, probably because Mr. Eisenhower did not go into detail as to what these would be.

The announcement of a balanced budget and that the balance has been achieved at levels of spending and revenue considerably different from those of fiscal 1959 came as a surprise to many. He had promised he would try to reduce nondefense expenditures in the next fiscal year but it was generally believed these cuts would be more than offset by increased spending for the military. It was, in fact, expected he would call for expenditures in the neighborhood of \$79 billion or \$80 billion, about the same as this year, and not \$77 billion.

It is generally admitted the speedy and consistent rebound of the economy from the recession's low last April will mean increased revenues. But many economists have placed the Federal income in fiscal 1960 at about \$75 billion. Mr. Eisenhower's anticipated figure of \$77 billion is about \$10 billion greater than the revenue estimated for fiscal 1959 last September, when the administration issued its latest budget revision.

Mr. Eisenhower, while promising a balanced budget, gave assurance this balance would not be reached because of a sacrifice of national defense. Rather, he said, such expenditures will be higher than ever before in time of peace. Whether his figure will satisfy those in Congress, whom he has termed spenders, seems unlikely because some of his critics have already labeled his proposal as a "pennywise and pound foolish" stand. He also said some domestic non-defense programs will continue at high levels while others will be held at varying levels consistent with the public interest.

Judging by the reception given the President's announcement by the Democrats, it would be too optimistic to believe he will get what he asks. Postal rates were hiked this year from 3 to 4 cents for both local and out-of-town letters as part of a program that will boost postal revenues about \$550 million annually. Mr. Eisenhower's request for a 5-cent rate, however, was given a cold shoulder and it seems probable it will suffer the same fate in the next session of Congress. It has been hinted the proposed gasoline tax hike will be for a cent or a cent and a half. This, on top of the present 3-cent-a-gallon tax, represents a figure that will be fought by many in Congress as well as by the petroleum and highway lobbies. And the public certainly won't welcome any such boost.

While the liberal faction of the Democratic Party has already voiced disapproval of Mr. Eisenhower's proposals, most Republicans and the Democrat conservatives, such as Senator BYRD, of Virginia, are likely to give it support. Political observers see the balanced budget announcement as a smart political move because it will put the responsibility for further deficit spending on the shoulders of the Democrat-controlled Congress. Democratic critics see Mr. Eisenhower's estimated revenues as too high and his spending estimates as too low. Whether the balanced budget will be achieved remains to be seen but some bitter battles are assured when Congress convenes.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, charity begins at home. Who first said it, I do not know. Maybe it was out of the wisdom of King Solomon. But anyhow that old saying has always been a sparkling proverb of everlasting truth in my book and in the books of many others.

Way up in Harlan County, Ky., is a valley called Clover Fork, where I did some visiting this past December. But right now all the bloom is off the clover on Clover Fork. And no one is knee deep or even ankle deep in clover anymore up there. It is a narrow vale of mining camp dejection at present. The men look right at you out of solemn and desolate eyes. The women speak a silent, mournful language that says, "Yes, the hope is all gone but we still keep a brave front for the sake of our families." The children, the perennial chatterboxes of cheer, still hula their plastic hoops and blow their bubble gum full of air pockets. And the Kentucky cardinals still flash their bright colors in the native bushes on the mountainsides. And, too, the waters of the creek still gurgle their cheerful optimism as they roll over rough rocks, yet these waters seem to hasten along as if hurrying to leave forever Clover Fork Valley and its sad plague of poverty.

I look at that man over there with the miner's light cap and with shoulders considerably stooped by a thousand bent-over trips through low-room necks and narrow airways and long entries inside the dark, damp mines. And then I ask along with the great poet, "Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave to have dominion over sea and land; to trace the stars and search the heavens for power; to feel the passion of eternity? What to him are Plato and the swing of Pleiades? What the long reaches of the peaks of song, the rift of dawn, the red-dening of the rose?" Well, enough of poetry. It is poverty, not poetry, that is claiming our attention just now.

It was exactly 2 weeks and 2 days before Christmas, but the season failed somehow. Because the bloom was off the clover; the berries were off the Christmas holly. Whenever the people are worrying over coffee and pork chops, all the Santa Claus business in the world is merely as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. There is just no harmony from it or jingle in it.

I stepped inside the dark hot room filled with several people and many odors. Someone with me said in a cheerful voice, "This is your Congressman come to see

you." No one stirred. No one spoke. The introduction was flat. If Ike himself had come in, maybe someone would have gotten up and said, "Here, take a chair." But I have some doubt about that. The mind was on the unseen "vittles," on the unknown job out yonder in the beautiful and prosperous valley of somewhere. I tried to sound something of a hopeful note and to lift their spirits just a little bit, but I was a considerable amount of nothing and their gaze was still on the floor as I left the house. God help me. I could not raise their souls one bit. I was a failure at that undertaking. But somehow I do not believe my country nor its people would want to fail that vale up yonder on Clover Fork in Harlan County.

I am right now more interested in this valley's Evarts than Estonia and more concerned over this valley's Verda than Venezuela. It is just human nature. Maybe it is nearsightedness that makes a fellow see the thin seat of his neighbor's pants before he ever sees a faraway Arab needing a new pair of sandals for the desert road. I guess this Congressman from southeast Kentucky is just a little nearsighted.

Mr. Speaker, in my book, charity begins at home.

Letter by Northerner States Case for South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1958, Mr. Carleton Putnam of Washington, D.C., addressed a letter to President Eisenhower, stating in a very forceful manner the South's case for the maintenance of segregation. Mr. Putnam, prominent writer and airlines executive, has through the years been in sufficiently close contact with the South, its problems, opportunities and aspirations to be well acquainted with the situation in our part of the country.

Mr. Putnam's letter to the President was mailed, after receipt by the President, to the editors of every leading newspaper in the country. Not one single major paper north of the Mason-Dixon line considered the letter of sufficient importance to make it available to its readers. Many papers in the South ran the letter in their "Letters to the Editor" column, but nationwide distribution was not possible because of lack of interest among northern editors. As a result, a group of citizens of Birmingham, in my district, raised sufficient funds by private subscription, to finance the cost of running

the letter as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times. This advertisement appeared in the Times a few days ago.

With the thought that my efforts will lend assistance in giving the letter the type of currency it deserves, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under permission heretofore given.

Mr. Putnam, a member of the famous New England Putnam family of Revolutionary War days, is a native of New York City, a graduate of Princeton and Columbia, and founder and president of the Chicago and Southern Airlines (1943-48). He is presently on the board of directors of Delta Airlines. In addition to being an outstanding business executive, Mr. Putnam is also a writer of note. He recently published a widely praised biography of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The letter which follows is commended to the careful reading and study of every Member of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 13, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago I was reading over Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the recent Little Rock case. Three sentences in it tempt me to write you this letter.

I am a northerner, but I have spent a large part of my life as a business executive in the South. I have a law degree, but I am now engaged in historical writing.

From this observation post I risk the presumption of a comment.

The sentences I wish to examine are these: "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feelings will yield, gradually though this be, to law and education."

It is my personal conviction that the local customs in this case were hardened by time for a very good reason, and that while they may not, as Frankfurter says have been decreed in heaven, they come closer to it than the current view of the Supreme Court.

I was particularly puzzled by Frankfurter's remark that "the Constitution is not the formulation of the merely personal views of the members of this court."

Five minutes before the Court's desegregation decision, the Constitution meant one thing: five minutes later, it meant something else. Only one thing intervened, namely, an expression of the personal views of the members of the Court.

It is not my purpose to dispute the point with which the greater part of Frankfurter's opinion is concerned. The law must be obeyed. But I think the original desegregation decision was wrong, that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found, not to disobey it, but to avoid it. Failing this, the situation should be corrected by constitutional amendment.

I cannot agree that this is a matter involving "a few states" as Frankfurter suggests. The picture in reality is of a court, by one sudden edict, forcing upon the entire South a view, and a way of life, with which the great majority of the population are in complete disagreement.

Although not from the legal, in fact from the practical, standpoint the North, which does not have the problem, is presuming to tell the South, which does have the problem, what to do.

To me there is a frightening arrogance in this performance. Neither the North, nor the Court, has any holy mandate inherent in the trend of the times or the progress of liberalism to reform society in the South.

In the matter of schools, rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association and, in the South at least, may require that both be considered simultaneously. (In using the word "association" here, I mean the right to associate with whom you please.)

In any case the crux of this issue would seem obvious: social status has to be earned.

Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pure-blooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization.

Finally he can inquire as to the number of pure-blooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science.

We were all in caves or trees originally. The progress which the pure-blooded black has made when left to himself, with a minimum of white help or hindrance, genetically or otherwise, can be measured today in the Congo.

Lord Bryce, a distinguished impartial foreign observer, presented the situation accurately in his "American Commonwealth" when he wrote in 1880:

"History is a record of the progress toward civilization of races originally barbarous. But that progress has in all cases been slow and gradual. * * * Utterly dissimilar is the case of the African Negro, caught up in and whirled along with the swift movement of the American democracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the most primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary and the most highly developed, types of culture. * * * A body of savages is violently carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on the plantations of masters who are 3,000 or 4,000 years in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force. * * * Suddenly, even more suddenly than they were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only free, but made full citizens and active members of the most popular government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear an equal part in ruling, not only themselves, but also their recent masters."

I would emphatically support improvement of education in Negro schools, if and where it is inferior.

Equality of opportunity and equality before the law, when not strained to cover other situations, are acceptable ideals because they provide the chance to earn and to progress, and consequently should be enforced by legal fiat as far as is humanly possible.

Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition in recent years has been characterized by more loose thinking. Few of us would care to enter a poetry contest with a top-ranking poet. And few would care to play chess with the champion.

Pin down the man who uses the word "equality," and at once the evasions and qualifications begin. As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were "equal in the sight of God."

I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God—after earning that status, and with various further qualifica-

tions—but where is the authority for the sort of ipso facto equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter.

Frankfurter closes his opinion with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Negro owes more than to any other man. I, too, would like to quote from Lincoln. At Charleston, Ill., in September 1858 in a debate with Douglas, Lincoln said:

"I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes nor qualifying them to hold office. * * * I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

The extent to which Lincoln would have modified these views today, or may have modified them before his death, is a moot question, but it is clear on its face that he would not have been in sympathy with the Supreme Court's position on desegregation.

Perhaps the most discouraging spectacle is the spectacle of northern newspapers dwelling with pleasure upon the predicament of the southern parent who is forced to choose between desegregation and no school at all for his child.

It does not seem to occur to the papers that this is the cruelest sort of blackmail; that the North is virtually putting a pistol at the head of the southern parent in a gesture which every northerner must contemplate with shame.

Indeed, there now seems little doubt that the Court's recent decision has set back the cause of the Negro in the South by a generation.

He may force his way into white schools, but will not force his way into white hearts nor earn the respect he seeks.

What evolution was slowly and wisely achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

"The Red Mass"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following sermon given by the Very Rev. Robert Gannon, S.J., on September 18, 1958, at the annual mass of the Holy Spirit, known as the Red Mass, and which is sponsored by the Catholic Lawyers Guild of the Diocese of Brooklyn to mark the opening of the fall term of the courts in Brooklyn:

In the summer of 1947 President Truman reassigned Myron Taylor as his personal representative at the Vatican. On this occasion he wrote the Holy Father a beautiful letter which caused some excitement in Brooklyn. In it he said without qualification, "Your

Holiness, this is a Christian Nation." Whereupon he was promptly accused by one of your colleagues of violating the Constitution by an attack on the white elephant which is supposed not only to separate church and state but to assure their mutual hostility. The accusation was, of course, fantastic and unimportant, except for the fact that it called our attention to an interesting phase of our national development. After all, was the President right? Or was the Brooklyn lawyer right when he cried out with some heat, "The U.S.A. is not in any sense a Christian Nation." The answer is not as simple as it might be.

Certainly we are not a Christian nation by law established as England, Spain and Sweden are Christian nations. The First Amendment to the Bill of Rights takes care of that. "Congress" we read "shall pass no law respecting the establishment of religion." The words are clear enough but the background is sometimes misunderstood. Judging from developments of recent years, one would think that the Founding Fathers were taking precautions against the Pope of 1789. Actually, he was the last one in their minds. The Papacy had been declining all through the 18th Century so that the poor Holy Father was probably never weaker at any period since the Western Schism than he was in the years between the fall of the Bastille and Waterloo. The same was true of the Catholic Church. It was undergoing one of its periodic burials and most people thought this was the last. No. The church which James Madison and the rest had in mind was the church which had collected tithes in the colonies for generations—the Church of England. So that by the First Amendment the Founding Fathers wished to make it clear that the Church of England was being disestablished in America and that no other was to take its place forever. Henceforth, all religions, Mohamadan, Protestant, Jewish and Catholic would be absolutely equal before the law. Clearly then, we are not a Christian nation as England, Sweden and Spain are Christian nations.

Are we, however, Christian on the basis of population? It is certainly true that the majority of our fellow citizens would list themselves as Christians in a noncommittal sort of way. They come of Christian stock. They look like Christians, they talk like Christians and frequently out of habit act like Christians but when it comes to Christian doctrine which forms the basis of Christian life, they ignore it or openly reject it. Many will say, "Of course I'm a Christian. What else could I be? I'm not a Jew or a Buddhist and my father helped to build the main church in our town." But if you press them and ask, "Do you believe then in the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ and in the inspiration and inerrancy of the New Testament?", the picture changes. It would be very difficult to prove that the United States is Christian on the basis of population.

What then of its ideals—as far as these can be separated from its theology? What of its education, its philosophy, its morality? Would these still be Christian enough to justify the former President's claim, "Your Holiness, this is a Christian country." A hundred years ago, the answer would have been "Yes," and this, in spite of the fact that fewer Americans proportionately were signed up as church members. Our schools, beginning with Harvard, whose motto was "Christo et Ecclesiae," were all with the exception of the University of Virginia, Christian foundations. But Horace Mann, an excellent Christian himself, in his effort to avoid offense against any particular sect, practically banished Christianity from the public schools, while the Christian private schools and colleges gradually succumbed to

the influence of the Ph. D.'s who had flocked to Europe after our Civil War to Paris and Berlin and had returned eager to spread the naturalism they had learned there. As a result, the education of the United States, by and large, is anything but Christian today.

That being so, what can we expect of our philosophy? The real leaders in the field have been men like James and Whitehead and Cohen and Dewey and Santayana, so that in spite of a liberal sprinkling of neo-Thomism our philosophers have not helped keep the United States a Christian nation and much less can be said for the arbiters of our moral standards. We may brush off as propaganda the comments that are written in the Soviet press about our business practices, our family life, and our female alcoholics, but we cannot ignore the annual reports of Edgar Hoover which invariably stress the percentage increase of crime amongst us, especially of juvenile crime. It would take an optimist to hold that, on the basis of our moral tone, the United States is a Christian nation.

And yet, Harry Truman was not altogether wrong. Ours is a country with at least a Christian past which cannot be ignored. The former President in his letter mentioned the discoverers, explorers and missionaries who were Christians and frequently heroic Christians. He mentioned the colonists, too. Many of them came over here because they wanted to practice their Christian religion and most of them brought some form of Christianity with them. When the time arrived to establish an independent government, very few of the leading citizens were deists or freethinkers. The so-called fathers of our country, the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the signers of the Constitution were almost without exception practical Christians. Franklin and Jefferson are the only exceptions cited. It is true that Jefferson was a conservative materialist, a child of the so-called enlightenment who considered God as "ethereal gas" but Franklin would protest that he was himself a true Christian. He had had a quarrel with the Presbyterian church and never joined any other but he was a deeply religious man and many of his speeches and many parts of the autobiography breathe the spirit of the New Testament. In fact, the tone of that whole generation is to be found in Washington's message to the Governors of the 13 States on resigning his commission as Commander in Chief of the Army. In it, he assumed that all the American Governors believed as he did that the future happiness of the United States depended on the imitation of Christ.

It is not surprising then that the form of democracy bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers was a Christian form of democracy, a democracy that rests on two distinctly Christian ideals. The first of these is the supremacy of law over the ruler, the second is the equality of all men before the law based on the God-given dignity of the human person. The first, the supremacy of law over the ruler, was handed down to us through English common law which derived from custom and tradition rather than from formal codes. It recognized the existence of a higher law that was in its broadest outline knowable through reason, knowable because it could be deduced from the nature of man. Before the rise of Christianity, no one recognized a natural right. All law was positive law. For the Jews, God's chosen people, it was divine law known as revelation and collected into codes, the greatest of which was the Ten Commandments given to Moses on Mount Sinai. For the Gentiles it was positive law known by state edict and, likewise, collected into codes. But our Founding Fathers presupposed in the democracy they bequeathed to us a higher law

binding rulers and ruled to which all positive law must conform. This great tradition which involves every man's right to immunity from the arbitrary leads back through John Marshall, Hamilton, and James Wilson to Edmund Burke, Lord Somers, Seldon, and medieval lawyers like Henry De Bracton, back beyond the Magna Carta to St. Ambrose and St. Augustine.

The same is true of the second great principle underlying our democracy, the principle of equality. This is not to be confused with the egalité of the French Revolution any more than Robespierre's Fraternité is to be compared with Christian charity. The French had been profoundly affected by the revival of Roman law under Philip the Fair and the subsequent weakening of the medieval tradition. Their egalité was understood in the pagan stoic sense which condemned all inequality of any sort. Our Founding Fathers not only preserved for us the English common law and the parliamentary tradition but also carried over from the Middle Ages the Augustinian concept that all men are equal under God as persons; as individuals, that is, with spiritual powers; as adopted sons of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. You will find nothing about personal rights in Aristotle or Cicero or the books of the Old Testament. It was because of the church's teaching on personality that we Americans fell heir to the tradition that no man has the right to impose his will on another except as God's representative. This is a tradition that might find a cool reception in Washington today. It might be thought repugnant to the rights of our National Free Thinkers Association but it would be difficult to declare unconstitutional traditions which gave rise to the Constitution.

President Truman, therefore, should have qualified his statement saying not "This is a Christian Nation" but "the two boasts of our country in which we take the deepest pride are Christian still—its origin and its special form of democracy. In its origin it is immutably Christian but the form of its democracy is subject to change. Some expect that change will come suddenly through Red revolution or conquest but violence is quite unnecessary. It can be so much more efficiently accomplished through the day-by-day decisions of our courts. There we can witness the struggle already joined between the old and the new theories of law. The old theory—your theory—the theory which is presupposed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence which is essential to the tradition of American democracy rests on the fact that there is a superior law which tests the laws of men and that there are objective standards for weighing the validity as well as the expediency of new legislation. The new theory of law popularized by Oliver Wendell Holmes ignores the existence of God as the source of all authority, minimizes principles and precedents and makes the judicial process a thing of mere utility and force, tempered with emotion, whim and intuition. The man in the street can feel the sands shifting under him. There is no more certainty in the law since consistency is not to be expected at the summit of the law. There are no more permanent rights, no more unalienable rights, no more natural rights since English common law got out of fashion in Washington. The situation is not hopeless. There is enough of our inheritance left to fight for but you gentlemen of the bench and bar will have to do most of the fighting. The rest of us are practically in your hands. If you fail us the last link that binds us to our Christian past, our Christian concept of democracy will disappear and Truman's critics will be right in saying that the United States of America is in no sense a Christian nation."

Will Congress Save Our Priceless Heritage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the election of last November 4 gave the Democratic Party an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress, which, Mr. Speaker, imposes a greater responsibility on your party—and especially on you, as leader of the party in control—than you have ever experienced in all your years as Speaker of this august body. I am sure you are well aware of that fact, and that the future welfare of America depends to a very great degree on your every act and decision during this session of Congress.

The time has come to speak plainly. Many Members who had the contracted support of Reuther's so-called liberal labor party were elected last November and, of course, they are expected to blindly follow orders from the organization which contributed greatly to their campaign, since they are bought and paid for. But, I sincerely hope it is not yet too late for us to profit from the costly experience which England suffered under the Fabian Socialists, who also masqueraded under the banner of the liberal labor party, and who got control of Parliament shortly after World War II and immediately put into effect the identical program Reuther's A.D.A. and C.O.P.E. are now proposing for us here in the U.S.A. To learn the facts about the suffering of the English people, especially the laboring people, the farmers and the small businessmen who suffered first and most at the hands of the Fabian Socialists makes the blood of any good American run cold. It must not happen here.

Democrats and Republicans are hoping—yes, praying—that Congress will hold the line against those who for selfish reasons are bringing concerted pressure on us to follow their anti-American liberal concepts. Every well informed, unbiased, American citizen knows that the true definition of a "modern Reuther liberal" is one who is primarily liberal with our constitutional rights and with our taxpayers' dollars.

Hence, under the circumstances as they now exist, were it not for my faith in you, Mr. Speaker, and in the good sense of most of my colleagues, I would shudder to contemplate the future of our blessed land. May God give us courage and the strength to meet the test, with the outspoken support of courageous men and women here in Congress and all over our broad land.

On this, the opening of the 86th Congress, I felt it in my heart to give expression—as I have here—to my innermost feelings, to be printed in the Record, that thousands, yea millions,

might read and then do their part, and more, to preserve our precious American liberties.

Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the last Congress starting on March 26, 1958, I made a series of addresses dealing with various phases of Canal Zone diplomatic and legislative history and problems. Though the writings on these subjects are voluminous and at first sight bewildering, when reduced to their essentials they are relatively simple.

At the request of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, president of the American Peace Society, I undertook to condense into a brief article for the fall 1958 issue of "World Affairs," the quarterly magazine of that organization, the basic points in the Canal Zone sovereignty question.

The article follows:

PANAMA CANAL ZONE: CONSTITUTIONAL DOMAIN OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Representative from Pennsylvania)

SUEZ CRISIS FOCUSED ATTENTION ON PANAMA

The dramatic but "legally unjustifiable" nationalization by Egypt on July 26, 1956, of the Suez Canal was an epochal event. It has focused world attention on the other great interoceanic waterway, the Panama Canal, to a degree not equaled since those memorable years near the start of this century when the key canal treaties, under which it was constructed and subsequently maintained and operated, were negotiated.

Originating in the Soviet Union and its satellites, the ensuing clamor has been featured by voluminous propaganda aimed at wresting ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States and transferring its jurisdiction to some international or other authority. This uproar, instead of tending to clarify and stabilize conditions on the American Isthmus, has formed a sinister agitation that conforms to the well-known pattern of penetration and subversion so characteristic of the tactics of the international Communist conspiracy for world conquest. Moreover, the din is today being fanned by jingoistic elements in Panama, including high officials in the government of that republic and has created a situation that is definitely hazardous.

Meanwhile, a widespread ignorance of the most elemental facts in canal history, prolonged silence by our government with respect to the rights and responsibilities of the United States at the Isthmus,¹ and its weak policies of appeasement and giveaway,

¹ George A. Finch, "Navigation and Use of the Suez Canal," Proceedings of the American Society of International Law (1957), p. 42.

² Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, March 26, 1958.

together have served to aggravate the situation, which truly needs rigorous clarification.

JURIDICAL BASE FOR ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICIES

Rooted in four centuries of history,³ the foundations of the United States Isthmian canal policies find expression in three important canal treaties:

First, The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, which facilitated construction of an Isthmian canal across Central America. In this treaty, Great Britain relinquished its own rights for the construction and control of such canal and recognized the exclusive right of the United States thereto. The United States, in assuming this responsibility, adopted the main points in the Convention of Constantinople of 1888, concerning the Suez Canal, as rules of the operation, and regulation of the American canal.

Second, The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States. On the part of Panama, this treaty granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Panama Canal, and, most significantly, as if the United States were the sovereign of the territory and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority. On the part of the United States, the main point for the purposes of this paper was that it guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama, which had just seceded from Colombia and whose existence depended on the protection of the United States and the success of the canal undertaking.

Third, The Thompson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus prior to the Panama Revolution of November 3, 1903. This treaty aimed at removal of all misunderstandings growing out of political events in Panama in November 1903, restoration of the cordial relationship that had previously existed between Colombia and the United States, and definition of their rights and interests with respect to the Canal and the Panama Railroad.

The negotiation of these three treaties, it should be emphasized, was not accidental. Instead, it was the result of long-range interoceanic canal policies of the United States developed over many years and having in mind always the history of the affected territory.

Here, as a matter of special interest, it should be remarked that the Panama Railroad, running through the Canal Zone and constituting the first American transcontinental rail system and the first practical step in the construction of the canal, was built by United States citizens in 1849-55. Later, it was acquired by the French, and sold to the United States as part of the French canal holdings acquired in 1904.

Throughout the period of United States operation of the canal, the requirements of these treaties have been carefully followed. Their main provisions have stood the test of experience and fully justify their adoption. They form a splendid monument to those who evolved them, and today Public Law 841, 81st Congress (1950), governing the administration of the canal enterprise and popularly known as the Thompson Act, actually mentions these treaties and specifies

³ Miles P. DuVal, Jr., "Cadiz to Cathay," (2d ed.) and "And the Mountains Will Move" (Stanford University Press, 1947) tell the story of the acquisition of the Canal Zone and building the Panama Canal.

that the levy of tolls is subject to their provisions.

PEAK OF U.S. ISTHMIAN INFLUENCE, 1903-39

Following the independence of Panama in 1903, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty was negotiated with the new sovereign of the Isthmus, instead of Colombia, pursuant to the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902, that had authorized negotiation of a treaty for canal purposes with Colombia.

As previously stated, this treaty authorized the acquisition and perpetual control of the Canal Zone for the primary objectives of constructing the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, all exclusively by the United States and also wholly at U.S. expense.

In addition, it is also clear from the diplomatic and legislative history of that era that the aim of both the United States and Panama was to establish and maintain complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone by the United States. This was done not only to assure the construction, efficient operation, and protection of the Canal in perpetuity, as provided in the Spooner Act of 1902 and in the 1903 treaty, but also to guarantee that Colombia could never be able to reassert successfully its sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, or the Republic of Panama.

Except for the Caesarian operation known in history as the Panama Revolution, out of which the independence of Panama resulted, and the provisions of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the Republic of Panama would never have been created and could never have survived. Besides, the United States would never have undertaken construction of a project as vast as the Panama Canal in a region then justly described as the pesthole of the world and long characterized as a land of endemic revolution repeatedly requiring the presence of naval vessels to maintain freedom of transisthmian transit.⁴

These points were fully understood at that time by Panamanian as well as North American leaders. Both realized that political stability in the Isthmian area was imperative for the success of the Canal enterprise—its construction and subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. They also recognized that such stability could be obtained only by vesting complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the United States.

The great North American statesman who developed our Isthmian policies included such eminent leaders as President Theodore Roosevelt, John Hay, John Bassett Moore, Adm. John G. Walker, William Howard Taft, and Elihu Root. President Roosevelt always viewed the Canal as the greatest accomplishment of his administration, and comparable in importance to the Louisiana Purchase. In essence, the results of their vision and efforts remained unimpaired until 1939—a period now recognized as the peak of United States influence on the Isthmus.

COLOMBIA'S INTEREST PROTECTED BY TREATY

Because of the importance of the Thompson-Urrutia Treaty, and the fact that it is not as well known as it should be, its principal provisions are summarized.

In article I, Colombia recognizes the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever." Furthermore, this article provides that Colombia shall enjoy certain rights, which include:

First, Transit through the Canal of Colombian troops, materials of war, and ships of

war, without paying charges to the United States.

Second, Exemption of charges on products of Colombian soil and industry, as well as mails, other than those to which the products and mails of the United States are subject.

Third, Exemption of Colombian citizens, crossing the Isthmus, from every toll, tax, or duty to which the citizens of the United States are not subject.

Fourth, Use of the Panama Railroad or any other railroad substituting therefor, in event of interruption of transit, for the transport of troops, materials of war, products, and mails of Colombia on the same basis as those of the United States.

In article II, the United States agreed to pay Colombia \$25 million, which was done.

By article III, Colombia recognized Panama as an independent nation and agreed to conclude a treaty of peace and friendship and to establish regular diplomatic relations, all of which was accomplished together with a treaty agreement between the two countries as to their common boundary.

Thus, it is clear that Colombia not only has substantial rights with respect to the Canal, but also a treaty interest in the continued operation of the Panama Railroad, which is binding on the United States. As will be later shown, this treaty interest of Colombia in 1955 was overlooked or ignored in the formulation of the treaty between the United States and Panama of that year.

TREATY POWER UNDERMINES UNITED STATES AUTHORITY

With the passing of the years after opening the canal to traffic on August 15, 1914, the operation of the project became a matter of routine with decreased public interest and scrutiny in the United States and Colombia. In Panama, however, there developed determined efforts toward securing revision of major provisions in the treaty structure.

Thoughtful North American officials, stationed in the Canal Zone as early as 1931-32, recognized the dangers involved and expressed fear that such treaty revision might lead to the ultimate loss of exclusive control of the canal by the United States.

Not until 1936, however, was the first major step in this direction made with the signing of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty. This treaty, because of opposition in the Senate, was not proclaimed until July 27, 1939.

The Hull-Alfaro Treaty, unlike the 1903 treaty, was negotiated without authorization or direction by the Congress. It weakened the dike in the diplomatic setup of the Panama Canal, but without impairment of the fundamental principle of its exclusive sovereign control by the United States.

To understand better its important provisions, it should be borne in mind that, by the time of the 1936 treaty, Panamanian leaders felt, because of the 1914 treaty between the United States and Colombia, that their country's independence was secure. Thus, they sought and secured abrogation of the guarantee provision of the 1903 treaty together with the right of the United States to maintain order in the terminal cities. In addition, the 1936 treaty surrendered other important rights of the United States granted in the 1903 treaty, including the important right of the United States of eminent domain within the Republic of Panama for canal purposes, and raised the canal annuity from \$250,000 to \$430,000 to compensate for the devaluation of the gold dollar, all without consideration except of token character.

The crippling of United States accessory powers, however, did not stop there. After prolonged secret negotiations started in 1953, the process was advanced much further in the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty, proclaimed

August 26, 1955, also negotiated without the authorization, direction, or suggestion by the Congress. This treaty gave to Panama additional valuable properties worth many millions and substantial rights, the latter including the authority of the United States to enforce sanitary ordinances in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon, which rights had been indispensable to building the canal. Moreover, the 1955 treaty increased the annuity by \$1.5 million, from \$430,000 specified in the 1936 treaty to \$1,930,000.

The Congress, in implementing this treaty, did not accept the additional \$1,500,000 as a charge on the Panama Canal enterprise but as foreign aid to Panama accorded by the Department of State as a diplomatic gesture. Thus, the annuity of \$1,930,000 is now being carried as an item in the budget of that Department, with reimbursement for \$430,000 of it to the Treasury, chargeable to the Panama Canal Company. This means that the annual cost of this diplomatic move (\$1,500,000) is borne by U.S. taxpayers and not canal users, further illustrating the propensity of the State Department to give away tax money for purposes of political placation. What a paradox is thus presented and what a dangerous precedent for the future administration of the Panama Canal.

Because all the 1955 treaty benefits and surrenders to Panama were extended for no other than purely token considerations, their costs ultimately will have to be covered by either increased taxes or higher tolls. Furthermore, they have definitely weakened the police power of the United States in meeting its treaty responsibilities for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal—a situation that might well prove fatal for the proper conduct of the canal enterprise in the future.

PANAMA RAILROAD LIQUIDATION NARROWLY AVERTED

One of the most objectionable features of the 1955 treaty was its surrender to Panama of valuable Panama Railroad property in the cities of Panama and Colon, even including the terminal freight yards and passenger station but excepting tracks in Colon necessary for Cristobal pier switching. Not only that, the treaty actually contemplated without the authority of the Congress the abandonment of the railroad itself, which, as shown previously, had been acquired with adequate compensation by the United States pursuant to both law and treaty. In addition, this move appears to have been taken with complete disregard or ignorance of the treaty rights of Colombia with respect to the Panama Railroad.

Apprised of the situation, congressional leaders intervened. An independent congressional inquiry⁵ resulted in the reversal of the formal endeavor of the Directorate of the Panama Canal Company to liquidate the railroad—a congressional decision fully justified by subsequent operation of the railroad. This action, however, was too late to save the terminal facilities of this historic and strategic rail line.

Now where does this leave us? Because the treaty has no provision for replacement of the ceded facilities, we are going to have a trans-Isthmian railroad without its originally designed and adequate terminal yards and stations. Could there be anything more absurd, or more ominous for the future conduct of our Isthmian policies?

CANAL ZONE IS CONSTITUTIONAL TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The sustained surrenders of our Isthmian rights and prerogatives, designed for proper maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal, extend beyond the limits of the Canal Zone into the very foundation of our constitutional form of government.

⁴ Flood, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States—Further Supplementary," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, Apr. 2, 1958, lists many incidents of Isthmian turmoil.

⁵ Flood, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States—Further Supplementary," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, Apr. 2, 1958, lists many incidents of Isthmian turmoil.

The acquisition of the Canal Zone and Panama Railroad was accomplished with adequate compensation pursuant to the Spooner Act of 1902 and the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty. Constructed and subsequently managed according to laws enacted by the Congress, the canal enterprise symbolizes to the people of the United States the productive benefits to be derived from our system of government.

Long recognized as part of the "coastline of the United States," the Canal Zone is not an occupied territory, as was once erroneously reported to the United Nations by our Department of State, but a portion of the constitutionally acquired territory of the United States.

BASIC ISTHMIAN POLICIES MUST BE REAFFIRMED

Unfortunately, the tragic surrenders culminating in the present Isthmian crisis represent a threat to our national power. In fact, the course pursued has resulted in the surrender without justification of our bargaining rights with Panama. It has created a situation that will require statesmanship of the highest order on the part of both Panama and the United States to correct.

In approaching this complicated task our leaders must realize that they are not dealing with a routine matter but one of transcendent importance for the indefinite future. History has shown that the canal question cannot safely be entrusted to minor negotiating officials of the executive departments alone but must be forthrightly faced by the Congress, which, as the ultimate authority, should reaffirm our canal policies in the light of all the basic considerations and realities involved.

The great lesson to be derived from a critical study of more than a century of experience in matters affecting security of transit, and the protection of the canal itself, is the imperative necessity for political stability on the isthmus, with no dilution or diminution of United States sovereignty and control over the Panama Canal enterprise.

*Senate Hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, pt. 19, Mar. 25, 1954, p. 1364.

The Starvation Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present to the House of Representatives an editorial containing most valuable observations on the TVA which appeared in the Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala., on January 4, 1959.

The editor of this newspaper, Mr. Barrett Shelton, is a distinguished journalist and an outstanding civic leader. Recently, he was elected president of the Associated Tennessee Valley Chambers of Commerce, and he is the author of this significant and thought-provoking editorial.

The editorial follows:

THE STARVATION DIET

Our old friends the private power interests and their new mouthpiece, the Chamber of

Commerce of the United States, have almost succeeded in putting us on a starvation diet in the Tennessee Valley in the matter of electric power generation. The 5 million people who depend on the Tennessee Valley Authority for electricity to light and heat their homes could run into a power shortage in 1961.

Who says so? The board of directors of TVA in their annual report to President Eisenhower and the Congress.

Some salient points in the board's report: Even if Congress passes the TVA self-financing bill this spring the action won't add any new generating capacity in time to keep supply ahead of demand through 1961.

Studies are being made to see how much new capacity can be financed out of power revenues, the source of funds for adding new generating units since 1953.

Units now under construction will add 1,535,000 kilowatts to the system which are expected to provide a modest margin of capacity over requirements in the winter of 1959-60 and a slight margin in the winter of 1960-61.

This is the situation produced by the starvation diet provided for 5 million Americans in the Tennessee Valley by the Eisenhower administration the result of advice from the "fat cats" who surround President Eisenhower and who hate TVA with a purposeful passion.

This is the result of the continuing campaign of propaganda handed out by the private power companies to people all over this Nation. Certainly if any money invested in advertising ever paid off a hundredfold, this power company investment in propaganda has done just that.

It is no wonder that the business interests, as represented by the many individual chambers of commerce in the Tennessee Valley are rising up and will make themselves heard. We have been taken to the cleaners, given this starvation diet long enough, and the Nation in general is going to know about it and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is already learning about it. We do not propose to kick over the traces and get out of the U.S. Chamber to do it, but rather we do propose to stay in that body and have our say over and over again to the end that TVA is not sold off nor starved to death.

There is a great future ahead for this valley, for the 5 million people who live and work and pay taxes in this valley, and we do not propose that any carefully planned, continuing campaign of hate against public power and distortion of facts concerning TVA and the people of this valley shall succeed.

Tax Equity for Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., which appeared in the New York Times of November 10, 1957:

TAX EQUITY FOR DISABLED—AN ANALYSIS OF MEASURE TO PROVIDE ADDED EXEMPTIONS FOR HANDICAPPED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Two recent tax rulings reported in the press have properly shocked a great many people.

The first was the denial by the Federal Tax Court of a claim for the deduction of expenses for a specially equipped automobile used by a man paralyzed from polio in traveling to and from work. The second was a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that the expenses of caring for a Seeing Eye dog, even when used in the conduct of business, may not be deducted.

As one of a number of letters sent to this writer said:

"Surely, our Government can't need tax money that badly."

The first case involved that of a paralyzed resident of Queens. He had claimed a deduction of \$1,800 for his automobile, which is equipped with hand controls, for expenses "essential to production of income." The court, however, ruled that, despite his disability, "his expenses related to that automobile are, in essence, nothing more than a commuter's expenses, which are personal in nature, and, therefore, specifically not deductible."

In its ruling on the seeing-eye dog, the Internal Revenue Service quoted a similar situation in which deduction was not permitted for the cost of maintaining a hearing and as a business expense even though the taxpayer was a lawyer. It did rule, however, that the expenses of caring for a seeing-eye dog might be deducted as a medical expense rather than as a business expense.

But the catch here is that, whereas business expenses are totally deductible, only that portion of medical and dental expenses that exceeds 3 percent of adjusted gross income is deductible.

BILL WOULD PROVIDE RELIEF

For a number of years, various organizations have sought legislation providing tax relief for certain other disabled individuals, such as the annual exemption of \$600 allowed the blind.

A bill to provide such relief is now before the House of Representatives. It was introduced by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat of Brooklyn, and bears the endorsement of a great many veteran, fraternal, and labor organizations. It would provide a disabled individual with an additional tax exemption of \$600 annually and an additional \$600 exemption for his spouse, and would include transportation costs to and from work by disabled persons as tax deductible business expenses.

It would seem there could be absolutely no argument against the last provision of Mr. KEOGH's proposals. Persons with physical disabilities practically always have extraordinary expenses in connection with the production of income. Many cannot use public transportation and must use taxicabs or have specially equipped automobiles. The recent case of the expenses of the seeing-eye dog and the prior ruling on hearing-aid maintenance for a lawyer are other examples.

To make these expenses tax deductible would be entirely consistent with basic income tax principles. These permit other categories of wage earners to deduct certain expenses that they incur as a necessary part of their income producing activities. This situation would be no different than that of the salesman who deducts entertainment expenses or the physician who deducts the cost of operating his car on professional calls.

INCENTIVE TO EMPLOYMENT

There is also little doubt that such a ruling would motivate certain disabled persons to seek employment. This writer knows personally of numerous instances in which disabled persons, having been placed in employment after rehabilitation, actually have less net income after their travel costs to and from employment than when they received public assistance prior to rehabilitation. It is difficult to motivate a person to work if by so doing he loses money.

The other provision of the Keogh bill—the annual exemption of \$600 each for the disabled person and his spouse—is designed to aid those with extraordinary expenses that are incurred because of disability but that are not related to the production of income.

For example, not all costs incurred in the purchase and maintenance of orthopedic and prosthetic devices are completely deductible under the medical deductions provisions of the law. Wheelchairs used by active disabled persons require repairs and maintenance. Many disabled persons require custom-made clothing or alterations on clothing. Clothing of persons using orthopedic and prosthetic appliances is subjected to unusual wear.

Some disabled persons must, of necessity, live in ground-floor apartments, which command higher rentals. Others must invest in ramps and special household equipment. The severely disabled person cannot climb to the balcony; he must pay the higher cost of orchestra seats at the theater or a concert.

These are little things. But they loom large in the budget of the disabled persons when they come up 365 days a year.

The proposed additional \$600 exemption for the physically disabled would be more difficult to administer than that which now exists for the blind. In the case of blindness, there are accurate measurements to determine if an individual is legally blind.

There are, however, no similar easily applied objective yardsticks to measure functional capacity in other types of disabling conditions. This must be based on the clinical opinion of a physician. Admittedly, there might be some abuses of the proposal, but evidently the medical society of the State of New York thinks they would be minimal, for it has endorsed Mr. Keogh's bill. In any event, the moral and practical values would far outweigh possible limited abuses.

One of the first matters before the Congress when it reconvenes is hearings on our tax structure, including treatment of the physically handicapped. These will begin on January 7.

The treatment the physically handicapped ask is not favoritism or special treatment. All they want is equity and parity.

VFW Resolution Opposing Cut in Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter and a resolution with respect to reduction of veterans' benefits:

ANTHRACITE COUNTIES COUNCIL,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF U.S.A.,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
December 12, 1958.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman, 11th Congressional District,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This has reference to the regular monthly meeting of the Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprised of the 10th and 11th Pennsylvania

Districts of Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wayne Counties, held at the Nescopeck Memorial VFW Post 8227, on Sunday, December 7, 1958, with Comdr. William J. Lester presiding.

At that meeting this council adopted a resolution, which will be acted upon by our VFW council of administration of Pennsylvania, relative to vigorously opposing the proposed action of the Bureau of the Budget in Washington with regard to making recommendations, to be presented to the 86th Congress, in cutting of veterans' benefits in order to balance the budget.

The council also went on record to transmit a copy of subject resolution, a copy of which is attached, to the two Pennsylvania U.S. Senators along with Congressmen in the council area and three times past commander in chief of the VFW, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman from Altoona, Pa.

The action of this council was prompted as a result of an address by you on Veterans Day at the Captain Christian S. Stegmaier, VFW Post No. 50, advising that the Bureau of the Budget in Washington is contemplating making proposals to Congress, to severely cut veterans' benefits. This along with the council's action has been evidenced by newspaper clippings of the Wilkes-Barre Record appearing on attached document.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would have subject resolution, along with letter of appreciation under signature of district 11, VFW, Com. John Radko, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when Congress convenes in January 1959. I would also appreciate 50 copies if and when same is made a matter of record for distribution throughout our council, department, and national headquarters.

Contacts are being made with other veterans organizations urging that they unite with us in countering any adverse moves which might materialize in having a demoralizing and financial effect upon the veteran.

On behalf of the council delegates I wish to extend my sincerest appreciation for your advice in your message at Post No. 50 and also the stand that you have already taken in connection with this matter.

Your comments on subject matter will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. FORLENZA,
Senior Vice Commander, Anthracite
Counties Council, VFW, Pittston, Pa.

ANTHRACITE COUNTIES COUNCIL, VFW
RESOLUTION

Whereas in accordance with an address to veterans at a Veterans Day program, held on Veterans Day, November 11, 1958, at the Capt. Christian E. Stegmaier, VFW Post No. 50, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman of the 11th Congressional District of Luzerne County, Pa., the Bureau of the Budget in Washington is contemplating making recommendations to severely cut veterans' benefits in order to balance the Federal budget. It is expected that the administration in Washington will present these proposals to cut back the veterans program, on a broad front, at the next session of Congress convening in January 1959;

Whereas it is anticipated that the administration in Washington when presenting these recommendations to cut veterans' benefits to the 86th Congress that veterans housing, VA hospital services, deduction of pensions from social security benefits, and proposing small lump payments for service-connected disabilities and many other phases

of the veterans program benefiting the veteran, will be affected if Congress accepts these proposals;

Whereas if Congress accepts proposals to cut back any veterans aid it will result in having a demoralizing and financial effect upon the veteran, his family and/or dependents. Many veterans are now facing a period of crisis both financially and economically in order to maintain a standard of living that should be accorded to every American citizen. If benefits are cut as contemplated, then the veteran will have a more serious crisis to face in order to make ends meet;

Whereas, mitigated by war time service, deserving veterans benefits should preclude any attempt at economies on a Bureau of the Budget school of thought;

Whereas America's one-time heralded heroes are now being sacrificed on the altar of economy in order that optimum budgetary functional responsibilities can be effected toward overseas and domestic entities; Now, therefore, it shall be

Resolved, At this meeting of the Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprised of the 10th and 11th Pennsylvania districts of Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wayne Counties, held at the Nescopeck Memorial, VFW Post 8227, on Sunday, December 7, 1958, that this council has gone on record vigorously opposing any adverse moves by the administration in Washington during the 86th Congress to cut back veterans' benefits, should such moves materialize same will have a financial and demoralizing effect upon the veteran, his family and/or dependent; it is further

Resolved, A special committee of the council VFW will make personal appearances at other district meetings of veterans' organizations urging united support to counteract and adverse moves by the administration. Copy of subject resolution will be directed to all Pennsylvania VFW district commanders, urging that they contact their Federal legislators and unite with this council in opposing cutback of veterans' benefits; be it further

Resolved, Copy of subject resolution will be directed to U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and U.S. Senator-elect HUGH SCOTT; copy to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th Congressional District of Luzerne County, and Congressman-elect STANLEY A. PROKOP, 10th Congressional District, along with Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, Pa., three times past commander in chief of the VFW, urging that they exercise their vested authority to preclude any proposed actions that might materialize in adversely affecting veterans' benefits; Be it further

Resolved, If moneys are required to balance the Federal budget during the next fiscal year, close scrutiny of existing and contemplated requirements of monetary dole could and would suffice for realizing a balanced budget.

John R. Humphreys, Adjutant, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Najid Saadi, Junior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; John Radko, Commander, District 11, VFW; Harold Ulrich, Past Commander, Anthracite Counties Council; Robert Davis, Chief of Staff, Department of Pennsylvania, VFW; John Sincavage, Trustee, District 11, VFW; William J. Lester, Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Anthony A. Forlenza, Senior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; James Gallagher, Commander, District 10, VFW; John J. Lane, Past Commander, District 11, VFW; Harry Wilkie, Sr., Commander, Kingston, VFW Post 283.

Appendix

The Leadership of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we Democrats have long been proud of the high quality of our congressional leadership.

It has been constructive and responsible. It has been statesmanlike and forward-looking. It has been leadership of both vision and effectiveness.

As one member of the majority, I am proud at all times to be enrolled in the ranks led by the Senator from Texas. We may disagree upon occasion. But the occasions are few and they do not detract from the high standards of his leadership.

On January 7 the Democrats met to organize for this session. Upon that occasion, the Senator from Texas delivered an address which expressed the very highest aspirations of the American people.

Senator JOHNSON talked of peace; of our vibrant, growing, expanding country; of the problems we face—problems which are also opportunities. It was a speech of optimism; of confidence; of strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this able address by the Senate Democratic leader be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY JOHNSON TO SENATE DEMOCRATS

We start today a new year and a new Congress.

We have met now to transact the necessary business of our party, but I feel it would be inappropriate to proceed without acknowledging the context in which we assemble.

For us, this is the starting of a new era. We have been given great strength. In all the long history of the Senate, never has one party won so many seats at a single election as we have won. For this, we are grateful—and certainly we are proud. Yet, we realize that our strength has never been, and is not now, the strength of numbers.

Our strength is what we are, and what we prove ourselves to be. What we hold we have earned. What we keep will be no more than what we deserve.

That is our special challenge.

Our strength will be deserving in proportion as we use it for the interests of all. By this standard, we have won the public trust; by this means, we shall honor the trust we have won.

JOHNSON SEES NEW ERA

New strength has brought us to a new era. Yet, as we note this, we cannot fail to note that this is, in much the same terms, the beginning now of a new era for our Nation, for the world, and for all humankind.

Our Nation is at the edge of what can clearly be its greatest age of expansion, growth, and abundance. Among the nations of the earth, we see emerging the first beginnings of a new age. Our times are yielding daily new capabilities for man.

The capabilities of government must keep pace with the capabilities of the people it serves. For this we know with certainty. There is no expense of government more costly or more intolerable than the burden of laggard government.

That is the work to which we come.

It is our purpose to fashion greater capabilities for our Government from the growing capabilities of man.

As Americans, not as partisans, we must acknowledge this reality: The capabilities of our Nation and its people are, in many vital areas, now outrunning the capabilities of our Government.

There is between the people and their Government a deficit of vigor, a deficit of confidence, and a deficit of will.

Prudence requires that we bring these books into balance.

To do so, we must seek the cause rather than tilt at the symptom. The faults of men and the failings of the system must not be confused. The one will pass; the other must be removed.

Government, if it is to serve at all, must serve the future—not the present alone, and most certainly not the past.

Today the future is already the controlling fact of these times—and of the decisions we take here.

The advent of a 200 million population, a \$500 billion national income, a trillion dollar economy are all near at hand.

THE PAST IS SERVED

Throughout our system, conservative men are already working with these facts.

Yet where men are responding to this future, their Government is not. The past is served—at penalty to the present and at the danger of default to the future.

It is against this danger of default that we must work.

Responsible government is responsive government. Our urgent duty—and our special opportunity—is to undertake the labors necessary to make the Government of our land responsive to the potential and the promise of the future.

What we can do now is subject to certain limits.

We have been given great strength, but not overriding strength. The executive arm of National Government remains under control of another party.

We have—by our majority here—an obligation to lead. We do not have authority to command. We have powers to advise and consent. We do not have powers to implement and accomplish.

These facts we appreciate, yet they do not matter for much beyond the confines of the Senate.

Our mandate is a mandate for confident and creative and constructive leadership—beginning now, not 2 years hence.

We shall honor the mandate.

Our opportunity—the great opportunity of this Senate—is to marshal the considerable resources of inquiry of the legislative branch to the task of defining for America new goals for the many new capabilities of its people, its economy, its technology and its national will.

We are clearly moving to a new age—an age of new standards, new accomplishments, and new potentials.

Against the promise of this new age, American industry and business is now pouring fourth billions in research to discover new capabilities.

Government, though, is moving hardly at all.

Research is under way on instruments of national security but, beyond that, little is being done. Great minds of the Nation are not being mobilized to the challenges of self-government by free men. The intellect of the Nation is not being used where it is most needed. Thus falling imperils us, fully as much, I believe, as would a failure to pursue research in the more obvious realms of national security.

I speak only for myself, of course, but I believe this. I believe that we should, through the resources available to us in the legislative branch, undertake the rewarding work of turning our land into the campus of the West.

We are working with the future. We are working with a new dimension—the most challenging men have ever faced.

If we are to be competent even for the routine of tomorrow, we shall need vision in our preparations—and we shall need both boldness and freshness.

We do not have it now.

It is the indictment of those who presently hold the responsibility of the action arm of our leadership that in dynamic times they have exalted—and still exalt—the static.

Free men can afford much. They can never afford the price of inertia.

Today we must face this fact: We have led the free world through a time of sickness and convalescence, but we are faced now with a well and vital world. The test of our national character and capacity will be our ability to lead a well world by our vigor and purpose as we have led a sick world by our wealth and compassion.

We need new ideas in many fields. We need to forge new tools of government.

Our controls over the monetary system are now two world wars old.

Our budget processes were formed in another day.

Our tax structure is obsolescent.

Our Government is dedicated, in many areas, to programs for which the purpose is no longer pertinent.

If we are not to default the integrity of our free enterprise system, we must concentrate vigorous effort on its future—rather than hold to easy concepts of its past.

We must not surrender to inflation.

We must not surrender to poverty.

We must not surrender to educational blight or medical mediocrity or social depression in any field of our society.

We must not abandon regions or cities or classes or ages to despair.

We must not allow the obsolescence of our ideas to foredoom vital segments of our enterprise.

We must not allow ourselves to forfeit the goals of equal standards of freedom, opportunity, and equality for want of boldness.

We certainly must not abdicate progress to the rule of tension and strife.

In a world reborn—facing the new youth of a new age and a new dimension of space—we must certainly not default the leadership of vigor to the totalitarians.

THE FIRST CONCERN

Fiscal solvency concerns us all. It is a first concern, for no course is honest without the courage of financial prudence. But we cannot afford to bankrupt the national conscience to serve the ends of political bookkeeping.

Moral integrity, as well as fiscal integrity, requires that we acknowledge deficits of will and deficits of effort and undertake a united search for responsible solutions to the problems of our times.

We, here in the Senate, have within the powers open to us under the Constitution a great opportunity to reach out across the land—into the universities and colleges, into private business, into labor, the professions, all walks of our national life—and ask great minds to come here to help us seek and search.

We can reach beyond our shores—to all the Western World and especially to our neighbor republics of this hemisphere—and ask others to share this labor with us.

We can bring men together to explore tomorrow's horizons for our land, our hemisphere, and the world.

From such explorations, we will find the facts and from the ideas with which we shall work the next decade to make government responsive to the potential of the future.

The world is in a race today that is more likely to be won by minds than missiles. We neglect this at our peril.

There is much that we must do and shall do in this session, yet, for our work, we do not come with a checklist in hand to attend only the pressing problems of the present.

We are—as are the people who sent us here—looking to the future.

We know that we shall win respect by our vision, not by our vendettas; by courage, not by carping.

Our first responsibility is responsibility itself.

The era is new. The promise is new. We work with new and growing capabilities. Yet our purpose remains unchanged. Always our party has been the party of confident men and we have drawn our strength from young and confident regions of a young and confident land.

Today there is a new youth and zest and confidence across all our land and we, in consequence, find ourselves here now as party of all the Nation.

New strength is ours. With that new strength we shall—by responsibility service—add strength to our Nation, our world, and our times.

The Objectives of International Communism Never Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, "The American people must not be fooled into

thinking that Communists have changed their long-range ambition for world domination or embraced the cause of peace." In the light of Soviet Russia's recently accelerated activities on the political, scientific, and psychological warfare fronts, this admonition was contained in an inspiring address by the Honorable J. Sinclair Armstrong, Assistant Secretary of the Navy—Financial Management—which he delivered on November 25, 1958, to a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs in Baltimore. Secretary Armstrong's speech was so outstanding that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT), AT THE ROTARY-KIWANIS LUNCHEON, BALTIMORE, MD., NOVEMBER 25, 1958

It is a great pleasure for me to be in Baltimore today with these Rotary and Kiwanis organizations. I am particularly honored to be with you under the auspices of your distinguished senior Senator and my friend of many years, JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, who has rendered outstanding service to the people of Maryland and of our country during his service in the U.S. Senate.

I would like to talk briefly this afternoon about some current aspects of national defense.

I propose to speak about problems which we as a nation face in dealing with the implacable and hostile forces of international communism.

To put this in historical perspective, let me turn back the clock for a moment and review briefly our U.S. national policies and aspirations during the past 40 or so years.

It has been a fact that the United States, in all of our international relations, has had as a fundamental purpose the attainment of freedom and justice for our country and all other peoples. In pursuing this fundamental objective of freedom and justice, our policy has been to maintain peace, not to wage war.

For we have believed that the best way to solve international problems is through the maintenance of peace rather than the waging of war. Never during the past 40 years and more have we ever willingly started a war. Each time we have participated in a war it has been because there was no other way by which the United States could proceed toward our purpose of establishing conditions of liberty and justice.

For example, the United States entered World War I not to accomplish any territorial gain, not to accomplish any economic domination of other people, not to secure any commercial or industrial advantage, but solely for the purpose of protecting countries whose peoples were devoted to the ideals of liberty and justice from domination by an aggressive military-minded empire.

We entered World War I with the highest ideals for which any country in modern times has gone to war. They were later expressed in President Woodrow Wilson's famous 14 points. Although the 14 points were not accomplished at the peace table at Versailles in 1919, they remain an enduring tribute to America's aspirations for freedom and justice for the peoples of all countries, small as well as large.

Twenty-three years later, because the free world was at bay and we were most grievously attacked at Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, our country once more took up arms for freedom. After great efforts and great sacrifice in which our country's men and women, young and old, were mobilized either in uniform or in the tremendous war pro-

duction effort at home, in which our military forces were deployed all over the globe, we succeeded by force of arms in defeating the forces of darkness and tyranny which had been almost at the point of engulfing the free world.

After the surrenders in April and August, 1945, of the Nazi-German and the Japanese Axis Governments our country again participated in strong and idealistic efforts to establish world peace. We laid down our arms. We demobilized our forces. We placed the support of our country behind the new world organization, the United Nations.

Unfortunately, once again the forces of darkness and tyranny arose, and within the space of only 5 years. By 1950 the Communists of Korea, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, commenced overt aggression against one of Asia's free nations, the Republic of Korea. The Chinese Communists joined in. So once more our country mobilized and, under United Nations auspices, fought to prevent the Communist conspiracy from overrunning a friendly and responsible free people. This war was brought to a successful end in 1953, after 2 long years of truce talks, because it appeared to the Communists that our intervention and determination made it impossible for them to overrun Korea. The one language Communists understand and respect is strength.

What are the problems we face today as a nation and how do they affect our national defense responsibilities? We are living in most dangerous times. Five years after the end of the Korean war, the danger is far greater than in other times. We face not just a military threat, but also a psychological attack. The force of Communist arms is no longer the only danger. The struggle of mankind toward a fuller life in freedom and liberty has assumed new dimensions. Free men today are being assailed by the Communist movement in the realm of ideas and ideals. Front lines today are in the hearts and minds of men and women, and school children, not just on battlefields.

The insidious influences of communism seek to weaken the free will of people, to strike fear into their hearts, to undermine their moral fiber and their ability to tell the difference between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, justice and tyranny. Communism represents a danger to our philosophy and to our moral convictions about the basic institutions of our country. Worst of all, communism seeks to take away men's confidence in themselves and in their ability to see and do the right.

The Communist conspiracy has assumed tremendous world significance. No free country, least of all the United States, can afford to relax in the face of the menace of international communism.

Communists have been extraordinarily busy and at times successful in snuffing out men's aspirations for freedom with the most ruthless suppression. Hungary is a recent example. And long after the brutal Soviet suppression of the Budapest uprising in November 1956, the subsequent execution, indeed the indefensible murder, of Premier Imre Nagy, despite a safe-conduct pledge to the Yugoslav Embassy, shocked the free world.

Recently the free world has been watching the Soviets draw the rope tightly around their Nobel prize author, Boris Pasternak, who dared to tell some ugly facts about Communist society.

Is it ever to be expected that the Communists will accord basic human rights and freedoms to the people whom they now dominate, and to the peoples the world over who are still free but whom they aspire to dominate? I think not.

Indeed the world well knows, and the Soviet Union recognizes, that the United States

stands as the great bulwark in the cause of human freedom. We are the one power in the world capable of preventing communism and its attendant slavery from engulfing the world. In this we have a great responsibility an done which we have borne manfully in the past 5 years.

In order to combat communism, in order to protect the security of our country, in order to assist other free countries in preserving their own freedom against aggression, we maintain strong United States military forces today. For after 1953, when we brought the Korean war to a conclusion, our country recognized that we must remain militarily strong.

We have kept over 2½ million men under arms. We have forged the greatest retaliatory capability against Communist nuclear attack which the world has ever known, through our Strategic Air Command. We have maintained strong, modern ground forces in our Army. We have maintained, over the seas of the world, great naval and marine forces, silent, mobile, ready and at all times capable of assuring freedom of the seas and being in trouble spots when our national policy dictates their so doing to protect American interests and fulfill our obligations to other free countries. We have participated with other free countries in forging alliances like NATO to protect free Europe, and SEATO to protect southeast Asia. Most important of all, we have lent our full power and influence to support the United Nations in the never-ceasing search for peaceful solutions of international problems.

We have succeeded in avoiding military conflict during the years of Communist-inspired tension since the Korean war ended. No American soldiers, sailors or airmen have been in battle. And in several important instances, as in Lebanon last summer and the Taiwan Straits in recent months, by showing our strength and resolution we have also succeeded in our efforts to assure the protection of friendly free nations against naked, brutal Communist aggression. Our resolution and strength, brilliantly shown in the Mediterranean and the western Pacific, have helped preserve peace.

For this past summer and fall the Communists have been testing our resolution and fortitude on two sides of the globe almost simultaneously. We can take great pride and have confidence for the future when we think that our standing up and facing dangerous consequences resulted in the preservation of nations of the free world which otherwise might have fallen prey to subversion and to direct aggression.

But we cannot rest on our laurels. We must not let down our guard. We must look to the future. We must seize our opportunities and at the same time recognize the dangers we face. We must be aware that the Communists are artful and clever in their use of psychological warfare, as well as their use of subversion and military aggression. We must recognize that each individual man, woman, and child is a target for Communist intrigue.

It is tremendously important that we ourselves recognize and resist the psychological pressures which the Communists will apply in months ahead, and the methods they use. How do the Communists apply psychological pressures?

It is not unusual for the Communists, with much fanfare, to broadcast blandishments to the world about the allegedly provocative nature of United States military strength. These blandishments they follow up with unenforceable and unsatisfactory proposals for disarmament or demobilization. Then, by their own acts of aggression or subversion, they create crises in which the armed power of the United States must be displayed for our own security, and for the security of our friends and allies.

Sometimes an incident of aggression is followed by an offer to confer or negotiate, noisily announced all over the world. A conference or negotiation in turn may be followed by some other aggressive maneuver. Communist propaganda is applied so as to bring pressure in any discussions and conferences that do occur so that the settlements arrived at will be as favorable as possible to them.

Let me illustrate just how the Communists skillfully interweave propaganda with negotiations and with the crises they create, all to serve their own best ends.

Let us look at the negotiations presently going on in Geneva on technical means to guard against surprise attack. Last March the Soviets complained against the flight procedures of our Strategic Air Command, alleging falsely that they represent a threat to the U.S.S.R. So the United States proposed in the United Nations Security Council the establishment of an Arctic inspection system against a surprise attack. This the Soviets vetoed.

Then we proposed a conference to cover technical measures of preventing surprise attack. Now at Geneva our delegation has faced political demands that our strategic bases abroad be abandoned and that our Arctic reconnaissance flights stop. Mr. Khrushchev has bitterly denounced our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

This twisting of facts must be resisted by our people. Our forces abroad, our bases and our fleets, are there for one reason and one only, to secure the United States and our allies against attack. We cannot let the world believe that we maintain bases and forces abroad out of any desire on our part to attack anyone. We don't. Our forces are defensive in purpose. Yet the whole burden of Soviet propaganda, as these conferences in Geneva go on, is to attempt to show that our defensive bases and forces constitute a threat to them.

A second example of skillful Communist mixture of propaganda, crisis and conference is the Soviet handling before world public opinion of the question of the cessation of nuclear testing. Six months ago the Soviet Union announced that they were unilaterally stopping tests and challenged the United States to do the same. We replied, as we have consistently maintained when we offered the atomic secrets to the world in 1946, that we cannot do so unless an inspection system is established which will guarantee the world against one party violating the agreement. So all summer long, the Soviet propaganda mill beat out the false story that the United States was standing out against mankind's aspirations against nuclear war. Then, as we were forced to show our armed strength in the crises they created in Lebanon and Taiwan, they argued to the world that we were aggressors. We agreed to a conference on suspension of nuclear testing and agreed to stop our own tests when the conference began, on October 31. Yet by tragic and inhuman defiance of the hopes of mankind, secretly, in early November, after the conference began, the Soviets themselves once again began nuclear testing.

While these conferences on technical means of guarding against surprise attack and on cessation of nuclear tests have been going on at Geneva, during the past week the Soviets have again applied pressure, as they did 10 years ago, on one of the nerve centers of the free world, Berlin. The Soviets well recognize the importance of our "showpiece" in West Berlin. They recognize West Berlin's effect on the subjugated peoples of East Germany. They recognize the unfavorable comparison of the Communist system in Eastern Europe in the satellite countries to conditions in West Berlin, where those who live under free world auspices have achieved far higher standards of economic and human freedom. They also recog-

nize Berlin as a place where they can apply pressure against basic policies affecting the security of the United States and our allies. So, whatever emerges in the difficult days that lie ahead in this Soviet-manufactured Berlin crisis, we must always remember that it is part of an overall Soviet purpose and plan. For the Communists remain highly flexible in their use of every possible device to achieve their ends, and their policies combine the skillful combination of crisis, propaganda, and conference—all for their own Communist aims.

The American people must not be fooled into thinking that Communists have changed their long range ambition for world domination or embraced the cause of peace. They have not, and to think so would be a dangerous delusion on our part. Indeed, the free world must win the psychological battles just as surely as we must win any military engagement. The Communist aim is world domination. This we must resist, in whatever way it appears. And we must prepare ourselves, in our own hearts and minds, to bear the struggle that lies ahead.

As our country looks into the future, looks to the negotiations, the propaganda, the pressures, the shooting that will undoubtedly from time to time be brought to bear upon the free world by the Communist world, we must have strength, courage and fortitude. We must not be fooled by the Communists, and we must not give in to them.

We must show potential aggressors that they cannot expect to win.

We in the Navy have always remembered Theodore Roosevelt, who sent the Great White Fleet around the world in 1907 and first impressed the world that the United States had become a world power and leader. A few weeks ago we celebrated Theodore Roosevelt's hundredth birthday. I have often thought that he described our own personal responsibility for preserving our own freedom when he wrote this: "We, here in America, hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years; and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

So we must dedicate ourselves to the principles of liberty, justice, and love of country through which alone mankind can rise to achieve our highest human aspirations.

The Debt Limit Is Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Debt Limits If They Are Not Observed?" published in the Fremont County Chronicle-News, of St. Anthony, Idaho.

The editorial, which was written by Harry N. Beall, publisher of the Chronicle-News, points out a pugent economic fact which today our Government seems to be ignoring. It cites figures to show that in only 13 years the average American's Federal taxes have almost doubled, and that one-third of his workday is spent simply creating revenue for a profligate Government.

I should like to suggest that my colleagues read this thoughtful editorial,

because I believe it strikes at the heart of our Nation's greatest peril today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

WHY DEBT LIMITS IF THEY ARE NOT OBSERVED?

There can be no other conclusion but that the debt limits set by Congress for our Nation are nothing but a stupid farce.

They are not being observed and apparently will not be observed. A long time ago a thoughtful Congress set a maximum which it felt the public debt must not be allowed to exceed because of the obvious danger to our economy.

That figure was reached. Did the Congress quit spending and attempt to hold the public debt within bounds? No, it simply increased the debt limit. Having done it once, it was easy to do again. Now the policy is simply to set a debt limit, pay it no mind, and raise it whenever it is reached. If memory serves, it was raised twice in recent months and now it is at \$288 billion. It isn't necessary to remember the exact figure—it will be raised again shortly.

All of which is dangerously stupid. If a debt limit is necessary—and surely it is—then it must be observed. In peacetime, in fact, if we cannot live within our income and pay back a little against that great indebtedness, what sort of a future can we expect but runaway inflation, a 10-cent or a 1-cent dollar and ultimate bankruptcy—with communism ever ready to move in and take over a government we haven't sense enough to keep afloat.

The figures are frightening. Our population is increasing very rapidly—more rapidly than at any time in our history. Yet the per capita Federal debt has increased heavily. Again—in 1946 Federal taxes were \$284 per capita, just after the war. Today in peace, with many millions greater population in the country in which to spread the load, the per capita tax figure is estimated at \$451.

Another example of the runaway power of taxes is that despite inflation and an ever increasing national product, taxes take a higher and higher percentage of that product—not just more money each year. In 1939 taxes took 17½ percent of a national product of \$83 billion. In 1946 they took 25 percent of a national product of \$200 billion. And in 1957 they took 28 percent of the national product of \$402½ billion.

The average man works 2½ hours of each 8-hour day just to pay his taxes—putting out far more effort for that than he does for his family's food, housing or clothing. It's time he insisted that the Congress set a debt limit and keep that limit, that it holds taxes from going higher and begins to pay off indebtedness, and that it finds and follows a financial program that will preserve instead of wreck this economy of ours.

Senator Johnson's Strategy

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* an editorial entitled "Senator Johnson's Strategy," published in the *New York Times* of January 12, 1959.

The *New York Times* is admittedly the greatest newspaper in this country, and

probably the greatest newspaper in the world. It is a conservative newspaper. It is a moderate newspaper. It is a middle-of-the-road newspaper, but it is also an honest newspaper, and it analyzes the measures before Congress with keenness and with a balanced view.

I invite the attention of the Senate and the country to the concluding paragraphs of this editorial, dealing with the motions which will shortly be before this body, and dealing with the strategy of the majority leader in seeking to get his proposal through. The *New York Times* editorial reads in part as follows:

But this week there will be a test that should separate those who believe in majority decisions from those who do not. Senator JOHNSON's own proposal for amending rule XXII, the closure provision, does three things: (1) It says that two-thirds of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds of all the Senators, may order closure; (2) it repeals the clause that exempts a rule change from closure; (3) it states that the Senate is a continuing body and thus need not adopt new rules at the beginning of a session.

What this compromise adds up to this year and this session is that the minority opponents of civil rights legislation can talk the majority to death. The intent is not to debate or to educate, but to frustrate the will of the majority. Senator JOHNSON knows this. He sanctions it, apparently, because he thinks it is worthwhile to keep the Democratic Party intact at the price of letting a minority veto its program.

This may be good strategy this year and this session. We believe it will turn out to be bad strategy in the long run. The Democratic sweep last fall was a liberal victory. Senator JOHNSON's strategy may drive multitudes of independent voters back into what is admittedly at this moment a disorganized and discouraged Republican Party.

I commend the entire editorial, and particularly its concluding paragraphs, to the attention of all Senators, on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSON'S STRATEGY

The strategy by which Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, is laboring to retain the filibuster as an instrument of Government has won admiration from the experts. Senator JOHNSON last week not only rounded up the expected goats but also some of the sheep against the Anderson proposal to reopen the Senate rules. He even roped in the two brandnew Senators from Alaska, whose records indicate they would go with the liberals on most questions.

This victory over Senator ANDERSON and his friends might be due in part to the belief of some Senators that it would be a dangerous precedent to start each session with a new wrangle over the entire set of rules. The belief may be right or it may be wrong—the House of Representatives, which renews its youth every 2 years, usually makes a routine job of adopting the same old rules.

But this week there will be a test that should separate those who believe in majority decisions from those who do not. Senator JOHNSON's own proposal for amending rule XXII, the closure provision, does three things: (1) It says that two-thirds of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds of all the Senators, may order closure; (2) it repeals the clause that exempts a rule change from closure; (3) it states that the Senate is a continuing body and thus need not adopt new rules at the beginning of a session.

What this compromise adds up to this year and this session is that the minority op-

ponents of civil rights legislation can talk the majority to death. The intent is not to debate or to educate but to frustrate the will of the majority. Senator JOHNSON knows this. He sanctions it, apparently, because he thinks it is worthwhile to keep the Democratic Party intact at the price of letting a minority veto its program.

This may be good strategy this year and this session. We believe it will turn out to be bad strategy in the long run. The Democratic sweep last fall was a liberal victory. Senator JOHNSON's strategy may drive multitudes of independent voters back into what is admittedly at this moment a disorganized and discouraged Republican Party.

**Naval Air Overhaul and Repair Station,
Corpus Christi, Tex., Shutdown Should
Be Reconsidered in Fairness to All**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are all aware that the Republican administration is so wedded to the idea of government by budgetary ledger sheets that it seems willing to jeopardize the Nation's security. This is not my belief alone. It is the firm feeling of a great number of people who have considered the matter carefully.

Certainly, national security permitting, I am as desirous as anyone of securing a balanced budget. But I believe it is very foolhardy and governmentally irresponsible to set out to balance the budget at all costs, and particularly at the costs of the security of America.

Recently this administration, exercising pressure through the Department of the Navy, arbitrarily ordered the firing of 3,200 skilled workers, and the shutdown of the overhaul and repair facilities at the Corpus Christi Naval Air Station. I say arbitrarily because the Congress, after due investigation, appropriated funds for the continued operation of this facility, believing it to be a necessary part of our defense effort.

Mr. President, the Navy, under pressure from the budget department of the administration, saw fit to totally disregard the consequences to a whole city and area by this budgetary move. It does not matter to the Budget Bureau and the administration that thousands of people are in jeopardy of losing their homes by government decree. It does not matter to the administration and the Budget Bureau that many small businesses in Corpus Christi may be bankrupt by this Government order.

This step was taken in the name of economy and efficiency, but there is a great deal of evidence that the opposite is the case. Upon closing down this facility, the Navy must ship much of the equipment and all of the work being done at Corpus Christi to Pensacola, Fla. Does it sound very efficient to ship airplane engines and other parts all the way to Florida for overhaul and repairs? It certainly does not. It is likely, indeed,

that shipping costs alone would eat up any economy in such a plan.

Mr. President, so far as I have been able to determine, and I am studying the matter quite closely, the only reasonable way to fairly and efficiently cut down overhaul and repair operations would be to decrease proportionately the operations at all nine of the Navy overhaul and repair facilities across the country. This would be, I believe, the just move and the efficient move.

A large number of individuals and organizations have been studying this matter and have communicated to me their findings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these remarks and the following:

A news story from the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of January 6, 1959, under the heading "Over 1,500 Hear Report on Fight To Keep Overhaul and Repair Here."

A letter from Mr. Bob Conwell, chairman of the public and business affairs committee of the Six Points Kiwanis Club, at Corpus Christi, Tex., and the text of a resolution adopted by that organization.

A resolution adopted on December 31, 1958, by the Gragg-Sherrill Post 248, of the American Legion, and a letter from the Corpus Christi Masters and Foremen's Association, by its secretary, Mr. William R. Tobe, dated December 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the article, letters, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Jan. 6, 1959]

OVER 1,500 HEAR REPORT ON FIGHT TO KEEP OVERHAUL AND REPAIR HERE

By Georgia Nelson

A crowd of about 1,500 braved cold, wet weather last night to hear a report on what has been and is being done in the fight to keep the Overhaul and Repair Division at NAS from being shut down.

The meeting in Memorial Coliseum was sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce Overhaul and Repair Committee, headed by Robert P. Wallace.

Tom Hanley, Overhaul and Repair production superintendent, gave a résumé of voluminous information that has been compiled and sent to Washington in an effort to get the Navy to rescind its order.

Russell Kirkland, Corpus Christi manager for Merrill Lynch, Pierce Fenner & Smith and local president of the Navy League, pledged assistance from the "civilian arm of the Navy" to help Corpus Christi keep the Overhaul and Repair activity.

INVESTIGATORS HERE

Hanley said two investigators from Washington spent the past week here gathering information to be used in determining whether the Navy's shutdown order will stand.

The two men, a lawyer and a CPA, are investigators for the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, of which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is chairman. They left Corpus Christi for Washington yesterday afternoon.

Hanley said four copies of the report have been sent to Washington. Wallace described it as a "weighty volume filled with bludgeoning facts to back up Corpus Christi's argument that the Overhaul and Repair shutdown order was a mistake."

DETAILED REPORT

The report, Hanley said, contains detailed information on the essential work being done by the Overhaul and Repair here and the high level of efficiency with which the Bureau of Aeronautics has credited the Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair.

Among advantages pointed out for keeping the Overhaul and Repair in Corpus Christi is the strategic location—not as vulnerable to foreign attack as other Overhaul and Repair installations in the country—and shorter material and transportation lines to all parts of the Nation.

Breakdowns were given on the skills and talents of the 2,995 persons employed in Overhaul and Repair to show that they are capable of overhauling all of the latest type of aircraft, including seaplanes.

Flexibility of expansion is another advantage mentioned in the report.

GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

The report detailed the tremendous expense the Government would incur by closing down the Overhaul and Repair. This would include the cost of moving a terrific inventory of supplies already here, the expense of moving out equipment valued at \$12 million and caretaker service for the buildings which are also valued at an estimated \$12 million, and the cost of moving part of the personnel elsewhere for other jobs.

The terminal pay alone for discharging all the employees of Overhaul and Repair, Hanley said, has been estimated at \$1.5 million.

"This order (to close down the Overhaul and Repair) is a reversal of the Defense Department's policy of dispersal of critical defense activities," Hanley said.

He drew laughs from the serious-faced audience only once when he said, "The Government may find itself in a big real estate business before it knows it."

This was a reference to the many homes in Corpus Christi and surrounding towns that are being bought by Overhaul and Repair personnel.

Still another phase of the report details the patriotism and high morale of Overhaul and Repair employees.

Figures indicate the personnel has given wholehearted support to all management sponsored programs. Virtually all are buying Government bonds on the payroll plan. They have contributed almost 100 percent to Navy Relief, the United Fund and other civic and welfare programs. The low loss of time from work due to sickness and the safety program of Overhaul and Repair were cited.

TELEGRAMS READ

Wallace read all of the telegrams that have been exchanged among Representative John Young, Senator Lyndon Johnson, and Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates.

"The biggest job has been done by giving our Senators and Representatives the ammunition they need to carry on the fight in Washington," Wallace said, "but we must maintain and step up our personal contact to support them."

He said that he talked yesterday with Young by telephone and that Young spent all of yesterday morning at the Navy Department.

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH said in a letter yesterday that he has contacted a number of high-ranking Naval officers in an effort to halt the cutback but that he has "not had any results."

SENT TO NYE

The letter was sent to attorney Paul W. Nye, Nueces County Democratic chairman. YARBOROUGH pledged in the letter to continue working toward keeping Overhaul and Repair running at full blast here.

Nye said that he has received letters from

JOHNSON and U.S. Representative SAM RAYBURN pledging every effort to keep Overhaul and Repair in Corpus Christi. Young is coordinating the Washington attack.

"I believe we will succeed in keeping the Overhaul and Repair operations," Nye said. "There are too many people really trying on this thing."

Nye said he has contacted every official possible to line up support for the continued operation of Overhaul and Repair.

KIWANIS CLUB OF SIX POINTS,
Corpus Christi, Tex., January 8, 1959.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution the Six Point Kiwanis Club of Corpus Christi passed at its regular meeting on January 6, 1959.

I know you are greatly interested in retaining at least a portion of the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi, and we would like to offer you all the assistance we have in retaining this installation.

Since the closing of the Overhaul and Repair would be a great blow to the economy of this entire area, I will appreciate all you can do on our behalf.

Yours truly,

BOB CONWELL,
Chairman, Public and Business Affairs
Committee, Six Points Kiwanis
Club.

RESOLUTION

We, the members of Six Points Kiwanis Club of Corpus Christi, in meeting assembled on this 6th day of January 1959, memorialize the Congress and the executive branch of our Government to reconsider the unwarranted and uneconomic proposal to close the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi.

The Navy Department has ordered a small cut in civilian employees across the Nation. Thirty percent of that nationwide cut is concentrated in Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair. Such figures give us pause to wonder.

Our Overhaul and Repair Department is one of nine in the U.S. Navy. It employs approximately 10 percent of the total of all Overhaul and Repair employees and has a physical plant presently valued at approximately \$30 million. Some 3,000 persons employing some 75 different crafts and skills are integrated into a smoothly functioning major industry of Corpus Christi, with an \$18 million annual payroll. Overhaul and Repair employees comprise approximately 14 percent of the total labor force of Corpus Christi. Their sudden firing will dissipate a highly organized and specialized repair and overhaul facility, causing untold hardship for 3,000 Corpus Christi families and will make an indelible impression on the economy of Corpus Christi, which is unable to absorb so drastic a cut in its labor force. Impact on local business will be drastic, widespread, and prolonged.

But let all who hear, know, that this Kiwanis Club is not opposed to economy in Federal Government, nor do we oppose the reduction in military expenditures where our preparedness program requires it. We do not selfishly ask for the maintenance of a Federal facility for the sole purpose of supporting the local economy. We do not endorse pork-barrelling or make-work Federal jobs in time of prosperity.

We believe it imperative, however, that all concerned recognize that the closing of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is not an economy move by the Government and will not reduce Federal expenditures one iota, but on the contrary, augurs the prob-

able increase of unnecessary Federal expenditures. Our conviction is based on these facts:

1. There has been no indication of comparable reduction in the Navy's use of the particular types of aircraft, engines and engine components being overhauled and repaired at Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi. The same work now being done at Corpus Christi will therefore have to be done elsewhere, most probably by the expanding of Overhaul and Repair facilities at the other eight Overhaul and Repair Departments scattered across the Nation. The equipment and physical plant at Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is one of the most modern and efficient of all Overhaul and Repair Departments. The closing of Corpus Christi Overhaul and Repair will mean the elimination of the most efficient equipment while increasing the workload for the more antiquated equipment of other Overhaul and Repair Departments.

2. The Navy has continuously sought to disperse its facilities as a protective measure in the event of national emergency, and industry has been urged to vacate the populous areas of the East and the exposed areas of the North and west coast, easily accessible over the North Pole. Corpus Christi is, geographically, best situated in the event of national emergency.

3. The Navy Department has repeatedly faced the problem of potential budget cuts and has repeatedly determined that, in the event of any budget cutting, it will be best prepared for military emergencies by making a horizontal cut in its Overhaul and Repair facilities, rather than a vertical cut: that is, by reducing the operating level of all Overhaul and Repair Departments, rather than eliminating any one Overhaul and Repair Department. This permits the fastest expansion in time of need, and retains a nucleus of employees and a physical plant in readiness when the occasion arises.

This sudden reversal of long established Navy Department policy of making horizontal cuts in Overhaul and Repair Department activity, being economically and militarily unwise, cannot be attributed to aught but political expediency or false economy.

We condemn politics playing with national defense and a false pretense and a sham and a facade made of governmental economy.

Since the work must yet be done, closing Corpus Christi is a travesty on economy. Even if the total workload of all Overhaul and Repair's were to be reduced, a wiser and more economical reduction would be a horizontal cut reducing all facilities, or even reducing the less modern facilities, or the more exposed geographical locations, or the facilities less capable of expanding, or those that have not produced the high degree of efficiency of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi. From any point of view, the proposed closing of Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is uneconomical, unwise, and militarily dangerous.

We in Kiwanis condemn the proposed closing, and petition our Government to reconsider and review the essential facts and rescind the order to close Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi.

Passed unanimously by Six Points Kiwanis Club, January 8, 1959.

ALLEN S. LEWIS,
President.
EARL THOMAS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been ordered that the Overhaul and Repair Department at U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., be completely closed by July 1, 1959; and

Whereas a more recent order from the Navy

Department has directed the firing of 1,200 employees by March 31, 1959; and

Whereas the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress did appropriate the funds for the continued operation of the Overhaul and Repair Department at U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.; and

Whereas the production record of the Overhaul and Repair Department of the U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., is excellent in comparison with all other Overhaul and Repair installations in the United States, and the strategic location of the U.S. Naval Air Station is of the utmost importance to the national defense; and

Whereas in the face of threatened aggression on the part of the Communist controlled countries of the world, the members of Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., believe the order to abolish the Overhaul and Repair Department, U.S. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., to be contrary to the best interests of the national defense, and do deplore this action on the part of the officials issuing said order: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the American Legion, Corpus Christi, Tex., request the support and assistance of the national security committee, Department of Texas, the American Legion, and the national defense committee of the national organization of the American Legion in an effort to have this untimely, uneconomical and unwise order rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the committees named and to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and RALPH YARBOROUGH and Congressmen SAM RAYBURN and JOHN YOUNG, and to Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations.

JACK E. BAIR,

Commander, Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248,
the American Legion.

Attest:

MAX D. PALMER,

Adjutant, Gragg-Sherrill Post, 248, the
American Legion.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION MASTER

MECHANICS & FOREMEN,

Corpus Christi, Tex., December 20, 1958.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We, the members of the Masters and Foremen's Association, sincerely believe no economies would result, and the security of our Nation would be impaired by the closing of Navy's overhaul and repair facility at Corpus Christi, Tex.

We know that the chief naval operation workload exceeds the combined capabilities of all overhaul and repairs by 20 percent. This work must be done somewhere, and the records will prove that Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, can do it as efficiently and economically as any concern in the country.

It is inevitable that the Navy would be forced into the full-scale aircraft maintenance business in time of war. Therefore, it is both economical and practical to maintain a continuing organization which can be geared to wartime requirements quickly and efficiently, simply by expanding an established force which is trained and experienced. The utilization of already existing facilities affords long-range economies since it avoids the great expense of tooling and outfitting in the event of unforeseen future mobilization needs.

Overhaul and Repair, Corpus Christi, is a specialized plant equipped to process any type of aircraft in operation by the Navy. It is in the utilization of this Overhaul and Repair facility that the Navy achieves the maximum defense effort at the minimum cost possible.

We support and earnestly solicit your efforts in calling for a full reconsideration and justification for this decision.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. JOBE,
Secretary, Masters and Foremen's Association.

Newspaper Advertisement Referring to "Competition for Survival"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Star, one of the best newspapers in the United States, there appears a most interesting full-page advertisement with the heading, "Competition for Survival." There follow certain characters forming the Russian words which mean "Even America must be surpassed." The advertisement, which contains interesting editorial material relating to the so-called cold war, was inserted by the A. O. Smith Corp., an industrial firm engaged in the research, development, and manufacture of products ranging from residential water heaters to farm feed processing units, from line pipe to guided missile components.

Mr. President, I think that the A. O. Smith Corp. and the Washington Star deserve our gratitude for the publication of this advertisement. As the advertisement states, "A. O. Smith's research and engineering skills are ready today—to help meet the challenge of competition for survival."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the advertisement appearing in the Washington Star of January 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPETITION FOR SURVIVAL

(Russian words. Translation: Even America must be surpassed)

In the face of the challenge expressed by this Soviet slogan, one of our most important weapons is the power of creative production. Are we keeping this weapon sharp?

It was in the late twenties that they first started talking about surpassing America. It seemed fantastic then—fantastic that this vast, impoverished slaveland should aspire to beat us at what we do best.

TARGET FROM THE START

From the time of that first 5-year plan, the Soviets have always regarded surpassing America's productivity as the key to world domination.

They have never lost sight of the fact that our ability to produce is freedom's most potent weapon. And that is why they dream of exceeding our productive pace as a goal for totalitarian victory.

THEIR PROGRESS RAPID

Authoritative sources agree the Soviet economy is expanding at a rate roughly twice that of our own. The consumer receives less than half of total annual output.

By contrast, about two-thirds of U.S. production is in consumer goods.

Roughly, one-quarter of annual Soviet output is plowed back into expansion of heavy industries, electric power, and transportation. This rate of reinvestment is approximately 40 percent higher than the U.S. reinvestment rate.

In their all-out drive for economic mastery, the Communists have racked up notable successes. Observers report there is nothing flimsy about the Soviet industrial product, nothing haphazard about their production techniques.

OUR ANSWER: CREATIVE

Can American industry win out against the massed productivity of Soviet slave labor? Of course it can.

Creative production has always been the strength of America. Born of free competition—nurtured by recognition of the individual rights of man—this creativity thrives on challenge. Its versatile change of pace has been proved in wars, both hot and cold.

THE THREAT OF OBSCOLESCENCE

In this time of competition for survival, America's creative industries are faced by the clear and present danger of obsolescence in plant and equipment.

This threat results from several factors. Increasingly high taxes and operating costs leave less and less to plow back into modernization and expansion. And the current depreciation rate is such that manufacturers often cannot write off equipment investment fast enough to capitalize on new developments. They are virtually forced to make do with outmoded production machinery.

In the face of the Soviet challenge, there's no place for withering obsolescence. Our industry has the creative talents to push far ahead of Soviet progress. It must also get the tools to make the most of these talents.

HERE'S ONE COMPANY'S REACTION TO THE CHALLENGE

Creative production has always been the driving force at A. O. Smith. In all kinds of economic weather, this company's success has stemmed from a skillful, persistent search for a better way, a more efficient way to make products that range from residential water heaters to farm feed-processing units, from line pipe to guided-missile components. A. O. Smith's research and engineering skills are ready today—to help meet the challenge of competition for survival. Shown here are just a few results of A. O. Smith's creative search for a better way.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in addition to this text, the advertisement includes several pictures showing activities of the A. O. Smith Corp., with appropriate captions.

Oil Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article published in the Minot Daily News dealing with oil depletion allowances.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MINOT OILMAN FIGHTS CHAMBER STAND FAVORING OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

Jack Coughlin, of Minot, who is actively engaged in the three major phases of oil production, has taken issue with the Washington report of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which favors continuing of oil depletion allowances.

Coughlin, vice president of the Westland Oil Co., through that company is directly concerned with distribution and retailing of petroleum products and, in the company's operation of a refinery at Williston, in the manufacture of products for market. He also is actively engaged with associates in oil drilling operations in Burke County.

Coughlin takes issue with the Chamber position that depletion allowance for oil drilling is a sacred cow that "can't stand tampering with."

In a letter to the U.S. chamber, he writes: "Times have changed since 1926 when the corporate tax rate was 13 percent instead of the 52 percent we now have. The incentive theory of depletion allowance has jumped 400 percent since that time. The depletion allowance theory was the outgrowth of a fear of oil shortage born in World War I, whereas since the 1930's we have had a period marked by overproduction which brought about proration laws.

"Your comments on the risk of oil production eight times out of nine he misses . . . are the most misleading of arguments for depletion and one that even the oil industry is dropping as being a wild statement. I don't know what rank wildcat area was used to produce those figures, but I do know that World Oil of Tulsa and other oil publications show that of the nearly 50,000 wells drilled each year the ratio is roughly 1½ producers to each dry hole. One has to be in the production business to appreciate that all dry holes are not necessary so since dry hole contributions will often make it wise to abandon a potential producer for fear of bringing in a marginal well and thus lose the dry hole money.

"I fail to see the comparison between depletion and depreciation. First of all, the producer is permitted to charge off the intangible costs of his well, which include drilling costs, geological, and engineering. In fact everything except storage tanks, pipelines, a pump if necessary, tubing, etc., which are all depreciable as a capital asset. How many other businesses can charge off most of their capital investments in 1 year or less? Having now charged off his investment, the producer is still permitted to take 27½ percent on his gross production. Not for a stated period of time, nor for a definite valuation such as depreciation, but for as long a time as the well produces and most likely many times the original cost of the well. You certainly can't say that adjusting depletion rates endangers depreciation; because they are so dissimilar.

"Why am I as an oil man opposed to the present depletion allowance?

"First. Because it is a tax loophole and subsidy and because I favor tax equality; "Second. Because the subsidy is not being retained for production only, but is being used to subsidize marketing losses by major integrated oil companies;

"Third. Because the incentive is not needed. It is a contradiction to encourage production by tax subsidies while controlling price and production through proration laws and import restrictions; and

"Fourth. How are we going to balance our national budget when we close our eyes to a loss of about \$1½ billion in tax money?

"I enjoy the fruits of depletion and drilling chargeoffs and I know whereof I write. I would continue to drill without such a large depletion allowance and I know the oil industry would, too, in spite of their protests that they wouldn't."

Frank P. Samford, Birmingham, Ala.,
Selected as Man of the South for
1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, each year the publication Dixie Business, under the editorship of Hubert F. Lee of Decatur, Ga., selects as a result of balloting throughout the South the Man of the South. For 1958 the one selected was Frank P. Samford, of Birmingham, Ala., president of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Samford's selection was one which met wide approval. Certainly the extensive activities of Mr. Samford for the development of the South and for civic betterment fully justify his being given this outstanding recognition.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article published in the Birmingham News of December 16, 1958, relating to Mr. Samford's selection; also, an excerpt from "Who's Who in America" regarding Mr. Samford; and, also, quotations from different persons relating to the selection of Mr. Samford.

There being no objection, the article and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Birmingham News, Dec. 16, 1958]
INSURANCE EXECUTIVE NAMED MAN OF SOUTH

Frank P. Samford, president of Liberty National Life Insurance Co., has been named Man of the South for 1958.

He is the third Birmingham businessman to receive the honor. Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the board of Alabama Power Co., was Man of the South in 1946 and Donald Comer, of Avondale Mills, in 1947.

The selection is made each year by the editors of Dixie Business at Decatur, Ga., the sponsoring magazine. Hubert F. Lee, editor, said Samford has received votes for the honor from around the world each year since 1949, particularly from fellow members of Rotary International.

He was one of the South's 50 foremost leaders picked by Dixie Business in 1949. This group is now termed the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living" honor group, and is limited to 200 living southerners.

Samford was born in Troy, Ala., in 1893, and graduated from Auburn in 1914. He has been president of Liberty National since 1934.

He was first nominated in 1948 for Man of the South by Gen. John C. Persons of Birmingham. Harry Ayers, publisher of the Anniston Star, has voted for Samford nearly every year since 1949.

At one time or another, many of the Nation's leading insurance company presidents have voted for Samford in the annual poll conducted by Editor Lee.

Earlier this year, Dixie Business selected Dr. Tom D. Spies, director of the Spies Nutrition Clinic here, for the A Great American distinguished service award.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA SKETCHES: FRANK P. SAMFORD

Samford, Frank Park, president, Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; born Troy, Ala.,

November 1, 1893; son of William Hodges and Kate (Park) S.; student State Normal College, Troy, B.S., Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, 1914; LL.D. (honorary), Howard College; married Hattie Mae Noland, December 23, 1919; children—Lieut. Frank P. Jr. (U.S.N.R.), Ann (Mrs. Sam E. Upchurch). Deputy insurance commissioner of Alabama, 1915-19; Alabama manager, Lumbermans Mutual Casualty Co., 1919-21; secretary Liberty National Life Insurance Co., 1921-32; vice president, 1932-34; president since 1934; director, Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co.; West Point Manufacturing Co.; Malone Freight Line; Birmingham Trust National Bank; Continental Gin Co.; Dixie Mills, Inc.; Columbus Manufacturing Co.; Equinox Mill; Lanett Bleachery & Dye Works, Wellington Sears Co.; Cabin Crafts, Inc. Member board, Life Insurance Sales Research Bureau, 1931-34. Member, board of directors and executive committee, Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, 1937; president, Industrial Insurer's Conference, 1938-40; president, Birmingham Community Chest, 1940-42; president, Jefferson Tuberculosis Sanatorium Society, 1942-44; president, Associated Industries of Alabama, 1941-42; member, board of directors, Institute of Life Insurance, 1944; member, executive committee, American Life Convention since 1948; president, Alabama State Chamber of Commerce 1946-49; U.S. Chamber of Commerce. President, board of trustees, Howard College; member, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Southern Research Institute; Alumni Association, Alabama Polytechnic Institute (president 1943-44); Alpha Tau Omega; Omicron Delta Kappa. Democrat. Baptist. Mason (Shriner). Clubs: Rotary (president 1936-37; district governor 1940-41), Birmingham (Birmingham); Birmingham Country; Mountain Brook Country. Home: 2700 Mountain Brook Parkway. Office: Liberty National Life Building, Birmingham, Ala.

QUOTES FROM LETTERS RELATING TO THE SELECTION OF MR. SAMFORD

Robert T. "Bobby" Jones, Jr., Man of the South for 1953: "I am delighted to have you record my vote for Mr. Samford."

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Man of the South for 1954: "I am happy to cast my vote for Mr. Frank P. Samford as the 1958 Man of the South."

Donald Comer, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Man of the South for 1947: "I certainly approve heartily of the selection of Frank Samford for the Man of the South. Not only for himself but also for his family."

C. Hamilton Moses, Little Rock, Man of the South for 1948: "I would be greatly pleased to see Frank Samford of Birmingham named as 1958 Man of the South. I don't see how a better selection could be made. As you know, I retired from the Arkansas Power and Light Co. 2 years ago and set up a law firm here in Little Rock with the son and son-in-law of Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN. It is a new experience starting over practicing law at the age of 70. Anyway, we are having a big time."

Ernest L. Kurth, Southland Paper Mills, Lufkin, Tex., Man of the South for 1949: "I am most happy to cast my vote for Mr. Frank P. Samford as Man of the South for 1958."

Thomas W. Martin, Alabama Power Co., Birmingham, the first Man of the South for 1946, in telephone conversation: "I nominated Frank Samford for Man of the South for 1958. He is one of the fine leaders on your list who deserves the honor."

Reuben B. Robertson, Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C., Man of the South for 1950: "I am not personally acquainted with Frank P. Samford, of Alabama, but I am sure that if you and Donald Comer recommend him he is certainly worthy of recognition."

Hugh Comer, Alabama Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.: "I am mighty happy that Frank Samford has been so overwhelmingly chosen as the Man of the South for 1958. He has made tremendous contributions to our well-being."

Louis Pizitz, Birmingham: "In my opinion you have chosen very wisely in selecting Mr. Frank P. Samford as Man of the South for 1958. He has helped in every way to build a better community."

Robert Jemison, Jr., Birmingham, the world's finest example of a good realtor: "I certainly hope Frank Samford will be voted the Man of the South, as I think he is outstanding, and a very fine choice. You may use my former letter."

Federal-State Relations as Affected by Judicial Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the resolution on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions approved by the Conference of Chief Justices held in Pasadena, Calif., on August 23, 1958, by a vote of 36 to 8, with 2 abstaining and 4 not present.

Immediately following the resolution, I include the final and full text of the report of the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS

Resolved—

1. That this conference approves the report of the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions submitted at this meeting.

2. That in the field of Federal-State relationships the division of powers between those granted to the National Government and those reserved to the State governments should be tested solely by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

3. That this conference believes that our system of federalism, under which control of matters primarily of national concern is committed to our national government and control of matters primarily of local concern is reserved to the several States, is sound and should be more diligently preserved.

4. That this conference, while recognizing that the application of constitutional rules to changed conditions must be sufficiently flexible as to make such rules adaptable to altered conditions, believes that a fundamental purpose of having a written constitution is to promote the certainty and stability of the provisions of law set forth in such a constitution.

5. That this Conference hereby respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States, in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of national and state powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or

permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government.

6. That this conference firmly believes that the subject with which the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions has been concerned is one of continuing importance, and that there should be a committee appointed to deal with the subject in the ensuing year.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS

FOREWORD

Your committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions was appointed pursuant to action taken at the 1957 meeting of the conference, at which, you will recall, there was some discussion of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and a resolution expressing concern with regard thereto was adopted by the conference. This committee held a meeting in Washington in December 1957, at which plans for conducting our work were developed. This meeting was attended by Sidney Spector of the Council of State Governments and by Prof. Philip B. Kurland, of the University of Chicago Law School.

The committee believed that it would be desirable to survey this field from the point of view of general trends rather than by attempting to submit detailed analyses of many cases. It was realized, however, that an expert survey of recent Supreme Court decisions within the area under consideration would be highly desirable in order that we might have the benefit in drafting this report of scholarly research and of competent analysis and appraisal, as well as of objectivity of approach.

Thanks to Professor Kurland and to four of his colleagues of the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School several monographs dealing with subjects within the committee's field of action have been prepared and have been furnished to all members of the committee and of the conference. These monographs and their authors are as follows:

1. "The Supreme Court, The Due Process Clause, and the In Personam Jurisdiction of State Courts," by Professor Kurland;

2. "Limitations on State Power To Deal With Issues of Subversion and Loyalty," by Assistant Professor Cramton;

3. "Congress, the States and Commerce," by Prof. Allison Dunham;

4. "The Supreme Court, Federalism, and State Systems of Criminal Justice," by Prof. Francis A. Allen; and

5. "The Supreme Court, the Congress and State Jurisdiction Over Labor Relations," by Prof. Bernard D. Meltzer.

These gentlemen have devoted much time, study, and thought to the preparation of very scholarly, interesting, and instructive monographs on the above subjects. We wish to express our deep appreciation to each of them for his very thorough research and analysis of these problems. With the pressure of the work of our respective courts, the members of this committee could not have undertaken this research work and we could scarcely have hoped, even with ample time, to equal the thorough and excellent reports which they have written on their respective subjects.

It had originally been hoped that all necessary research material would be available to your committee by the end of April and that the committee could study it and then meet for discussion, possibly late in May, and thereafter send at least a draft of the committee's report to the members of the con-

ference well in advance of the 1958 meeting; but these hopes have not been realized. The magnitude of the studies and the thoroughness with which they have been made rendered it impossible to complete them until about 2 months after the original target date, and it has been impracticable to hold another meeting of this committee until the time of the conference.

Even after this unavoidable delay had developed, there was a plan to have these papers presented at a seminar to be held at the University of Chicago late in June. Unfortunately, this plan could not be carried through, either. We hope, however, that these papers may be published in the near future with such changes and additions as the several authors may wish to make in them. Some will undoubtedly be desired in order to include decisions of the Supreme Court in some cases which are referred to in these monographs, but in which decisions were rendered after the monographs had been prepared. Each of the monographs as transmitted to us is stated to be in preliminary form and subject to change and as not being for publication. Much as we are indebted to Professor Kurland and his colleagues for their invaluable research aid, your committee must accept sole responsibility for the views herein stated. Unfortunately, it is impracticable to include all or even a substantial part of their analyses in this report.

BACKGROUND AND PERSPECTIVE

We think it desirable at the outset of this report to set out some points which may help to put the report in proper perspective, familiar or self-evident as these points may be:

First. Though decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have a major impact upon Federal-State relationships and have had such an impact since the days of Chief Justice Marshall, they are only a part of the whole structure of these relationships. These relations are, of course, founded upon the Constitution of the United States itself. They are materially affected not only by judicial decisions but in very large measure by acts of Congress adopted under the powers conferred by the Constitution. They are also affected, or may be affected, by the exercise of the treaty power.

Of great practical importance as affecting Federal-State relationships are the rulings and actions of Federal administrative bodies. These include the independent agency regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board. Many important administrative powers are exercised by the several departments of the executive branch, notably the Treasury Department and the Department of the Interior. The scope and importance of the administration of the Federal tax laws are, of course, familiar to many individuals and businesses because of their direct impact, and require no elaboration.

Second. When we turn to the specific field of the effect of judicial decisions on Federal-State relationships we come at once to the question as to where power should lie to give the ultimate interpretation to the Constitution and to the laws made in pursuance thereof under the authority of the United States. By necessity and by almost universal common consent, these ultimate powers are regarded as being vested in the Supreme Court of the United States. Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to chaos. (See Judge Learned Hand's most interesting Holmes Lectures on "The Bill of Rights" delivered at the Harvard Law School this year and published by the Harvard University Press.)

Third. There is obviously great interaction between Federal legislation and admin-

istrative action on the one hand, and decisions of the Supreme Court on the other, because of the power of the Court to interpret and apply acts of Congress and to determine the validity of administrative action and the permissible scope thereof.

Fourth. Whether federalism shall continue to exist, and if so in what form, is primarily a political question rather than a judicial question. On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that judicial decisions, specifically decisions of the Supreme Court, can give tremendous impetus to changes in the allocation of powers and responsibilities as between the Federal and the State Governments. Likewise, it can hardly be seriously disputed that on many occasions the decisions of the Supreme Court have produced exactly that effect.

Fifth. This conference has no legal powers whatsoever. If any conclusions or recommendations at which we may arrive are to have any effect, this can only be through the power of persuasion.

Sixth. It is a part of our obligation to seek to uphold respect for law. We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results. We hope that the expression of our views may have some value. They pertain to matters which directly affect the work of our State courts. In this report we urge the desirability of self-restraint on the part of the Supreme Court in the exercise of the vast powers committed to it. We endeavor not to be guilty ourselves of a lack of due restraint in expressing our concern and, at times, our criticisms in making the comments and observations which follow.

PROBLEMS OF FEDERALISM

The difference between matters primarily local and matters primarily national was the guiding principle upon which the framers of our National Constitution acted in outlining the division of powers between the National and State Governments.

This guiding principle, central to the American Federal system, was recognized when the original Constitution was being drawn and was emphasized by De Tocqueville. Under his summary of the Federal Constitution he says:

"The first question which awaited the Americans was so to divide the sovereignty that each of the different States which composed the Union should continue to govern itself in all that concerned its internal prosperity, while the entire Nation, represented by the Union, should continue to form a compact body and to provide for all general exigencies. The problem was a complex and difficult one. It was as impossible to determine beforehand, with any degree of accuracy, the share of authority that each of the two governments was to enjoy as to foresee all the incidents in the life of a nation."

In the period when the Constitution was in the course of adoption "The Federalist" (No. 45) discussed the division of sovereignty between the Union and the States and said: "The powers delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the internal order and prosperity of the State."

Those thoughts expressed in "The Federalist" of course are those of the general period when both the original Constitution and the 10th amendment were proposed and

adopted. They long antedated the proposal of the 14th amendment.

The fundamental need for a system of distribution of powers between national and State governments was impressed sharply upon the framers of our Constitution not only because of their knowledge of the governmental systems of ancient Greece and Rome. They also were familiar with the Government of England; they were even more aware of the colonial governments in the Original States and the governments of those States after the Revolution. Included in government on this side of the Atlantic was the institution known as the New England town meeting, though it was not in use in all of the States. A town meeting could not be extended successfully to any large unit of population, which, for legislative action, must rely upon representative government.

But it is this spirit of self-government, of local self-government, which has been a vital force in shaping our democracy from its very inception.

The views expressed by our late brother, Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, on the division of powers between the National and State governments—delivered in his addresses at the University of Nebraska and published under the title "The Doctrine of the Separation of Powers and Its Present Day Significance"—are persuasive. He traced the origins of the doctrine of the separation of powers to four sources: Montesquieu and other political philosophers who preceded him; English constitutional experience; American colonial experience; and the common sense and political wisdom of the Founding Fathers. He concluded his comments on the experiences of the American colonists with the British Government with this sentence: "As colonists they had enough of a completely centralized government with no distribution of powers and they were intent on seeing to it that they should never suffer such grievances from a government of their own construction."

His comments on the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances and on the concern of the Founding Fathers with the proper distribution of governmental power between the Nation and the several States indicates that he treated them as parts of the plan for preserving the Nation on the one side and individual freedom on the other—in other words, that the traditional tripartite vertical division of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of Government was not an end in itself, but was a means toward an end; and that the horizontal distribution or allocation of powers between National and State governments was also a means toward the same end and was a part of the separation of powers which was accomplished by the Federal Constitution. It is a form of the separation of powers with which Montesquieu was not concerned; but the horizontal division of powers, whether thought of as a form of separation of powers or not, was very much in the minds of the framers of the Constitution.

TWO MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

The outstanding development in Federal-State relations since the adoption of the National Constitution has been the expansion of the power of the National Government and the relative contraction of the powers of the State governments. To a large extent this is wholly unavoidable and indeed is a necessity, primarily because of improved transportation and communication of all kinds and because of mass production. On the other hand, our Constitution does envision federalism. The very name of our Nation indicates that it is to be composed of States. The Supreme Court of a bygone day said in *Texas v. White* (7 Wall. 700, 721 (1868)): "The Constitution, in all its pro-

visions, looks to an indestructible Union of indestructible States."

Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and National affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the major of policy in many major social and economic fields. It is not subject to the restraints to which a legislative body is subject. There are points at which it is difficult to delineate precisely the line which should circumscribe the judicial function and separate it from that of policymaking. Thus, usually within narrow limits, a court may be called upon in the ordinary course of its duties to make what is actually a policy decision by choosing between two rules, either of which might be deemed applicable to the situation presented in a pending case.

But if and when a court in construing and applying a constitutional provision or a statute becomes a policymaker, it may leave construction behind and exercise functions which are essentially legislative in character, whether they serve in practical effect as a constitutional amendment or as an amendment of a statute. It is here that we feel the greatest concern, and it is here that we think the greatest restraint is called for. There is nothing new in urging judicial self-restraint, though there may be, and we think there is, new need to urge it.

It would be useless to attempt to review all of the decisions of the Supreme Court which have had a profound effect upon the course of our history. It has been said that the Dred Scott decision made the Civil War inevitable. Whether this is really true or not, we need not attempt to determine. Even if it is discounted as a serious overstatement, it remains a dramatic reminder of the great influence which Supreme Court decisions have had and can have. As to the great effects of decisions of that Court on the economic development of the country, see Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis" (49 Columbia Law Review 735).

SOURCES OF NATIONAL POWER

Most of the powers of the National Government were set forth in the original Constitution; some have been added since. In the days of Chief Justice Marshall the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution and a broad construction of the powers granted to the National Government were fully developed, and as a part of this development the extent of national control over interstate commerce became very firmly established. The trends established in those days have never ceased to operate and in comparatively recent years have operated at times in a startling manner in the extent to which interstate commerce has been held to be involved, as for example in the familiar case involving an elevator operator in a loft building.

From a practical standpoint the increase in Federal revenues resulting from the 16th amendment (the income tax amendment) has been of great importance. National control over State action in many fields has been vastly expanded by the 14th amendment.

We shall refer to some subjects and types of cases which bear upon Federal-State relationships.

THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE

One provision of the Federal Constitution which was included in it from the beginning but which, in practical effect, lay dormant for more than a century, is the general welfare clause. In *United States v. Butler* (297 U.S. 1), the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was held invalid. An argument was advanced in that case that the general welfare clause would sustain the imposition of the tax and that money derived from the tax could be expended for any purposes which would promote the general welfare. The

Court viewed this argument with favor as a general proposition, but found it not supportable on the facts of that case. However, it was not long before that clause was relied upon and applied. See *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis* (301 U.S. 548) and *Helvering v. Davis* (301 U.S. 690). In those cases the Social Security Act was upheld and the general welfare clause was relied upon both to support the tax and to support the expenditures of the money raised by the social-security taxes.

GRANTS-IN-AID

Closely related to this subject are the so-called grants-in-aid which go back to the Morrill Act of 1862 and the grants thereunder to the so-called land-grant colleges. The extent of grants-in-aid today is very great, but questions relating to the wisdom as distinguished from the legal basis for such grants seem to lie wholly in the political field and are hardly appropriate for discussion in this report. Perhaps we should also observe that since the decision of *Massachusetts v. Mellon* (262 U.S. 447), there seems to be no effective way in which either a State or an individual can challenge the validity of a Federal grant-in-aid.

DOCTRINE OF PREEMPTION

Many, if not most, of the problems of federalism today arise either in connection with the commerce clause and the vast extent to which its sweep has been carried by the Supreme Court, or they arise under the 14th amendment. Historically, cases involving the doctrine of preemption pertain mostly to the commerce clause. More recently the doctrine has been applied in other fields, notably in the case of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, in which the Smith Act and other Federal statutes dealing with communism and loyalty problems were held to have preempted the field and to invalidate or suspend the Pennsylvania antisubversive statute which sought to impose a penalty for conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence. In that particular case it happens that the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania was affirmed. That fact, however, emphasizes rather than detracts from the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption.

LABOR RELATIONS CASES

In connection with commerce clause cases, the doctrine of preemption, coupled with only partial express regulation by Congress, has produced a state of considerable confusion in the field of labor relations.

One of the most serious problems in this field was pointed up or created (depending upon how one looks at the matter) by the Supreme Court's decision in *Amalgamated Association v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (340 U.S. 383), which overturned a State statute aimed at preventing strikes and lockouts in public utilities. This decision left the States powerless to protect their own citizens against emergencies created by the suspension of essential services, even though, as the dissent pointed out, such emergencies were economically and practically confined to a single State.

In two cases decided on May 28, 1958, in which the majority opinions were written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Burton, respectively, the right of an employee to sue a union in a State court was upheld. In *International Association of Machinists v. Gonzales*, a union member was held entitled to maintain a suit against his union for damages for wrongful expulsion. In *International Union, United Auto, etc. Workers v. Russell*, an employee, who was not a union member, was held entitled to maintain a suit for malicious interference with his employment through picketing during a strike against his employer. Pickets prevented Russell from entering the plant.

Regardless of what may be the ultimate solution of jurisdictional problems in this

field, it appears that at the present time there is unfortunately a kind of no-man's land in which serious uncertainty exists. This uncertainty is in part undoubtedly due to the failure of Congress to make its wishes entirely clear. Also, somewhat varying views appear to have been adopted by the Supreme Court from time to time.

In connection with this matter, in the case of *Textile Union v. Lincoln Mills* (353 U.S. 448), the majority opinion contains language which we find somewhat disturbing. That case concerns the interpretation of section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. Paragraph (a) of that section provides: "Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this Chapter, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties." Paragraph (b) of the same section provides in substance that a labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity without the procedural difficulties which formerly attended suits by or against unincorporated associations consisting of large numbers of persons. Section 301(a) was held to be more than jurisdictional and was held to authorize Federal courts to fashion a body of Federal law for the enforcement of these collective bargaining agreements and to include within that body of Federal law specific performance of promises to arbitrate grievances under collective bargaining agreements.

What a state court is to do if confronted with a case similar to the *Lincoln Mills* case is by no means clear. It is evident that the substantive law to be applied must be Federal law, but the question remains, where is that Federal law to be found? It will probably take years for the development or the "fashioning" of the body of Federal law which the Supreme Court says the Federal courts are authorized to make. Can a state court act at all? If it can act and does act, what remedies should it apply? Should it use those afforded by state law, or is it limited to those which would be available under Federal law if the suit were in a Federal court? It is perfectly possible that these questions will not have to be answered, since the Supreme Court may adopt the view that the field has been completely preempted by the Federal law and committed solely to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, so that the state courts can have no part whatsoever in enforcing rights recognized by section 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act. Such a result does not seem to be required by the language of section 301 nor yet does the legislative history of that section appear to warrant such a construction.

Professor Meltzer's monograph has brought out many of the difficulties in this whole field of substantive labor law with regard to the division of power between State and Federal Governments. As he points out much of this confusion is due to the fact that Congress has not made clear what functions the States may perform and what they may not perform. There are situations in which the particular activity involved is prohibited by Federal law, others in which it is protected by Federal law, and others in which the Federal law is silent. At the present time there seems to be one field in which State action is clearly permissible. That is where actual violence is involved in a labor dispute.

STATE LAW IN DIVERSITY CASES

Not all of the decisions of the Supreme Court in comparatively recent years have limited or tended to limit the power of the States or the effect of State laws. The celebrated case of *Erie R. R. v. Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64) overruled *Swift v. Tyson* and estab-

lished substantive State law, decisional as well as statutory, as controlling in diversity cases in the Federal courts. This marked the end of the doctrine of a Federal common law in such cases.

IN PERSONAM JURISDICTION OVER NONRESIDENTS

Also, in cases involving the in personam jurisdiction of State courts over nonresidents, the Supreme Court has tended to relax rather than tighten restrictions under the due process clause upon State action in this field. *International Shoe Co. v. Washington* (326 U.S. 310) is probably the most significant case in this development. In sustaining the jurisdiction of a Washington court to render a judgment in personam against a foreign corporation which carries on some activities within the State of Washington, Chief Justice Stone used the now familiar phrase that there "were sufficient contacts or ties with the State of the forum to make it reasonable and just, according to our traditional conception of fair play and substantial justice, to enforce the obligation which appellant has incurred there." Formalistic doctrines or dogmas have been replaced by a more flexible and realistic approach, and this trend has been carried forward in subsequent cases leading up to and including *McGee v. International Life Insurance Co.* (355 U.S. 220), until halted by *Hanson v. Denckla* (357 U.S. decided June 23, 1958).

TAXATION

In the field of taxation the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity has been seriously curtailed partly by judicial decisions and partly by statute. This has not been entirely a one-way street.

In recent years cases involving state taxation have arisen in many fields. Sometimes they have involved questions of burdens upon interstate commerce or the export-import clause, sometimes of jurisdiction to tax as a matter of due process, and sometimes they have arisen on the fringes of governmental immunity, as where a State has sought to tax a contractor doing business with the National Government. There have been some shifts in holdings. On the whole, the Supreme Court seems perhaps to have taken a more liberal view in recent years toward the validity of State taxation than it formerly took.

OTHER 14TH AMENDMENT CASES

In other fields, however, the 14th amendment has been invoked to cut down State action in many fields. This has been noticeably true in cases involving not only the 14th amendment but also the 1st amendment guarantee of freedom of speech or the 5th amendment protection against self-incrimination. State-antisubversive acts have been practically eliminated by *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* in which the decision was rested on the group of preemption of the field by the Federal statutes.

THE SWEET CASE—STATE LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

One manifestation of this restrictive action under 14th amendment is to be found in *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234). In that case, the State of New Hampshire had enacted a subversive activity statute which imposed various disabilities on subversive persons and subversive organizations. In 1953 the legislature adopted a resolution under which it constituted the attorney general a one-man legislative committee to investigate violations of that act and to recommend additional legislation. *Sweezy*, described as a non-Communist Marxist, was summoned to testify at the investigation conducted by the attorney general, pursuant to this authorization. He testified freely about many matters but refused to answer two types of questions: (1) inquiries concerning the activities of the Progressive Party in the State during the 1948 campaign; and (2) inquiries concern-

ing a lecture *Sweezy* had delivered in 1954 to a class at the University of New Hampshire. He was adjudged in contempt by a state court for failure to answer these questions. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction, but there is no majority opinion. The opinion of the Chief Justice, in which he was joined by Justices Black, Douglas and Brennan, started out by reaffirming the position taken in *Watkins v. United States* (354 U.S. 178) that legislative investigations can encroach on first amendment rights. It then attacked the New Hampshire Subversive Activities Act and stated that the definition of subversive persons and subversive organizations was so vague and limitless that they extended to conduct which is only remotely related to actual subversion and which is done free of any conscious intent to be a part of such activity. Then followed a lengthy discourse on the importance of academic freedom and political expression. This was not, however, the ground upon which these four Justices ultimately relied for their conclusion that the conviction should be reversed. The Chief Justice said in part:

"The respective roles of the legislature and the investigator thus revealed are of considerable significance to the issue before us. It is eminently clear that the basic discretion of determining the direction of the legislative inquiry has been turned over to the investigative agency. The attorney general has been given such a sweeping and uncertain mandate that it is his discretion which picks out the subjects that will be pursued, what witnesses will be summoned and what questions will be asked. In this circumstance, it cannot be stated authoritatively that the legislature asked the attorney general to gather the kind of facts comprised in the subjects upon which petitioner was interrogated."

Four members of the Court, two in a concurring opinion and two in a dissenting opinion, took vigorous issue with the view that the conviction was invalid because of the legislature's failure to provide adequate standards to guide the attorney general's investigation. Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Harlan concurred in the reversal of the conviction on the ground that there was no basis for a belief that *Sweezy* or the Progressive Party threatened the safety of the State and hence that the liberties of the individual should prevail. Mr. Justice Clark, with whom Mr. Justice Burton joined, arrived at the opposite conclusion and took the view that the State's interest in self-preservation justified the intrusion into *Sweezy's* personal affairs.

In commenting on this case Professor Cramton says: "The most puzzling aspect of the *Sweezy* case is the reliance by the Chief Justice on delegation of power conceptions. New Hampshire had determined that it wanted the information which *Sweezy* refused to give; to say that the State has not demonstrated that it wants the information seems so unreal as to be incredible. The State had delegated power to the attorney general to determine the scope of inquiry within the general subject of subversive activities. Under these circumstances the conclusion of the Chief Justice that the vagueness of the resolution violates the due process clause must be, despite his protestations, a holding that a State legislature cannot delegate such a power."

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT CASES

There are many cases involving public employment and the question of disqualification therefor by reason of Communist Party membership or other questions of loyalty. *Slochower v. Board of Higher Education* (350 U.S. 551) is a well known example of cases of this type. Two more recent cases, *Lerner v. Casey*, and *Beilan v. Board of Public Education* (both in 357 U.S. and decided on June 30, 1958), have upheld disqualifica-

tions for employment where such issues were involved, but they did so on the basis of lack of competence or fitness. *Lerner* was a subway conductor in New York and *Beilan* was a public school instructor. In each case the decision was by a five-to-four majority.

ADMISSION TO THE BAR

When we come to the recent cases on admission to the bar, we are in a field of unusual sensitivity. We are well aware that any adverse comment which we may make on those decisions lays us open to attack on the grounds that we are complaining of the curtailment of our own powers and that we are merely voicing the equivalent of the ancient protest of the defeated litigant—in this instance the wall of a judge who has been reversed. That is a prospect which we accept in preference to maintaining silence on a matter which we think cannot be ignored without omitting an important element of the subject with which this report is concerned.

Konigsberg v. State Bar of California (353 U.S. 252), seems to us to reach the high water mark so far established by the Supreme Court in overthrowing the action of a State and in denying to a State the power to keep order in its own house.

The majority opinion first hurdled the problem as to whether or not the Federal question sought to be raised was properly presented to the State's highest court for decision and was decided by that court. Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissented on the ground that the record left it doubtful whether this jurisdictional requirement for review by the Supreme Court had been met and favored a remand of the case for certification by the State's highest court of "whether or not it did in fact pass on a claim properly before it under the due process clause of the 14th amendment." Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Clark shared Mr. Justice Frankfurter's jurisdictional views. They also dissented on the merits in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Harlan, of which more later.

The majority opinion next turned to the merits of *Konigsberg's* application for admission to the bar. Applicable State statutes required one seeking admission to show that he was a person of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the National or State government by force or violence. The committee of bar examiners, after holding several hearings on *Konigsberg's* application, notified him that his application was denied because he did not show that he met the above qualifications.

The Supreme Court made its own review of the facts.

On the score of good moral character, the majority found that *Konigsberg* had sufficiently established it, that certain editorials written by him attacking this country's participation in the Korean war, the actions of political leaders, the influence of "big business" on American life, racial discrimination and the Supreme Court's decision in *Dennis v. United States* (341 U.S. 494), would not support any rational inference of bad moral character, and that his refusal to answer questions "almost all" of which were described by the Court as having "concerned his political affiliations, editorials and beliefs" (353 U.S. 269) would not support such an inference either. On the matter of advocating the overthrow of the National or State government by force or violence, the Court held (as it had in the companion case of *Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico* (353 U.S. 232), decided contemporaneously) that past membership in the Communist Party was not enough to show bad moral character. The majority apparently accepted as sufficient *Konigsberg's* denial of any present advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of California, which was uncontradicted on the record. He had re-

fused to answer questions relating to his past political affiliations and beliefs, which the bar committee might have used to test the truthfulness of his present claims. His refusal to answer was based upon his views as to the effect of the 1st and 14th amendments. The Court did not make any ultimate determination of their correctness, but (at 353 U.S. 270) said that prior decisions by this Court indicated that his objections to answering the questions [which we shall refer to below] were not frivolous.

The majority asserted that *Konigsberg* "was not denied admission to the California bar simply because he refused to answer questions." In a footnote appended to this statement it is said (353 U.S. 259): "Neither the committee as a whole nor any of its members ever intimated that *Konigsberg* would be barred just because he refused to answer relevant inquiries or because he was obstructing the committee. Some members informed him that they did not necessarily accept his position that they were not entitled to inquire into his political associations and opinions and said that his failure to answer would have some bearing on their determination whether he was qualified. But they never suggested that his failure to answer their questions was, by itself, a sufficient independent ground for denial of his application."

Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent took issue with these views—convincingly, we think. He quoted lengthy extracts from the record of *Konigsberg's* hearings before the subcommittee and the committee of the State bar investigating his application. (353 U.S. 284-309.) *Konigsberg* flatly refused to state whether or not at the time of the hearing he was a member of the Communist Party and refused to answer questions on whether he had ever been a Communist or belonged to various organizations, including the Communist Party. The bar committee conceded that he could not be required to answer a question if the answer might tend to incriminate him; but *Konigsberg* did not stand on the fifth amendment and his answer which came nearest to raising that question, as far as we can see, seems to have been based upon a fear of prosecution for perjury for whatever answer he might then give as to membership in the Communist Party. We think, on the basis of the extracts from the record contained in Mr. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion that the committee was concerned with its duty under the statute to certify as to this applicant's good moral character (p. 295), and that the committee was concerned with the applicant's disinclination to respond to questions proposed by the committee (p. 301), and that the committee, in passing on his good moral character, sought to test his veracity (p. 303).

The majority, however, having reached the conclusion above stated, that *Konigsberg* had not been denied admission to the bar simply because he refused to answer questions, then proceeded to demolish a strawman by saying that there was nothing in the California statutes or decisions, or in the rules of the bar committee which had been called to the Court's attention, suggesting that a failure to answer questions "is ipso facto, a basis for excluding an applicant from the bar, irrespective of how overwhelming is his showing of good character or loyalty or how flimsy are the suspicions of the bar examiners." Whether *Konigsberg's* overwhelming showing of his own good character would have been shaken if he had answered the relevant questions which he refused to answer, we cannot say. We have long been under the impression that candor is required of members of the bar and, prior to *Konigsberg* we should not have thought that there was any doubt that a candidate for admission to the bar should answer questions, as to matters relating to his fitness for admission, and that failure or

refusal to answer such questions would warrant an inference unfavorable to the applicant or a finding that he had failed to meet the burden of proof of his moral fitness.

Let us repeat that *Konigsberg* did not invoke protection against self-incrimination. He invoked a privilege which he claimed to exist against answering certain questions. These might have served to test his veracity at the committee hearings held to determine whether or not he was possessed of the good moral character required for admission to the bar.

The majority opinion seems to ignore the issue of veracity sought to be raised by the questions which *Konigsberg* refused to answer. It is also somewhat confusing with regard to the burden of proof. At one point (pp. 270-271) it says that the committee was not warranted in drawing from *Konigsberg's* refusal to answer questions any inference that he was of bad moral character; at another (p. 273) it says that there was no evidence in the record to justify a finding that he had failed to establish his good moral character.

Also at page 273 of 353d United States Reports, the majority said: "We recognize the importance of leaving States free to select their own bars, but it is equally important that the State not exercise this power in an arbitrary or discriminatory manner nor in such way as to impinge on the freedom of political expression or association. A bar composed of lawyers of good character is a worthy objective but it is unnecessary to sacrifice vital freedoms in order to obtain that goal. It is also important to society and the bar itself that lawyers be unintimidated—free to think, speak and act as members of an independent bar." The majority thus makes two stated concessions—each, of course, subject to limitations—one, that it is important to leave the States free to select their own bars and, the other, that a bar composed of lawyers of good character is a worthy objective.

We think that Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent on the merits, in which Mr. Justice Clark joined, shows the fallacies of the majority position. On the facts which we think were demonstrated by the excerpts from the record included in that dissent, it seems to us that the net result of the case is that a State is unable to protect itself against admitting to its bar an applicant who, by his own refusal to answer certain questions as to what the majority regarded as political associations and activities, avoids a test of his veracity through cross examination on a matter which he has the burden of proving in order to establish his right to admission to the bar. The power left to the States to regulate admission to their bars under *Konigsberg* hardly seems adequate to achieve what the majority chose to describe as a worthy objective—a bar composed of lawyers of good character.

We shall close our discussion of *Konigsberg* by quoting two passages from Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent, in which Mr. Justice Clark joined. In one, he states that "this case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the right of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this Court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter." In the other, his concluding comment (p. 312), he says: "[W]hat the Court has really done, I think, is simply to impose on California its own notions of public policy and judgment. For me, today's decision represents an unacceptable intrusion into a matter of State concern."

The *Lerner* and *Bellan* cases above referred to seem to indicate some recession from the intimations, though not from the decisions, in the *Konigsberg* and *Slochow* cases. In *Bellan* the schoolteacher was told that his refusal to answer questions might result in his dismissal, and his refusal to answer ques-

tions pertaining to loyalty matters was held relevant to support a finding that he was incompetent. "Incompetent" seems to have been taken in the sense of unfit.

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW

When we turn to the impact of decisions of the Supreme Court upon the State administration of criminal justice, we find that we have entered a very broad field. In many matters, such as the fair drawing of juries, the exclusion of forced confessions as evidence, and the right to counsel at least in all serious cases, we do not believe that there is any real difference in doctrine between the views held by the Supreme Court of the United States and the views held by the highest courts of the several States.

There is, however, a rather considerable difference at times as to how these general principles should be applied and as to whether they have been duly regarded or not. In such matters the Supreme Court not only feels free to review the facts, but considers it to be its duty to make an independent review of the facts. It sometimes seems that the rule which governs most appellate courts in the view of findings of fact by trial courts is given lip service, but is actually given the least possible practical effect. Appellate courts generally will give great weight to the findings of fact by trial courts which had the opportunity to see and hear the witnesses, and they are reluctant to disturb such findings. The Supreme Court at times seems to read the records in criminal cases with a somewhat different point of view. Perhaps no more striking example of this can readily be found than in *Moore v. Michigan* (355 U.S. 155).

In the *Moore* case the defendant had been charged in 1937 with the crime of first degree murder, to which he pleaded guilty. The murder followed a rape and was marked by extreme brutality. The defendant was a Negro youth, 17 years of age at the time of the offense, and is described as being of limited education (only the seventh grade) and as being of rather low mentality. He confessed the crime to law enforcement officers and he expressed a desire to plead guilty and "get it over with". Before such a plea was permitted to be entered he was interviewed by the trial judge in the privacy of the judge's chambers and he again admitted his guilt, said he did not want counsel and expressed the desire to "get it over with", to be sent to whatever institution he was to be confined in, and to be placed under observation. Following this, the plea of guilty was accepted and there was a hearing to determine the punishment which should be imposed. About 12 years later the defendant sought a new trial principally on the ground that he had been unfairly dealt with because he was not represented by counsel. He had expressly disclaimed any desire for counsel at the time of his trial. Pursuant to the law of Michigan, he had a hearing on this application for a new trial. In most respects his testimony was seriously at variance with the testimony of other witnesses. He was corroborated in one matter by a man who had been a deputy sheriff at the time when the prisoner was arrested and was being questioned. The trial court, however, found in substance that the defendant knew what he was doing when he rejected the appointment of counsel and pleaded guilty, that he was then calm and not intimidated, and, after hearing him testify, that he was completely unworthy of belief. It accordingly denied the application for a new trial. This denial was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Michigan, largely upon the basis of the findings of fact by the trial court. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed. The latter Court felt that counsel might have been of assistance to the prisoner, in view of his youth, lack of education and low mentality, by requiring the

State to prove its case against him (saying the evidence was largely circumstantial), by raising a question as to his sanity, and by presenting factors which might have lessened the severity of the penalty imposed. It was the maximum permitted under the Michigan law—solitary confinement for life at hard labor. The case was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1957. The majority opinion does not seem to have given any consideration whatsoever to the difficulties of proof which the State might encounter after the lapse of many years or the risks to society which might result from the release of a prisoner of this type, if the new prosecution should fail. They are, however, pointed out in the dissent.

Another recent case which seems to us surprising, and the full scope of which we cannot foresee, is *Lambert v. California* (355 U.S., decided Dec. 16, 1957). In that case a majority of the Court reversed a conviction under a Los Angeles ordinance which required a person convicted of a felony, or of a crime which would be felony under the law of California, to register upon taking up residence in Los Angeles. Lambert had been convicted of forgery and had served a long term in a California prison for that offense. She was arrested on suspicion of another crime and her failure to register was then discovered and she was prosecuted, convicted, and fined. The majority of the Supreme Court found that she had no notice of the ordinance, that it was not likely to be known, that it was a measure merely for the convenience of the police, that the defendant had no opportunity to comply with it after learning of it and before being prosecuted, that she did not act willfully in failing to register, that she was not "blameworthy" in failing to do so, and that her conviction involved a denial of due process of law.

This decision was reached only after argument and reargument. Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote a short dissenting opinion in which Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Whitaker joined. He referred to the great number of State and Federal statutes which imposed criminal penalties for nonfeasance and stated that he felt confident that "the present decision will turn out to be an isolated deviation from the strong current of precedents—a derelict on the waters of the law."

We shall not comment in this report upon the broad sweep which the Supreme Court now gives to habeas corpus proceedings. Matters of this sort seem to fall within the scope of the committee of this conference on the habeas corpus bill which has been advocated for some years by this conference for enactment by the Congress of the United States, and has been supported by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association, the Association of Attorneys General and the Department of Justice.

We cannot, however, completely avoid any reference at all to habeas corpus matters because what is probably the most far-reaching decision of recent years on State criminal procedure which has been rendered by the Supreme Court is itself very close to a habeas corpus case. That is the case of *Griffin v. Illinois* (351 U.S. 12) which arose under the Illinois Post Conviction Procedure Act. The substance of the holding in that case may perhaps be briefly and accurately stated in this way: If a transcript of the record, or its equivalent, is essential to an effective appeal, and if a State permits an appeal by those able to pay for the cost of the record or its equivalent, then the State must furnish without expense to an indigent defendant either a transcript of the record at his trial, or an equivalent thereof, in order that the indigent defendant may have an equally effective right of appeal. Otherwise, the inference seems clear, the indigent defendant must be released upon habeas corpus or

similar proceedings. Probably no one would dispute the proposition that the poor man should not be deprived of the opportunity for a meritorious appeal simply because of his poverty. The practical problems which flow from the decision in *Griffin v. Illinois* are however almost unlimited and are now only in course of development and possible solution. This was extensively discussed at the 1957 meeting of this Conference of Chief Justices in New York.

We may say at this point that in order to give full effect to the doctrine of *Griffin v. Illinois*, we see no basis for distinction between the cost of the record and other expenses to which the defendant will necessarily be put in the prosecution of an appeal. These include filing fees, the cost of printing the brief and of such part of the record as may be necessary, and counsel fees.

The *Griffin* case was very recently given retroactive effect by the Supreme Court in a per curiam opinion in *Eskridge v. Washington State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles* (78 S. Ct. 1061). In that case the defendant, who was convicted in 1935, gave timely notice of an appeal. His application then made for a copy of the transcript of the trial proceedings to be furnished at public expense was denied by the trial judge. A statute provided for so furnishing a transcript if "in his (the trial judge's) opinion justice will thereby be promoted." The trial judge found that justice would not be promoted, in that the defendant had had a fair and impartial trial, and that, in his opinion, no grave or prejudicial errors had occurred in the trial. The defendant then sought a writ of mandate from the supreme court of the State, ordering the trial judge to have the transcript furnished for the prosecution of his appeal. This was denied and his appeal was dismissed. In 1956 he instituted habeas corpus proceedings which, on June 16, 1958, resulted in a reversal of the Washington court's decision and a remand "for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion." It was conceded that the reporter's transcript from the trial was still available. In what form it exists does not appear from the Supreme Court's opinion. As in *Griffin*, it was held that an adequate substitute for the transcript might be furnished in lieu of the transcript itself. Justices Harlan and Whitaker dissented briefly on the ground that "on this record the *Griffin* case decided in 1956 should not be applied to this conviction occurring in 1935." This accords with the view expressed by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his concurring opinion in *Griffin* that it should not be retroactive. He did not participate in the *Eskridge* case.

Just where *Griffin v. Illinois* may lead us is rather hard to say. That it will mean a vast increase in criminal appeals and a huge case-load for appellate courts seems almost to go without saying. There are two possible ways in which the meritorious appeals might be taken care of and the nonmeritorious appeals eliminated. One would be to apply a screening process to appeals of all kinds, whether taken by the indigent or by persons well able to pay for the cost of appeals. It seems very doubtful that legislatures generally would be willing to curtail the absolute right of appeal in criminal cases which now exists in many jurisdictions. Another possible approach would be to require some showing of merit before permitting an appeal to be taken by an indigent defendant at the expense of the State.

Whether this latter approach which we may call "screening" would be practical or not is, to say the least, very dubious. First, let us look at a Federal statute and Supreme Court decisions thereunder. What is now subsection (a) of section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, annotated, contains a sentence reading as follows: "An appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." This section or a precursor

thereof was involved in *Miller v. United States* (317 U.S. 192), *Johnson v. United States* (352 U.S. 565), and *Farley v. United States* (354 U.S. 521, 523). In the *Miller* case the Supreme Court held that the discretion of the trial court in withholding such a certificate was subject to review on appeal, and that in order that such a review might be made by the Court of Appeals it was necessary that it have before it either the transcript of the record or an adequate substitute therefor, which might consist of the trial judge's notes or of an agreed statement as to the points on which review was sought. Similar holdings were made by per curiam opinions in the *Johnson* and *Farley* cases, in each of which the trial court refused to certify that the appeal was taken in good faith. In each case, though perhaps more clearly in *Johnson*, the trial court seems to have felt that the proposed appeal was frivolous, and hence not in good faith.

The *Eskridge* case, above cited, decided on June 16, 1958, rejected the screening process under the State statute there involved, and appears to require, under the 14th amendment, that a full appeal be allowed—not simply a review of the screening process, as under the Federal statute above cited. The effect of the *Eskridge* case thus seems rather clearly to be that unless all appeals, at least in the same types of cases, are subject to screening, none may be.

It would seem that it may be possible to make a valid classification of appeals which shall be subject to screening and of appeals which shall not. Such a classification might be based upon the gravity of the offense or possibly upon the sentence imposed. In most, if not all, states, such a classification would doubtless require legislative action.

In the *Griffin* case, it will be recalled, the Supreme Court stated that a substitute for an actual transcript of the record would be acceptable if it were sufficient to present the points upon which the defendant based his appeal. The Supreme Court suggested the possible use of bystanders' bills of exceptions.

It seems probable to us that an actual transcript of the record will be required in most cases. For example, in cases where the basis for appeal is the alleged insufficiency of the evidence, it may be very difficult to eliminate from that part of the record which is to be transcribed portions which seem to have no immediate bearing upon this question. A statement of the facts to be agreed upon by trial counsel for both sides may be still more difficult to achieve even with the aid of the trial judge.

The danger of swamping some State appellate courts under the flood of appeals which may be loosed by *Griffin* and *Eskridge* is not a reassuring prospect. How far *Eskridge* may lead and whether it will be extended beyond its facts remain to be seen.

CONCLUSIONS

This long review, though far from exhaustive, shows some of the uncertainties as to the distribution of power which are probably inevitable in a federal system of government. It also shows, on the whole, a continuing and, we think, an accelerating trend toward increasing power of the national government and correspondingly contracted power of the State governments. Much of this is doubtless due to the fact that many matters which were once mainly of local concern are now parts of larger matters which are of national concern. Much of this stems from the doctrine of a strong, central government and of the plenitude of national power within broad limits of what may be necessary and proper in the exercise of the granted powers of the national government which was expounded and established by Chief Justice Marshall and his colleagues, though some of the modern extensions may and do seem

to us to go to extremes. Much, however, comes from the extent of the control over the action of the States which the Supreme Court exercises under its views of the 14th amendment.

We believe that strong State and local governments are essential to the effective functioning of the American system of federal government; that they should not be sacrificed needlessly to leveling, and sometimes deadening, uniformity; and that in the interest of active, citizen participation in self-government—the foundation of our democracy—they should be sustained and strengthened.

As long as this country continues to be a developing country and as long as the conditions under which we live continue to change, there will always be problems of the allocation of power depending upon whether certain matters should be regarded as primarily of national concern or as primarily of local concern. These adjustments can hardly be effected without some friction. How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. Of course, the question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two things are really the same in substance.

We are now concerned specifically with the effect of judicial decisions upon the relations between the Federal Government and the State governments. Here we think that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly. There have been, of course, and still are, very considerable differences within the Court on these matters, and there has been quite recently a growing recognition of the fact that our Government is still a Federal Government and that the historic line which experience seems to justify between matters primarily of national concern and matters primarily of local concern should not be hastily or lightly obliterated. A number of justices have repeatedly demonstrated their awareness of problems of federalism and their recognition that federalism is still a living part of our system of government.

The extent to which the Supreme Court assumes the function of policymaker is also of concern to us in the conduct of our judicial business. We realize that in the course of American history the Supreme Court has frequently—one might, indeed, say customarily—exercised policymaking powers going far—beyond those involved, say, in making a selection between competing rules of law.

We believe that in the fields with which we are concerned, and as to which we feel entitled to speak, the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. We feel this is particularly the case in both of the great fields we have discussed—namely, the extent and extension of the Federal power, and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment. In the light of the immense power of the Supreme Court and its practical nonreviewability in most instances no more important obligation rests upon it, in our view, than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policymaking role.

We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seem to us primarily legislative powers. (See Judge Learned Hand on the Bill of Rights.) We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises. It is strange, indeed, to reflect that under a constitution which pro-

vides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments one branch of one government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense, and in many respects, dominant, power which it now wields.

We believe that the great principle of distribution of powers among the various branches of government and between levels of government has vitality today and is the crucial base of our democracy. We further believe that in construing and applying the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, this principle of the division of power based upon whether a matter is primarily of national or of local concern should not be lost sight of or ignored, especially in fields which bear upon the meaning of a constitutional or statutory provision, or the validity of State action presented for review. For, with due allowance for the changed conditions under which it may or must operate, the principle is as worthy of our consideration today as it was of the consideration of the great men who met in 1787 to establish our Nation as a nation.

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast. We find first that in constitutional cases unanimous decisions are comparative rarities and that multiple opinions, concurring or dissenting, are common occurrences. We find next that divisions in results on a five to four basis are quite frequent. We find further that on some occasions a majority of the Court cannot be mustered in support of any one opinion and that the result of a given case may come from the divergent views of individual Justices who happen to unite on one outcome or the other of the case before the Court.

We further find that the Court does not accord finality to its own determinations of constitutional questions, or for that matter of others. We concede that a slavish adherence to stare decisis could at times have unfortunate consequences; but it seems strange that under a constitutional doctrine which requires all others to recognize the Supreme Court's rulings on constitutional questions as binding adjudications of the meaning and application of the Constitution, the Court itself has so frequently overturned its own decisions thereon, after the lapse of periods varying from 1 year to 75, or even 95 years. (See the tables appended to Mr. Justice Douglas' address on "Stare Decisis," 49 Columbia Law Review 735, 756-758.) The Constitution expressly sets up its own procedures for amendment, slow or cumbersome though they may be.

These frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. We believe that the latter is the correct approach, and we have no doubt that every member of the Supreme Court intends to adhere to that approach, and believes that he does so. It is our earnest hope which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise to the full its power of judicial self-restraint by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise. The value of our system of federalism, and of local self-government in local matters which it embodies, should be kept firmly in mind, as we believe it was by those who framed our Constitution.

At times the Supreme Court manifests, or seems to manifest, an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system. That

impatience may extend to an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution, or the extent to which it undertakes to exercise them, and it may extend to the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides. The words of Ellhu Root on the opposite side of the problem, asserted at a time when demands were current for recall of judges and judicial decisions, bear repeating: "If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government, rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment." (Quoted in 31 Boston University Law Review 43.)

We believe that what Mr. Root said is sound doctrine to be followed towards the Constitution, the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the Constitution. Surely, it is no less incumbent upon the Supreme Court, on its part, to be equally restrained and to be as sure as is humanly possible that it is adhering to the fundamentals of the Constitution with regard to the distribution of powers and the separation of powers, and with regard to the limitations of judicial power which are implicit in such separation and distribution, and that it is not merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable.

We may expect the question as to what can be accomplished by the report of this committee or by resolutions adopted in conformity with it. Most certainly some will say that nothing expressed here would deter a member or group of members of an independent judiciary from pursuing a planned course. Let us grant that this may be true. The value of a firm statement by us lies in the fact that we speak as members of all the State appellate courts with a background of many years' experience in the determination of thousands of cases of all kinds. Surely there are those who will respect a declaration of what we believe. And it just could be true that our statement might serve as an encouragement to those members of an independent judiciary who now or in the future may in their conscience adhere to views more consistent with our own.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick W. Brune, Chief Judge of Maryland, Chairman; Albert Conway, Chief Judge of New York; John R. Dethmers, Chief Justice of Michigan; William H. Duckworth, Chief Justice of Georgia; John E. Hickman, Chief Justice of Texas; John E. Martin, Chief Justice of Wisconsin; Martin A. Nelson, Associate Justice of Minnesota; William C. Perry, Chief Justice of Oregon; Taylor H. Stukes, Chief Justice of South Carolina; Raymond S. Wilkins, Chief Justice of Massachusetts.

"Campy" Goes Home"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of November 9, 1958. This great athlete has been a courageous and fine patient and his gallant fight back from tragedy should be an inspiration to all who are physically handicapped:

"CAMPY" GOES HOME

After 9 months in the hospital Roy Campanella has gone home. He isn't entirely well yet and will have to go on with his therapy. But he has made the first big step back on the road to recovery and to the resumption of his life as a useful citizen.

The Campanella case has more than its immediate significance. Roy is something of a symbol, now, to all those who are fighting their way back from seemingly overwhelming disaster. He has shown that it can be done. He is a personal symbol, of course, because of his great good humor, his magnificent courage, and his record as an outstanding athlete. Tragedy struck a man who was already much in the public eye and high in the public esteem.

But there is more to it than that. The magnificent treatment that saved his life in the first place and that now has placed him on the way to fuller recovery is part of a great program of rehabilitation that is steadily expanding. What was done for "Campy" at Bellevue Center can be done for others, both there and throughout the world.

It is doubtful that the doctors will often get as good a patient as Roy. They will never get a better one. But they and he, working together, have demonstrated how greatly valor can be the better part of wisdom. Miracles can happen. Brave men can still live if they have the will. "Campy" has gone home, and he has come home to all of us.

Nation Pays Tribute to All War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a speech given by Judge David B. Williams, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, on the occasion of Veterans Day in Boston, Mass.

Judge David B. Williams, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, led the ceremonies in behalf of all veteran groups at Boston, Mass., on Veterans Day. This year, the rites at Boston were sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans.

Leo W. Lalley, State commander, DAV, was in charge of the ceremonies. Charles N. Collatos, Massachusetts commissioner of veterans' services, was master of ceremonies. The highlights of the day was the laying of wreaths by the State commanders of all veterans' organizations.

TEXT OF WILLIAMS TALK

Up until 4 years ago all of us called November 11 each year by its familiar name—Armistice Day—but, in 1954, the Congress officially gave this date a much broader meaning, and now this date is known as Veterans Day.

With the full approval of our most distinguished veteran, the President of the United States, citizens everywhere are asked to pause on November 11 to salute our fellow Americans who have exemplified the highest tradition of citizenship by serving in defense of this Nation.

While this salute is merited, we who are veterans, and disabled veterans at that, feel that this day is a solemn occasion in which all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the cause for which we fought, for which we were disabled, and for which so many of our comrades died. And while we look back to great sacrifices, we must at the same time look forward to the goals we all desire.

If we can demonstrate to ourselves that our children and grandchildren will live to know the honorable peace for which we all struggle, then we can feel assured that we merit the salute you are asked to give us on Veterans Day.

Yes, the very theme of Veterans Day—the permanent slogan—is "Peace With Honor." And unless we have and maintain peace with honor all will have been in vain.

Few can match veterans in their experienced understanding of what America truly seeks in the determined effort to achieve peace with honor. Few can match disabled veterans in their personal knowledge of the suffering that modern warfare brings.

They know that peace with honor lies at the very heart of our American principles. Americans have always wanted peace. But we have never been willing to accept it when it meant dishonor.

CONSIDER HISTORY

This is a good day for inventory—for re-evaluation—let's look back into our history just a bit:

Long before there was a Declaration of Independence, determined men of New England were dumping tea in the harbor of Boston. It represented taxation without representation. For them it was the bitter tea of dishonor. They wanted peace. They wanted to live in friendship with the mother country overseas. But they were not willing to buy peace and friendship at the cost of their rights as free men and women.

It took a terrible war to bring to those colonists a peace with honor. But the men of America were not afraid to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. And out of that war came an independent nation, with a peace that free Americans could accept and approve.

When the war was over, our fighting men returned, as veterans, to their homes, their shops and their farms. As our war veterans have done ever since, they settled down to hard working, peaceful life. They turned their minds and hearts to the creation of a strong and stable country for their children, and for those to come after them.

Their warlike deeds against superior odds had thrilled the world. But in the years that followed the war they outdid their victories in war by their peacetime development of the boundless resources of our land. Their productive skills rolled back the frontiers beyond the Alleghenies.

But peace with honor is not something that, once earned, remains of its own accord. The new Americans found that out when their sailing clippers entered the waters of the Mediterranean on legitimate business—and fell afoul the Barbary pirates.

Our seamen were told: "Pay us annual tribute or we'll scuttle your ships and make slaves of you."

The proudest and strongest nations of Europe had accepted that blunt ultimatum. To pay tribute was easy; it was relatively cheap; it avoided bloodshed. But it also was dishonorable. And our forefathers knew that peace without honor is a bad investment that pays no dividends.

America's answer was presented in person by our sailors and marines. The Barbary

pirates quickly saw the point. Our fighting men enforced peace with honor. Then they came home as veterans. Like the men from Saratoga and Yorktown they turned—as mechanics, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and teachers—to the peacetime development of our rapidly expanding young nation.

Once again, within a few short years, the march of events made it clear that peace with honor comes only to those who earn it and remains only with those who are willing to defend it when the need arises.

Busy in her world struggle with Napoleon, and careless of the basic human rights of others, Britain halted our ships on the high seas. She seized our sailors. She ignored our protests.

As before, America's answer was delivered in person. When the final statement was made at New Orleans by the fighting men of Andrew Jackson's command, the point became very clear indeed to our opponents. They accepted our thesis that peace with honor was America's minimum requirement—against them or anyone else.

Again our fighting men had earned the proud title of veterans. They went back to their homes and shops, and they went to work. And our country grew and spread to the westward. The steamboats and the railroads came. And we prospered.

Then came the greatest tragedy in our history. Brother against brother. A civil war—with the preservation of our Union at stake.

Much has been said—much always will be said about the most terrible of our wars. But the central point must always remain clear: In 1861, for North and South, peace with honor had become impossible. The final dreadful recourse to arms was the price we had to pay for our earlier mistakes and our earlier compromises.

But in the end, the words and deeds of men of good will prevailed. Peace with honor came to our land.

OUR COUNTRY GROWS

The fighting men returned to their homes. America's security and wealth grew as veterans turned their attention to the ways of business, industry, and commerce. As the decades passed we developed into a world power.

Through all of these changes our watchword remained as before: Peace with honor. The whole world had come to accept it as our basic American way of life. And we and the world prospered, until—in the second decade of the bloody 20th century—there was massed against our friends and allies—a vicious combination of armed power, with new threats and new aggressions.

Many books have been written about World War I. Many things have been said about America's entry into World War I, after enemy submarines began their unrestricted undersea warfare against every ship afloat on the high seas. But one fact remains clear: The terms arrogantly offered to us to remain neutral, peaceful, and safe were dishonorable.

And so, as in the case of our fathers, our grandfathers, and those before them, we had to call on our fighting men. We called on the sons of veterans of earlier days to fight for the only sure basis of our national existence as a free people—peace with honor.

They proved that when freedom is judged to be not worth fighting for, free men are left with nothing that's worth living for.

They proved that peace with honor is more than just a slogan to men and women who have been described accurately for all time, by one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. He said our Nation was "conceived in liberty."

They proved it anew—our fighting men, our veterans—on land, on sea, and in the air—when the challenge to peace with honor was flung down, even more brutally than be-

fore, by enemies of mankind who made good their mad promise to engulf the world in World War II.

They proved it—our fighting men, our veterans—on the bare and zero-cold mountains of Korea. They proved it, when to have hesitated in the will to oppose aggression would have been to betray the deepest qualities that make us Americans.

SPEAKS FOR DISABLED

In closing, I want to point out that there is one group of veterans who need your special attention and should be brought into special focus on this day of observance.

Bruce Catton, famous American author and editor, state it so eloquently that I would like to read you his words, rather than attempt to express any thoughts of mine that might not do justice to what I want to say. Mr. Catton said in a message written for the DAV:

"November 11 is Veterans Day: a day set aside by act of Congress and Presidential proclamation, to honor the memory of those who served in war. It has particularly reference to the living—for it is on Memorial Day that we pay our tribute to the men who never came back—and unless the day is to be a complete mockery it must include a renewed awareness of our obligation to the disabled ex-soldier. The Disabled American Veterans—the DAV—aptly points out that the disabled serviceman is asking for nothing more than a fair chance to make his own way in the world.

"He doesn't particularly want tears, and he is not demanding huge appropriations from the public treasury. What he does want is the kind of sympathetic understanding and the active support that will make it easier for him to resume his place, in spite of physical handicap, as a regular member of society. That is not too much to ask, and it is assuredly the very least that we can give.

"If we feel a sense of continuing obligation for services rendered, and make it a point to discharge that obligation in the attitude that we carry over into our regular workaday routine, life for the disabled veteran will be a good deal easier, and happier."

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, as Mr. Catton points out, there could be no better time than Veterans Day for us to renew our awareness of what we owe the veteran who took wounds in battle—for us.

Francis E. Walter, Chairman of the Special International Meeting on Refugees Held in Geneva, Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during my most recent visit in Geneva, Switzerland, I was extremely happy to attend, on November 20, 1958, a special international meeting on refugees held by representatives of 29 governments immediately upon the termination of the ninth session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM.

Mr. Marcus Daly, the director of ICEM, stressed that the meeting convened at the suggestion of the U.S. Government for the purpose of exploring the present status of those refugees in Western Europe who, for a variety of

reasons, have been so far unable to find new homes in the countries of resettlement.

I am informed that the result of the debates held in Geneva, as well as the results of the studies presently in progress, will be the subject of a special report to the House. Such report will be submitted at a later date, I understand, when the studies and statistical compilations are available. At the present time, however, it gives me great pleasure to submit to the attention of my colleagues that part of the proceedings of the special international meeting on refugees which pertain to the nomination and the unanimous election to the chair of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby submit the verbatim transcript of the pertinent part of the Geneva proceedings.

Upon the conclusion of Mr. Daly's opening remarks, the delegate of Australia obtained the floor:

Mr. JOCKEL (Australia). Mr. Director, gentlemen. As you said, Mr. Director, this is a meeting of a very special character, called by the United States or, rather, suggested by the United States, to take advantage of the presence of the representatives who are here in Geneva. It is not in the formal sense an ICEM meeting and indeed when we look around the room and we see the Governments assembled, the United Nations High Commissioner's Office, the Voluntary Agencies, rather would they be considered as representing a community of countries and organizations interested in refugee work. In this room this morning we have many men with special responsibilities in their governments for migration and refugee questions and among such a group of top-level and influential people a discussion of the remaining refugee problems and an assembly of the facts and information relating to these problems can do nothing but good in sustaining and expanding international effort.

Among us this morning we have a very distinguished gentleman who is especially well equipped by knowledge, experience and authority to direct these deliberations. It is indeed our good fortune to have with us Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, the chairman of the United States congressional delegation to the just-concluded ICEM Council. We believe we should take advantage of his presence and his interest in this work and it is my pleasure to nominate Congressman WALTER to preside over this meeting. The United States Delegation has kindly offered to make his services available for this purpose.

It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the contribution that Congressman WALTER has made to the work of ICEM, which has, itself made such a contribution to the solution of refugee problems. He continues to be a tower of strength to the organization and my country is by no means the least to appreciate what his support means for ICEM and in related matters. I feel I should, however, place before you some indication of Congressman WALTER's unflagging work in the refugee field in the last decade. For every United States legislation concerning refugees and migrants since the war, Congressman WALTER, in Congress, has been the author and the pilot. This extends from the Displaced Persons Act in 1948, through which 400,000 persons were admitted to the United States, the Refugee Relief Act providing for a further 110,000 admissions, right down to recent legislation for the admission of Dutch expellees. It includes also the 1957 legislation providing

for the liberalization of the entry laws in immigrant cases involving sicknesses and diseases, thereby facilitating family reunions and the admission of refugees.

Generous ideas and practices have a way of spreading; the example of what the United States is doing and has done in this area is not lost on other Governments and indeed there has seldom been a period of such constructive general effort in the refugee field. I am sure that you will all agree that to appoint as chairman today one of the greatest architects of this international work would be the best basis we could, in this meeting, have for further fruitful effort. Thank you, Mr. Director.

Mr. HAVEMANN (Netherlands). Mr. Director, it is a great privilege to me to support the proposal just made by the Australian representative. All of us know how much we owe to Mr. WALTER in the field of refugees and migration. With his great prestige and political leadership he has very successfully directed his efforts to helping many countries, many groups of refugees and innumerable individuals to alleviate or to solve their problems. It is right that we should ask him to take the chair, not only as an expression of our gratitude but still more because we badly need his guidance in our endeavors to deal effectively with the refugee problem. As a leading and outstanding politician, Mr. WALTER is not always easy to convince; he has a sound dose of skepticism which prevents him from believing in what he is accustomed to call international social workers pipe dreams. But I have already noted many times that once Mr. WALTER is convinced of the urgency of a matter he kneads the circumstances like wax until the solution he has in mind is reached. For this reason I hope the nations represented here will call on Mr. WALTER to act as their leader and may be in a later stage their trustee. I am certain that we can then hope to reach a solution of our problems pretty soon. Thank you.

Mr. DE LIERA (Spain) (translation from Spanish). Mr. Chairman, I wished to address the meeting for the express purpose of supporting the proposal of the representative of Australia but my colleague, the delegate of the Netherlands, anticipated my intention. I should now like to associate myself with that proposal by saying that I consider that the background and exceptional ability possessed by Mr. WALTER make him the most suitable person to preside over the meeting called for this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RIVAS (Venezuela) (translation from Spanish). Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Venezuela has very great pleasure in supporting the proposal made by the representative of Australia, seconded by the representatives of the Netherlands and of Spain, that Congressman WALTER should be chairman of this special meeting on refugees.

In point of fact, my delegation is well acquainted with the efforts made by Mr. WALTER not only on behalf of expellees, but also on behalf of all the migrants in order to help them to build up a prosperous existence at the same time to contribute to the development of many countries which need the cooperation offered by these human resources. Thank you.

Mr. FALCHI (Italy) (translation from French). Mr. Chairman, I should like to give my wholehearted support to the proposal just made. The Director has told us of the importance of this meeting; we are most interested in this problem and we hope that the discussions which are about to take place will be successful. I firmly believe that there is no one who is better qualified than Mr. WALTER, by his experience and authority to preside over our work and to strengthen our hopes of achieving concrete results. In consequence, I associate myself wholeheartedly with the pro-

posal which has been made to entrust the chair to Mr. WALTER.

Mr. DALY. I would like to thank the delegates for their remarks. Are there any further remarks? Has any other representative the wish to put forward another candidate for the office of chairman? (No response.) It would appear to be the wish of this meeting that Congressman WALTER be, and he is, unanimously elected to be chairman. [Applause.] I should like to introduce our new chairman, Congressman WALTER.

Mr. WALTER (delegate of the United States). Gentlemen, in the first instance I wish to state that I deeply appreciate the very nice things that have been said about me and may I add, I trust that they will not go unnoticed by my potential political opponents in some forthcoming election campaign back home. In a more serious vein, I assure you that the purpose of this meeting is one that should stir all of us to attempt a solution of a problem that will become increasingly difficult unless solved early.

Up to now ICEM has been successfully dealing with the results of the failure to recognize a problem caused by overpopulation. I am sure that the nations of the world that are participating in an attempt to bring about a solution to that problem recognize the fact that there is another one which must be dealt with as intelligently as this great organization of ICEM dealt with the one presented to it in Brussels in 1951 when the organization was created.

I am sure that all will realize that this is merely, may I say, an exploratory meeting. First, I think it is extremely important that we know exactly what the problem is and the extent of the problem before us. After we realize just exactly what that is, then, of course, whatever steps must be taken can be taken intelligently.

I am sure that all of us are very much in the dark as to just exactly what the size and the nature of the "residual refugees" problem is, and I am sure that this informal meeting, attended by everyone who has exhibited an interest in this matter, will bear fruit. The Chair recognizes the representative of the United States to explain the position of the United States. Mr. O'Connor.

Teamsters' president James Hoffa, "Are you frightened? You're not tough enough to get rid of these people." Chairman JOHN L. McCLELLAN repeatedly attacked Hoffa during the hearings. Senator IVES told one of Hoffa's underlings, Robert (Barney) Baker, that he was an inveterate liar.

These comments were presumably justified, but suppose similar statements had been made about Communists by members of the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. How the country would have rung with outcries against the witch hunters. Actually, the Communist-investigating committees are notably mild. Nobody shouts epithets at the hapless and helpless Red witnesses. Instead, the Reds often shout epithets at Senators and Representatives. It is they who do the taunting and assailing, backed up by laughing and clapping Communists in the audience. Too often the press has chuckled approvingly.

A number of delegates to the gangland convention at Apalachin, N.Y., a year ago were jailed by State judges because they took the fifth amendment when asked questions by a State investigating commission. The commission promised that if they answered the questions, they would be immune from prosecution in State courts; but the witnesses pointed out that this wouldn't protect them from Federal prosecution.

Nevertheless, one judge palled some of these men after a 3-minute hearing. Another judge said: "What went on at Apalachin that day I don't know. But the people have a right to know. . . . Organized society has at least as much right as organized crime." True enough, but hasn't society also as much right as organized communism?

The Apalachin delegates refused to become informers. The liberal press says it is monstrous to demand that Communists be informers. The gangland code is wicked for ordinary gangsters, but noble for the Communist gang. A double standard is applied to favor members of the Soviet fifth column. At a time when their masters in Moscow are whetting their knife for the throat of the United States, we give the Communists privileges which we deny to punks and union racketeers. Why?

welcome. If I dare speak for the many friends who have joined you in this visit to the Eternal City, may I say that all of us rejoice to have you accept the title and "take possession" as Titular Cardinal of the Venerable Church of Santa Susanna.

While making history yourself, you are following in historical footsteps. Cardinal Aiello became our first recorded titular in the year 494. His successors were eminent and many—Pope St. Sergius I, Pope Leo III who was crowned Pope in the crypt of this church, Pope Nicholas V, and Pope Paul V—all were your predecessors. To list the long file of cardinal titulars is to review the history of Rome—the power and the glory of names like Barberini, Corsini, Borghese, Valentini through Barnabo and Bonzano. Your name will be joined to them and to the prelates of many nations who have acknowledged Santa Susanna as their church—Portuguese, French, English, Italian—and in 1875 one of your illustrious forebears whose origin speaks for itself bore the name of Patrick Cardinal Moran. Cardinal Bonzano, papal delegate to the United States in 1925, and the late Cardinal Mooney in 1946 rounded out a list of memorable churchmen who as you are doing today "took possession" of Santa Susanna.

I am quite sure that Cardinal Rezzonico, assuming the title of Santa Susanna's in 1776, shook his head many times on hearing of the goings on in the independence seeking America. Undoubtedly he felt it a deplorable waste of good tea when your civic minded predecessors donned war paint and introduced the world to iced tea—out of Boston Harbor. Yet in all of his fears and prayers for the future I doubt very much did he anticipate a day when an American cardinal from Massachusetts would be welcomed to an ancient and venerable church in Rome by another New Englander from the neighboring State of Connecticut. Today an American pastor in Rome for probably the first time in Roman history welcomes an American cardinal to his titular church with great joy. Accepting this title and with the "taking of possession" you become one of the Rome clergy upon whom the Pope relies for assistance and counsel; by accepting this obligation you become an elector of those who follow in the chair of Peter.

I hope we will not embarrass Your Eminence if we liken you for a moment to St. Paul. St. Paul, Roman citizen, had looked forward to Rome for many years. Here was the infant church, here was Peter and through those long journeys through the Mediterranean area he longed for the day when he might join the church in the Eternal City. Finally he came to Rome, but as a prisoner bound for Caesar's judgment seat. Long delayed on his voyage, founding the apostolic see of Malta on his way, he arrived one day at the foot of the Via Appia—an old man, a prisoner in chains. But here, for the first time in a magnificent career, there were friends, Christians, enthusiastic Christians to greet him. His eyes glistened like those of an angel as he began the march up to Rome—and then at the Three Taverns, the halfway mark another group, this time of the older people whose zeal to greet him could not match the speed of their younger contemporaries—but here they were waiting to welcome him. St. Paul, an interdict missionary, an evangelist without peer—is welcomed home. And Holy Scripture says that Paul gave thanks to God, took courage and came on to Rome—home.

Today we give thanks that you are here among friends. There are those who came with you many more thousands of miles than did Paul's, but you have some 35 Cistercian nuns who await your visit to their convent. Their prayers are the most powerful I've ever known—they are your hidden arsenal of strength day and night before the Blessed Sacrament praying for you. Here in

Why Do Reds Have Privileges Denied to Underworld Crooks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of November 17, 1958:

WHY DO REDS HAVE PRIVILEGES DENIED TO UNDERWORLD CROOKS?

You can hardly pick up your newspaper nowadays without finding new proof of a double standard of ethics that favors Moscow's fifth column. Governor Harriman, of New York, recently had this to say about some hoodlums: "These people have got to be forced to talk." His emotions can be approved, but if he had said that about uncommunicative Communists, he would have been denounced from coast to coast as a witch hunter.

During the McClellan Committee's hearings, Counsel Robert F. Kennedy said to the

Richard Cardinal Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address of welcome to Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, by Rev. James F. Cunningham, C.S.P., rector of His Eminence's new Titular Church, on Friday, December 19, when the Cardinal "took possession" of the church, which appeared in The Pilot on December 20.

The address follows:

NEW ENGLAND PAULIST GREETES HIS
EMINENCE

Your Eminence, welcome to Santa Susanna's.

On behalf of the American colony here in Rome, the Santa Susanna Guild, the Cistercian nuns who, unseen, are attending this ceremony in their chapel adjoining the High Altar, on behalf of the Paulist Fathers and their parishioners, may I say you are most

the church—Romans all—are the parishioners of Santa Susanna's—the Santa Susanna Guild. Why do I mention these ladies? Is it because Pope Pius the XII a few months ago granted them a private audience and commended them on their apostolic spirit? Yes—because he particularly mentioned their devotion to the Church of Santa Susanna. As Your Eminence looks at the walls of the sanctuary and the paintings of our 400-year-old roof—this new—so the nave of the church, so too the chapel of St. Lawrence where you kneel in prayer on your way to the sanctuary. The ladies have provided the funds which have made these repairs possible—the crypt where Santa Susanna, her father Gibinius, and St. Felicitus lie buried—newly restored, a new furnace which at the moment is giving some heat—a rare thing in a Roman church. A courtyard restored and, lastly, a 400-year-old roof this year repaired and renewed. The ladies of the Santa Susanna Guild and their husbands form a working crew of 60 that many a church in the United States could envy. The Paulist Fathers, already so much in your debt, are always at your service. One of your friends is not present, but I am sure looking down from heaven completely satisfied and happy at the honor accorded you is Father Gillis. I know of no other single factor which could give him more happiness than that the Paulist Fathers were able to welcome his outstanding friend and exemplary prelate—Your Eminence.

The late Cardinal Stritch, upon his return to America some years ago, told of a young priest at his side as the ship came into New York Harbor. The young man had been many years abroad and suddenly as he looked up at the Statue of Lady Liberty he realized he was home. There was silence and the Cardinal realized the young man wept. "She may have her faults, Your Eminence," he said, "but she is the best there is." Today, welcoming you as our titular cardinal, we see no faults—but we are most happy and highly honored that His Holiness has bestowed upon us a titular like yourself, a citizen of no mean city, a prelate of no mean stature, a man of God—the best there is.

A Deserved Commendation of the FBI and Its Director, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Sunday, January 4, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's assistance to local police in probing the recent wave of synagogue and school bombings is "reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence," B'nai B'rith, the Jewish service organization, said today.

A statement by Philip M. Klutznick, of Park Forest, Ill., president of the 400,000-member organization, cited the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover, for their deep concern with the bombings and threats of bombings. "Through the availability of the FBI's cooperative services, State and local law enforcement agencies have received strong support in meeting their responsibilities," it said.

Reference to the Federal law enforcement agency was embodied in Mr. Klutznick's yearend report to B'nai B'rith's board of governors.

The statement commended Mr. Hoover's initiative in having the FBI sponsor a series of law enforcement conferences to explain to police officials how to meet these assaults upon our free way of life.

Declaring that problems of enforcing the rule of law are a continuing issue of transcendent importance to the welfare of the Nation, Mr. Klutznick said that "the investigative efforts, training assistance and scientific services of the FBI have been a tremendous value in improving the efficiency and performance of law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country."

"They have had the salutary effect of strengthening law enforcement and reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence that in recent months had intruded on good community relations in several parts of the Nation," the B'nai B'rith president said.

In recognizing the FBI's resolute measures to safeguard the rights and privileges of all people, Mr. Klutznick said that B'nai B'rith and others in the Jewish community have cause to appreciate that in troubled times such as these the Nation possesses an effective public servant in Mr. Hoover and the agency he heads, the FBI.

The full statement from Mr. Klutznick's report follows:

Since its founding 115 years ago, and as a natural parallel to its concern for the freedoms and the cultural and spiritual advancement of its members and their coreligionists, B'nai B'rith has been actively dedicated to the welfare of the general American community.

One continuing issue of transcendent importance to the common welfare that has been dominant these past 12 months is that of law enforcement—the challenge of domestic and foreign forces to the American concept of the rule of law as distinguished from the arbitrary rule of man.

In the strengthening of our democratic processes nothing is more important than to support unreservedly the forces of law and order. Our way of life depends on justice which must rest on an adequate appreciation of law and the orderly process of enforcing law within the meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

In this connection, we have reviewed with interest the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as set forth in the report of its distinguished director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, to Attorney General William P. Rogers. It presents in detail the accomplishments and resolute measures of the FBI to safeguard the rights and privileges of all people.

Over the years B'nai B'rith has carefully followed the work of this Federal law enforcement agency. Invariably, in our contacts with it, we have noted the steadfastness of Mr. Hoover and his associates to protect the liberties of all individuals, without distinctions of race or creed. Nothing can be more representative of the institutions of democratic government at work.

Of particular interest to B'nai B'rith is the deep concern of the FBI with the recent wave of bombings and threats of bombings involving religious and educational institutions. Mr. Hoover, typical of the skillful leadership he has brought to the law enforcement profession, took the initiative in having the FBI sponsor a series of law enforcement confer-

ences to explain to police officials throughout the Nation how to meet these assaults upon our free way of life.

Through the availability of the FBI's cooperative services, State and local law enforcement agencies have received strong support in meeting their responsibilities. The investigative efforts, training assistance, and scientific services of the FBI have been a tremendous value in improving the efficiency and performance of law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country. These activities helped to promote the traditions of democratic justice by protecting the innocent while safeguarding the interest of the citizenry against the criminal and subversive.

In an area of special concern to B'nai B'rith, they have had the salutary effect of strengthening law enforcement and reducing the threat of continued bigot-inspired violence that in recent months had intruded on good community relations in several parts of the Nation.

B'nai B'rith and others in the Jewish community therefore have cause to appreciate that in troubled times such as these the Nation possesses an effective public servant in Mr. Hoover, and the agency he heads, the FBI. Their proven record is a guarantee that those civil liberties which have made our Nation great will continue to command respect and observance in the years to come.

H.R. 209 and H.R. 210

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the column by Ed Wimmer in the Cincinnati Inquirer of January 5, 1959. Mr. Wimmer is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States. His column is one of the widest read columns in this area of interest in the United States. I am happy to inform my colleagues that H.R. 12879 and H.R. 12878, which I introduced in the 85th Congress have been reintroduced in the 86th Congress as H.R. 209 and H.R. 210, and have been reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Tremendous interest in this proposed Housing legislation is being shown all over the country and I trust that the Banking and Currency Committee will schedule early hearings on the bills. Mr. Wimmer's column follows:

CONGRESS GIVEN BILLS TO HALT RESIDENTIAL
BLIGHT

(Ed Wimmer)

A result of studies made by the Shinner Foundation, Chicago, were two bills introduced in the last Congress, that could send this Nation well on the road to solving the national housing problem, and at the same time start a sizable boom.

One of the bills, H.R. 12879, calls for establishment of a Housing Conservation and Rehabilitation Finance Agency to provide loan funds for conservation and rehabilitation of existing housing, while H.R. 12878 seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer to treat expenditures for

modernization or improvement of residential property (paid by him or incurred during the taxable year) as expenses which are not chargeable to capital account.

In making his case for such legislation, Congressman O'HARA used statistics compiled by the foundation which showed hundreds of thousands of neglected housing units in the United States that are passing annually from acceptable classes into undesirable categories. Mr. O'HARA said:

"Housing is America's number one investment—over \$500 billion—which is three times the investment in agriculture; more than five times the value of all life insurance companies, and literally dwarfs our huge industrial empires.

"We have poured fantastic sums into slum clearance projects these past 6 years, for example, and if the same pace was maintained, it would take us 160 years to lick the problem as it now exists. In fact, the slum problem will never be licked if we continue to pour our dollars into cures and our dime into prevention.

"What we've got to do, is to put our emphasis on conservation and rehabilitation to bring our total housing effort into balance by arresting the further expansion of slums and blight, and this can be done only by maintenance and restoration of what is still sound. Our approach to this problem is to make it worthwhile and possible for private owners to do the bulk of the job, which is the way it should be done under our American system.

"It is time we abandon the overly optimistic view of some public housing officials that this Government can and should tear down and replace every rundown housing structure."

According to Mr. O'HARA, H.R. 12879 would provide the Conservation Agency with capital subscribed by the Federal treasury. The Agency's power would be to make loans for conservation and rehabilitation; issue debentures against or guarantee and sell outright, mortgages obtained from original capital which thereby would renew available loan funds." It would also have the power to insure private loans for the purposes mentioned.

Countless owners of residential properties in the areas hit by residential property deterioration, are unable to obtain funds to halt the blight of their buildings. They are enmeshed in antiquated ordinances. Many rental property owners say: "Why should I restore my properties to decent standards if the community stays below standard?" Then there are those who profit most on the worst kind of slum conditions.

If city ordinances are brought up to date and enforced, and if repair and modernization costs could (at least in part) be deducted from tax returns, a new wave of private enterprise spending would snowball over the Nation, and as the Shinner Foundation says:

"For every tax forgiveness of \$250 million out of a \$1 billion investment in modernization and conservation, there would be created no fewer than 80,000 man-years of work, and a demand for at least \$500 million in materials."

The Foundation also noted that tax returns from all this activity would be greater than the suggested allowable deductions, saying nothing of the enormous social gains.

Consider that 18 million people now live in slum or semislum areas (much of which is created by the people themselves), but if these conditions are allowed to spread, more millions will be driven into already overcrowded areas and into the suburbs—creating new blight to further weaken the fabric of American family life.

Such a program as suggested in the O'HARA bills would save hundreds of thousands of small businesses involved in the supply of

materials, and greatly strengthen private capitalism by putting private initiative to work on the widest possible front.

Annual Convention Banquet of Veterans of World War I, Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my remarks made to the annual convention banquet of the Veterans of World War I, which was held at the Hotel Leland in Springfield, Ill., on Tuesday, September 16, 1958, as follows:

It is a happy choice that our first national convention, under a Federal charter, is taking place in Springfield, Ill.

As a native of Massachusetts, I am proud of the fact that many of the early settlers who built their own homes on this new land near the "River of Men," came from such places as Salem and Springfield in Massachusetts.

On this, my first visit to the capital city of Illinois, I am aware of this historical process at work. Those of us who traveled here from New England, are impressed by the beauty and charm of Springfield, but, even more, we sense the invisible presence of the man whose immortal spirit brought unity to our Nation.

It was many, many years ago that Abraham Lincoln rose to greatness, during a critical period in our history. It was almost midway between the Revolutionary War and the cold war of 1958.

And then, before his work was done, he came home to his last resting place in the midwest. His remains are embraced by the good earth of Oak Grove Cemetery, the national shrine at Springfield, Ill.

He understood the agony that divided our Nation through four years of civil strife. Each furrow in his brow, each deepening line on that tragic face, bore witness to the pain and sacrifice that he suffered to bring freedom through that first and most awesome test of his young manhood.

Lincoln had compassion for the men in blue and the men in gray.

If death had not stilled his generous heart, just as it closed the life of another President in our own day, and in each case just before the final victory, I am sure that he would have made plans to provide for the Civil War Veterans during the sunset years of their earthly journey.

It was in the final paragraph of his second inaugural address that Lincoln said: "Let us strive . . . to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

A little known fact to Americans of today, is the time and study and lengthy debate given to the question of providing compensation and pensions for war veterans from the 1st Congress up to the 85th which adjourned in August of the present year.

As far as we who gather at this convention are concerned, that debate goes on.

In the 86th Congress, which convenes in January of 1959, we shall work toward our objective, which is the enactment of a \$100 pension per month for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age.

And providing that the pension to which a person is entitled under this proposed leg-

islation shall be in addition to any compensation to which such person may be entitled for service-connected disability.

As change is the law of life, the policies of the Federal Government toward the veterans who have served it so well in the various wars, have been shaped by many experiments and many experiences.

From disability compensation to a pure pension is a rough and twisting road where many Congresses have lost their way as they tried to find the right program for the aging veterans.

Public attitudes toward veterans as a whole, have gone through quite a transformation since the end of the Revolutionary War.

The first national pension law was passed by the Continental Congress on August 26, 1776. Every officer, soldier, or sailor losing a limb in any engagement or being so disabled in the service of the United States as to render him incapable of earning his livelihood, was promised half pay for life, or during disability.

The Revolutionary Service Pension Law of 1818, introduced a new principle into this field of legislation. Before this time, disability was the firm requirement for the payment of any pension. With the new law, mere service in the Armed Forces, together with poverty, became the basis for entitlement.

Congress adopted a pure service pension schedule for the Revolutionary War survivors, on June 7, 1832. This Act granted full pay for life to veterans who had served a minimum of 2 years.

The Mexican War Pension Act of 1887, granted a pension, if the veteran was suffering from disabilities to a pensionable degree. Veterans 62 years of age or older were entitled to a pension, regardless of any disability.

The trend was plain to see. Congress was becoming more liberal with the experience of each successive war.

In the debate on the Mexican War pension act, Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, pleaded for uniformity, for consistency of action on the part of Congress. He explained that if the Government were bound, as a matter of principle, to pension soldiers or sailors who do not need the pension, and who are under no disability, then it is a universal principle, and as such, the veterans of all wars are entitled to the pension. Enactment of the bill, said the Senator, would very shortly compel the Congress to take the next step—a pure service pension for the Civil War veterans.

The Mexican War pension act was debated for 3 years.

But the arguments in favor of it finally overwhelmed the opposition, and Congress passed the bill in January 1887.

The Dependent Pension Act of 1890 was a service-pension law. Pensioners, however, were required to demonstrate their inability to perform manual labor as a means of supporting themselves.

This law spawned many abuses, and gave rise to much dissatisfaction.

Widespread agitation led to the act of May 11, 1912, setting up a formula whereby the Civil War veteran must have served at least 90 days in that conflict, and that he must be 62 years of age or older. The amounts provided for on a graduated scale according to length of service, have been increased from time to time since 1912.

The act of June 5, 1920, was entitled "An act to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition."

It provided that any such person who has reached the age of 62 years, shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll.

As for pure service pensions, the Spanish American War still remains our most re-

cent conflict for which pensions have been authorized by the Congress.

Obviously, the veterans of World War I are next in order.

When Congress passed a bill to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of 1917-18 it was vetoed by President Harding on September 19, 1922. In the message explaining his action, the President was looking to the future when he said that it is inevitable as the years pass that pension provision for World War veterans will be made, as it has been made for those who served in previous wars.

That prophecy was made 36 years ago.

When we average out the length of time that the veterans of the five wars in American history, up to and including the Spanish-American War, had to wait before service pensions were authorized, we find that it takes nearly 43 years.

We, of World War I with 40 years behind us are close to the time of our entitlement.

When we consider that our good friends, the Spanish-American War veterans, only had to wait 22 years for their pensions, it would appear that favorable action on our claim cannot be delayed much longer.

In the last session of the Congress, when my bill to provide a Federal charter for our organization was being debated, there were a few who opposed the bill. They insisted that our group was organized for the sole purpose of "lobbying through Congress a general pension bill that would provide \$100 monthly to all World War I veterans regardless of need or length of service."

We have never concealed the fact that this is one of our objectives.

There is nothing sudden or revolutionary in such a proposal 40 years after World War I and following a precedent that was established long ago.

We believe that the veteran who is 62 years of age or older is entitled to a pension of \$100 per month upon proof of age and honorable service.

We are certain that this is the simplest and fairest method by which the Nation's obligation to the aging veterans of World War I will be honored.

In the school of practical experience we have learned that few people in positions of leadership and influence showed any interest in pensions for the veterans of World War I, until our organization was founded. Its astounding growth within the past few years has opened the eyes of our legislators, and is reminding a grateful but sometimes absent-minded Nation that the pension issue is approaching decision day.

As we have found unity, and strength, and inspiring comradeship through our membership in the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., we have come to realize that only by such mobilization of our forces, directed toward the goal of a pension for all veterans of that conflict, can we win to our side, the public support that is necessary to achieve victory in this campaign.

But this is not the single and exclusive purpose of our organization.

If that were so, our reason for being, and our rediscovered community of interest would melt away as soon as the pension battle is won.

We have other objectives, as well.

For the veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have a mission to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and the individual States of the Union, and to foster the spirit and practice of true Americanism.

We must fight unceasingly for our national security in order to protect Americans from enemies within our borders, as well as those from without, to the end that our American way of life be preserved.

We are the senior veterans of our country, inheriting the responsibilities of those who preceded us.

As guardians of the home front we must be alert and positive concerning the needs of our country today in its struggle with a foe who employs unseen weapons to confuse us, and hypnotize us, weapons that are difficult to counteract if they should dull the minds and the will of the United States and its people.

The veterans of World War I fought on the field of battle, where we came to grips with the enemy, and finally defeated him after much pain and sacrifice.

Since the end of World War I, new aggressors have come to power, threatening the peace of the world. They are much more cunning in their methods. And much more dangerous.

First there was fascism, and now communism.

The evil that was hatched in Moscow and that spread over a number of independent nations before the free world took steps to contain it, wages war constantly, even while it is shaking your hand.

In the First World War, aggressors depended almost entirely upon military power.

Espionage was in its infancy, largely limited to a few individual agents.

Psychology was a new word that only professors understood.

The man who was able to support a telephone in his home and an automobile in the one-stall garage that was located in the backyard was looked up to as a person of distinction.

The airplane was a fragile, one-man flying machine of doubtful speed and range.

As for radio and television, they were just dreams.

In the past 40 years, as these techniques and inventions became commonplace facts, the free nations developed them for peacetime use, and as aids to a more abundant life for their people.

The dictatorships, however, applied this knowledge to serve the aggressive purposes of the all-powerful state.

Communism, because of its long experience in conspiracy, saw the possibilities of using this new knowledge to extend its control over the minds and lives of mankind.

And so the Communists developed the cunning weapons of indirect aggression; infiltration, subversion, propaganda, and brainwashing.

While fomenting trouble in Korea and Indochina, and diverting some of our strength and attention to those areas, they were making their plans to provoke unrest elsewhere.

They are aiding and abetting Nasser in his ambition to become lord and master of the Arab world and to become a tool of the Communists, although he does not seem to realize this danger as yet. You may be sure, at this very moment, while our attention is focused on the problems of one area, the Communists are sowing the seeds of confusion and turmoil in some other area. All for the purpose of bewildering the free world, causing it to react impulsively with too little and too late, keeping us always on the defensive with jabs that are intended to wear us down.

The Communists know how deep is the yearning for peace, and so they start a so-called peace offensive, calculating that many sincere people will be taken in by the mere repetition of the word "peace." In the process, the Communists make headway on their real, though hidden, purpose. They seek in this manner, to weaken the will of the free nations, to beguile them into a reduction of expenditures for defense by appealing to individual selfishness, and to spread the fatal belief that it is somehow possible to coexist with them. Even though the record proves that this tyranny will betray anything and everything to reach its goal of world conquest.

They know that people forget.

Less than 2 years ago, they sent their armed forces into Hungary to crush the brave people who had overthrown the Red government that had been imposed upon them. Only a few months ago, they announced the execution of those who led the freedom fighters, whom they had seized in violation of a safe-conduct pledge.

This summer, they self-righteously protested the arrival of American troops in Lebanon, and British troops in Jordan, in spite of the fact that these military units were invited by the duly constituted governments of those small nations, to protect them from indirect aggression.

On the face of it, the Russian demands for the immediate withdrawal of the allied forces was a flagrant example of Red hypocrisy.

How could they protest our peaceful and temporary intervention, in the light of their bloody invasion of Hungary that wiped out its newly won independence and while their troops still occupy that unhappy land in defiance of the United Nations?

Their brazen contempt for reason, and justice, and world opinion is based on their assurance that people forget.

Unfortunately many do forget.

The Communists know that if they press their initiative and keep repeating such attractive words as "peoples' republic," "democracy," and "peace" over and over again, the ignorant and the innocent alike will be deceived by slogans into believing that: "Well, maybe we can do business with them after all."

That is exactly the response that the Communists want.

The intended victims do not realize that anyone who trusts the Communists and let's down his guard is halfway into the trap with its bait to lure the unwary and its barked wire that prevents their escape.

Never forget that it took only a handful of Bolshevik conspirators, who knew what they wanted, to secure control of Russia, when the long-suffering Russian people, further drained by military defeats, forced the abdication of Czar Nicholas.

The majority of Russians with moderate views could not get together on an effective program.

While they argued among themselves as to what they should do, the ruthless minority of Bolsheviks confused and tricked the debaters, while the Red strong-arm squads took over the war ministry, the police stations, and the communication centers.

That was in 1917.

Since then, they have built up a system of tight control over the Russian people. Mixing propaganda and terror, they have channeled and driven the energies of the Russian people in a tremendous effort to build up heavy industry, and military power.

Not content with that, they have reached out and have absorbed into their empire, a number of neighboring nations.

Operating from Moscow, communism has agents and dupes trying to subvert many other nations around the globe.

With fanatical zeal, communism has developed from a small band of conspirators in 1917, until now it is a present danger to every free nation in the world.

Back in that same year, 1917, the United States became a world power.

Since the beginning of our nation we had lived a protected existence, with two wide oceans that separated us from the problems in the rest of the world, while we concentrated on our internal growth and progress.

It was the maturing power and idealism of the United States that won victory for the Allies in World War I.

From that point on, even though we did not realize it, the burden and the responsibility of leading the free world was on our shoulders because there was no other nation

with the faith backed by the material resources, to do the job.

Many of our people, including some in high places, closed their eyes to this fact.

The pacifism of the twenties, the neutrality of the thirties—these were the symptoms of our retreat from international realities.

That is why we were unprepared, both in our thinking and in our ability to defend ourselves on December 7, 1941.

Then we had time to recover from the blow.

Now, we have none, because intercontinental missiles with hydrogen warheads will soon be able to leap across the oceans that had isolated us from direct attack in the past.

There is no turning back to the uncomplicated days of our nation's adolescence.

Communist Russia is determined to forge ahead in every field, and there is disturbing evidence that the Reds have gained the lead in two critical areas: in the number of engineers, technicians, and scientists that they graduate each year; and in their development of the powerful rockets that will be the key to military supremacy, and to the control of outer space.

If our national reaction to this is a business-as-usual attitude, instead of vigilance, look-ahead policies, and extra effort, we shall find ourselves on the road to inevitable defeat.

We have some responsible leaders of government who are aware of this danger. There are competent officers in the Pentagon; and the scientists who are working on our rocket and space exploration programs are among the world's best.

All this, however, is not enough.

I am thinking of Abraham Lincoln, who would walk miles to get a book and study it by the uncertain light of the fireplace in his log cabin, to prepare himself for the time when the nation needed him.

I am thinking of the American initiative that opened up the West; that ventured into the unseen and the unknown because it was not afraid to advance beyond comfort and security in order to dare and do.

In this wonderful land of ours, with all the blessings we enjoy, there are too many people in 1958 who want to play it safe and to avoid the hard thinking and the resolute actions without which there is no leadership.

The vision, courage, and effort of the people, as it was in Lincoln's time, is required to animate our Nation.

How can our Federal Government make up its mind and go forward toward the solution of international problems, and to discover the new worlds of outer space in freedom's name, unless it hears from us?

As the Declaration of Independence states: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This does not simply mean the form and organization of government; the laws which define and limit its authority; and the routine services it performs for us.

Far more important is the confident mandate that it must receive from the people to embark on those programs that are imperative if freedom is not to mark time, and fall behind the dynamic drive of communism.

That clear call for constructive action, welling up from the people of the United States sounds but faintly in Washington today.

It must speak up and it must be heard.

Demanding that we strengthen our allies and strengthen the United Nations, but, let's face it, in the uncertain world of today, the fate of freedom depends on the leadership, or lack of leadership, of the United States and its people.

On January 23 the Preparedness Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate issued a unanimous report stating that the Soviet Union

is ahead of us in missiles and in submarines. Experts testified that our competitors are producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our own.

On August 28, American educators pointed out that Russia is putting 10 to 15 percent of its total income into educational channels, while Americans are spending only 3 to 5 percent on education.

Unless we get going, the Reds will not only catch up with us; they will overpower us.

If such should come to pass, it will do no good to think that we are far ahead of the Russians in the number of automobiles, ranchhouses, bank accounts, and insurance policies. These, together with our schools and universities, our churches and our free press, our labor unions, and our industries, would be seized, controlled, and used by the dictatorship that is communism. Such voluntary groups as the World War I Veterans of the United States of America would not be tolerated.

Our organization has the rare opportunity, because it is new, to dedicate itself to the task of rousing our Nation from its complacency.

I take the liberty of suggesting that our organization, by the united effort of our barracks that network the Nation shall organize and energize a drive to alert America.

We must have the most modern defense system; one that is constantly improving its efficiency under the realistic leadership of such men as the late Gen. Billy Mitchell, General Gavin, who recently resigned from the Army that he loved, so that he could tell the truth to the American people and Admiral Rickover, who overcame many service obstacles to develop a nuclear-powered submarine fleet.

To achieve this, and the economic system to sustain it, we must give top priority to education. For everything depends on applied knowledge; putting freedom to work, and putting science to work. We need to give more of our resources, more of our encouragement, and more of our honors to education. The old idea that education is completed by the award of a high school diploma, or a college degree, is one of the most dangerous of illusions. To keep ahead of the Russians it will be necessary for Americans, grownups as well as youngsters, to keep on learning, under an expanded educational system that will discover new ways and methods to bring forth the best in all.

Our Nation must also do a better job in reaching the peoples of this world with the truth concerning our principles and our policies. Within the United States, we have succeeded in developing the art of communication to a degree that is mutually beneficial to our people, to the economy, and to the free exchange of ideas. For some strange reason, we have not been able to communicate as effectively with our neighbors in other countries.

There is a powerful ferment at work throughout this world, as desperately poor and backward people are waking up and are reaching for the better life that should and can be theirs.

So far it is a peaceful revolution that the United States, above all nations should understand and assist.

If we fail them in their hour of need, they will have no other choice but to follow the siren call of communism.

Our Nation cannot rest upon its past.

It cannot close its eyes to new horizons if it is to be true to itself and to the submerged peoples who look to the United States for leadership.

We have the means but lack the firm and steady purpose.

This is the very heart of the problem.

We need the spirit of Paul Revere and the

response of the Minutemen at Concord and Lexington. We need the humanity and courage of Abraham Lincoln. We need to measure up to the searchers in the wagon trains, the dauntless homesteaders who crossed the Mississippi to open up the unknown West.

Reviving, bringing to life within ourselves, the ability to make forward decisions.

For the rest of the world will not wait.

We have the last chance to create the most productive educational system in the world.

We have a short time left to find the serious purpose, and to start the bold actions that will lead the hunger of mankind toward the discovery of freedom and progress.

I sound the warning not to panic, but to wake up.

And I say to you, my comrades of World War I, that this is our opportunity and responsibility.

For here, in this hall, we feel close to the Great Emancipator.

With the wisdom of eternity, He is calling upon us to give the greatest service to humanity at a fateful hour in the life of man.

Out of this wealth of mind and soul, rising up from our membership, we must develop the program and the dedicated purpose that will inspire America to pioneer again.

Negroes: Big Advances in Jobs, Wealth, Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the November 28 issue of "U.S. News & World Report" entitled "Negroes: Big Advances in Jobs, Wealth, Status." This article points out how the segregation problem has overshadowed the tremendous strides the Negroes have made in both the social and economic fields and the even bigger gains which are expected in the years to come.

The article follows:

NEGROES: BIG ADVANCES IN JOBS, WEALTH, STATUS

In spite of all the furor about segregation—records show that Negroes have made tremendous progress in recent years. New and better jobs are opening to them. Economically, Negroes are gaining on the whites.

A Negro, Marian Anderson, recently was sworn in as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations. Ralph Bunche, a Negro, is an Under Secretary of the U.N. The U.S. Minister to Rumania, Clifton R. Wharton, is a Negro.

In the 1958 world series, one of the stars was a Negro, Elston Howard of the New York Yankees. Althea Gibson, a Negro, is the world's tennis champion among women.

In Washington, J. Ernest Wilkins, a Negro, was, until recently, Assistant Secretary of Labor. One out of four Government jobs in the Nation's capital is filled by a Negro. One-sixth of these Negroes hold supervisory posts.

In Detroit, Negroes are moving into sales jobs behind the counters of that city's biggest, most fashionable department store. In Maryland, an aviation company has begun to hire Negro engineers. Atlanta, for the first time, recently elected a Negro to its school board. A few weeks ago, a Negro

was nominated to be a municipal judge in Newark, N.J.

BIG ECONOMIC PROGRESS

A furor over integration of the races in schools of the South has created a widespread impression that the U.S. Negro is not sharing in the Nation's well-being. Yet quietly, almost unnoticed, America's nearly 19 million Negroes are making economic gains that would be hard to match anywhere in the world.

Says Dr. Joseph H. Douglass, a Negro sociologist who holds down a top job in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare:

"In the last 18 years, the Negro has come further than he did in three quarters of a century after the Civil War."

In 1940, just before the U.S. became involved in World War II, the census showed four out of five Negroes lived in the South. One in three lived on a Southern farm. Negro income, per capita, was only 30 percent that of whites.

Then came the defense boom. A manpower shortage opened up jobs to Negroes as never before.

Now population reports show that only two out of three Negroes live in the South. Only one out of eight lives on a farm.

Studies by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal this: Since 1940, the median wage of U.S. whites has gone up about three and one half times—but the median wage of Negroes has gone up five times. Negro income, on an average per capita, has moved up to 55 percent of that of whites.

Many Negroes who have gone North have entered industry. They have moved into skilled trades, white collar job and—at times—into the professions.

Before World War II, only one Negro in 10 held a so-called good job in the crafts or professions. Now the figure is one in five.

RISE OF NEW CLASS

In that process of change, sociologists say, a sizable middle class is developing among Negroes. About 40 percent of U.S. Negro families own or are buying their homes. You find Negro neighborhoods that duplicate those of whites—down to split-level dwellings with late-model cars parked in the driveways. Luxury neighborhoods for Negroes feature landscaped homes costing anywhere from \$30,000 to \$100,000.

A study conducted by the Birmingham News and the Birmingham Post-Herald gives detailed information concerning the economic status of Negroes in the Alabama city. It shows this:

About 20 percent of all Negro families in Birmingham now are earning \$4,000 or more annually. Fifty percent own, or are buying, their own homes. Forty-one percent own automobiles, 96 percent own mechanical refrigerators, 76.2 percent own washing machines, and 80 percent own television sets.

SOME COMPARISONS

Today, America's Negroes own more automobiles than are found in all of Soviet Russia with its 200 million people. Negro enrollment in colleges exceeds the total college enrollment of West Germany. Negro purchasing power in the United States is said to be bigger than that of Canada's 16 million people.

Negroes are getting more and better paying jobs in industry and construction as labor unions lower their racial bars. Since 1940, Negro membership in unions has gone up three times and now comes to more than 2 million. Even in the South, a majority of union locals are biracial. A substantial number have at least one Negro officer.

At one time, many unions barred Negroes from membership. And it is still true that Negroes, in practice, are restricted to inferior jobs by some unions. Barriers still exist in railroad jobs, except for porters. On

New York's waterfront, few if any Negro longshoremen draw favored assignments.

Even so, the overall picture is changing rapidly. Only a few unions still maintain bans against Negro membership. There are many instances of management opening up promotion lists to Negro candidates.

Today, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, there are three times as many Negro foremen and craftsmen as in 1940. In some places, such as the automobile plants in Detroit, Negroes are found supervising white workers.

The number of Negroes in white collar jobs has gone up even more—eight times since 1940. One reason for this growth is set forth by the director of a Los Angeles employment office. He says:

"A few years ago it was almost impossible to place a Negro girl as a secretary. Now it's getting harder to find really good secretaries, so employers are beginning to ask us for anyone who can do the job well—regardless of color."

Airlines have started hiring Negro girls as stewardesses. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago not long ago began hiring Negroes as bank clerks. In big cities everywhere, Negroes are getting jobs as sales clerks, food demonstrators, typists, receptionists, telephone operators and in similar white-collar positions.

ROLE IN GOVERNMENT

The Department of Labor says that three times as many Negroes now hold jobs in Federal, State, and local governments as was the case in 1940. Recently Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell said that more than 300 Negroes have been appointed to responsible posts in the executive branch of the U.S. Government since 1952.

From the Department of Defense, you get this picture: About 250,000 Negroes are serving in the armed forces. Of these, an estimated 5,000 are commissioned or warrant officers. The Air Force has a Negro brigadier general. Two Negroes hold the rank of colonel in the Army. Two, in the Navy, are commanders. Eight Negro cadets are enrolled at West Point, and 11 Negro midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

In the political field, four Negroes are Members of Congress and there are Negro lawmakers in at least 15 State legislatures. A Negro justice sits on the New York State Supreme Court. An estimated 15 Southern cities have Negroes on their city councils.

Over the past 18 years, the number of Negro professional and technical workers has doubled. Today, in any big city, you find Negro doctors and lawyers—and, often, Negro chemists, engineers, architects and newspapermen.

Dr. Percy Julian, a Negro, helped develop methods for synthetic production of drugs and then set up his own laboratory in Chicago. Thurgood Marshall, counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, is ranked among the Nation's top lawyers. Dr. Peter Marshall Murray recently served as president of the New York County Medical Society. A Negro newsmen, Carl Rowan, won the Pulitzer prize for reporting. Paul R. Williams of Los Angeles is an internationally known architect.

ATHLETES AND ARTISTS

Sports and entertainment are opening up new avenues of wealth to Negroes. Major-league baseball was desegregated just after World War II. Now 15 out of 16 clubs have Negroes on their rosters. Negroes also appear on the rosters of most professional football and basketball teams.

The world of boxing is dominated by Ray Robinson, Archie Moore, and Floyd Patterson. Louis Armstrong, Harry Belafonte, and many other Negroes pack theaters wherever they appear. Negro singers now are appearing on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera.

Much of the Negro's growing income is finding its way into Negro-owned business and finance. At present, there are 14 successful Negro-owned banks in the United States, with combined assets of \$40 million. One such bank, in Atlanta, is a member of the Federal Reserve System. Negroes own 62 life insurance companies with more than 1 billion dollars' worth of policies in force. They also own 150 newspapers, including a daily in Atlanta, and 3 radio stations.

Such firms still do 90 percent of their business with Negroes. But some are building up white clientele, too. Out in Los Angeles, for instance, a Negro has developed the largest paint-preservative business on the west coast.

AHEAD: BIGGER GAINS

Economists foresee even bigger gains for Negroes in the years ahead. They point to Labor Department records showing that about 200,000 Negroes now are attending college or professional schools—a three-fold increase since 1940. The number studying engineering and architecture has multiplied 10 times.

Dr. Lewis K. Downing, dean of the school of engineering and architecture at Howard University, a predominantly Negro institution, says:

"There are probably 2,000 Negroes studying these subjects now in American colleges and universities. It's a new source of supply for employers—and they're exploiting it. Despite the recession last spring, about 40 industries sent men to interview our 1958 graduates."

With all their gains in recent years, U.S. Negroes still lag behind whites in earning power. Negroes continue to account for a heavy share of the Nation's unskilled labor, unemployment and relief rolls. In times of recession, the complaint is still heard that Negroes are "last to be hired, first to be fired."

Even so, America's nearly 19 million Negroes are moving up the economic ladder. And they are moving up at a pace far beyond anything foreseen a few years ago.

A Bill That Offers an Effective Way To Make This a Nation of Better Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress I introduced a bill—H.R. 196—which, if enacted, would grant to an American taxpayer an income tax deduction of up to \$2,000 on money he spends during a calendar year to repair or modernize his owner-occupied home.

Under my bill the first 3 percent of income spent for such home repair and modernization cannot be claimed as a deduction. Everything expended on such work above this 3 percent, up to \$2,000 in any one year, is deductible.

The citizen with a \$5,000 gross income would obtain no deduction on the first \$150 spent on such work. The person with a \$10,000 gross income would obtain no deduction until after he had spent \$300. The amount spent above the \$150 or \$300, as the case might be, would be deductible but not more than

\$2,000 by any one taxpayer in any one year.

This deduction is similar to that now allowed taxpayers on medical and hospital bills.

The obvious purpose of this proposed legislation is to speed up and increase home repairing and home modernization by homeowners. There are 6 million dwellings in the Nation that are run-down, dilapidated, and in desperate need of repair and modernization. The allowing homeowners tax credits for funds spent in improving their dwellings should encourage an enormous amount of home improvement and thereby make the Nation better housed.

How much would such a program of tax credits for home repair and modernization, as my bill proposes, cost in lost tax revenues. My reply is very little or perhaps nothing at all.

The tax credits granted, of course, will decrease the income taxes paid by the home owner. However, this loss in revenue quickly would be offset by creating many sources of additional income tax revenue.

First. The repair and modernization program this legislation would generate would provide tens of thousands of additional jobs for building tradesmen of all kinds—carpenters, plumbers, electricians, painters, brick masons and others—and these, because of their increased earnings, will pay more taxes.

Second. Businessmen and corporations which deal in building materials of all kinds at the manufacturing, wholesale or retail level, all, will enjoy larger sales and profits. They as a result of this program will pay more income taxes into the treasury, in the case of corporations, as much as 52 percent of their increased profits.

Third. The increased employment a great home repair and modernization program will create will lessen the drain on unemployment reserves.

Fourth. Improved homes also mean increased real estate values and automatically more tax revenues at the local level for States, counties, cities, and schools.

Fifth. The increased sales and profits and the increased employment and wages generated by such a program for the building industry and its employees will raise the general level of prosperity for all businesses which also then will pay more taxes into the treasury.

The increased revenues created by such a program from all five of these sources will in large part or entirely overcome any loss of income tax revenues the Government would experience from this tax exemption.

Most of all the program would provide millions of Americans within a very few years with better, more beautiful, and more healthy homes. This intangible benefit may be far greater and more lasting even than the financial one.

I urge that home building contractors, members of the building trades unions, and dealers in and producers of building materials of all kinds give careful study to my bill. If they believe the idea sound and desirable, I urge that they discuss this bill—H.R. 196—with their

associates and through their associations and unions pass resolutions urging enactment of this bill—H.R. 196—by the present 86th Congress. I, as Congressman, will use such resolutions to promote support by Congressmen of my bill. Such resolutions, or letters, I assure you, will be most helpful in obtaining enactment of this bill, which if enacted I am sure will help add materially to the prosperity of the Nation as well as providing the American people with a vast number of better homes.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 1119, entitled "The Rehabilitation Act of 1958." I wish to make a few comments about this bill and about the rehabilitation program in general.

As you know, I serve as chairman of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. In this capacity, I have reviewed the appropriation requests of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and have become intimately acquainted with the operations of the State-Federal program of rehabilitation. I have great confidence in its leadership on both State and Federal levels and in the general integrity of the program. Each year shows a greater number of handicapped persons completing their rehabilitation, 74,000 in 1958, and the quality of services is also improving, particularly for the severely handicapped.

At the same time, however, I have been conscious of the weaknesses in this program and have, from time to time, spoken out on this subject. My chief concern has been that some of the most severely handicapped persons are being denied services because such services do not appear to be feasible for them under the definition of rehabilitation found in present legislation. The present act, Mr. Speaker, is a vocational rehabilitation act. For a handicapped person to be served under this act there must be a reasonable expectation that he will be employable following services. There are many severely handicapped persons in this country who could profit substantially from rehabilitation services but who must be denied such services because of his restricted definition. This also means that many borderline cases may be rejected, because the chances of failure may be greater than the chances of success. The bill I have just introduced has been designed to correct some of the weaknesses which have been described above.

EVALUATION SERVICES

An adequate evaluation service is essential for all rehabilitation applicants, but particularly so for the most severely disabled. This evaluation is medical,

psychological, social, and vocational. It takes time and is expensive, but it is essential if there is to be an adequate understanding of the rehabilitation potential of the individual. At the present time, there is no one place in most of our communities, or no one agency, which has the responsibility for providing an adequate diagnostic service for all handicapped adults. My bill would provide Federal assistance to the States to enable State rehabilitation agencies to establish such comprehensive evaluation services.

INDEPENDENT LIVING

One title of this bill sets up a program of independent living rehabilitation for severely handicapped people for whom there may not be a reasonable expectation of employability at the time they make application, but who can achieve a degree of independence which will enable them to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or an attendant at home. This will mean that rehabilitation agencies may begin services for people who may not appear to be employable following services. Actually, experience has shown that many such individuals do achieve vocational rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION FACILITIES

At the present time, there is a program of rehabilitation facilities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, commonly called the Hill-Burton Act. This program has been useful in establishing, in the main, medical rehabilitation facilities. Under this act it is not possible to assist in the establishment of rehabilitation workshops or many other rehabilitation facilities. As a result, there are many badly needed rehabilitation facilities for which there is no Federal assistance at this time. My bill sets up in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of rehabilitation facilities which would be used to establish workshops for the mentally ill, mentally retarded, cerebral palsied, and many other severely handicapped individuals; speech and hearing centers; rehabilitation centers for the blind, and many other types. Provisions are made for the coordination of this program with the Hill-Burton program, so as to prevent any possibility of duplication.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

One of the provisions of my bill would increase the appropriation authority for the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped from \$225,000 to \$300,000. The President's Committee is an organization of private individuals and voluntary organizations dedicated to increasing employment opportunities for physically handicapped individuals. The Federal Government makes an appropriation annually to support a small staff which guides this voluntary activity. In my judgment, the committee is doing an excellent job in creating a climate favorable to the employment of the handicapped. The small increase in appropriation authority will take care of necessary increases in costs and provide for a modest expansion.

sion of services during the next 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill I have tried to fill the most significant gaps in present rehabilitation legislation. The bill provides for Federal assistance for a centralized, comprehensive evaluation system for all handicapped adults. It extends rehabilitation services to individuals for whom there cannot be at the beginning, a reasonable expectation of employability. It provides for a supplementary program of rehabilitation facilities under which will be built the many facilities which are needed to rehabilitate the handicapped. Finally, it increases the appropriation authority for the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped. I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will conduct hearings on this legislation at an early date. The passage of this legislation will do much to increase rehabilitation opportunities for our most severely disabled citizens.

Address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., Wichita Falls, Tex., November 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a distinct privilege to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Walter D. Cline, Sr., a fellow Texan and a longtime resident of my hometown of Wichita Falls, Tex. It is not an exaggeration to say that Walter Cline is one of the most distinguished men in the United States as his many accomplishments indicate. Mr. Cline married his childhood sweetheart, Miss Ella Pipes. Five children were born to the Clines, four of whom are still living. The Clines came to Wichita Falls first in 1913, and except for a 5-year period when they lived in Burk Burnett, they have made their home in Wichita Falls since 1918. When Walter Cline came to Wichita Falls he started on a career of civic and fraternal service matched by few men in the Nation. Being a highly successful businessman, he served as first president of the Texas-Louisiana Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association; president of the Wichita Falls Chamber of Commerce; president and director of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce; president of the Wichita Falls Rotary Club; member of the Wichita Falls Welfare Council; first potentate of Maskat Temple, and imperial potentate of the Shrine. He was the founder and director of the first community chest in the South; represented the Wichita Falls Boy Scouts on the Scouts regional council; was organizer of the local chapter of DeMolay; chairman of the board of trustees of the YWCA and a generous contributor to the YWCA building fund in Wichita Falls. He is an honorary Blackfoot Indian chief and

a member of "Who's Who in America." He holds an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Centenary College, and was decorated by King Albert of Belgium and by King George V of England. Walter Cline says:

I've lived a full, rich life; sure, I've had some disappointments but on the whole, life has been very good to me. And all through it, I've tried to live by one philosophy; I'd rather be wrong than nothing.

The following address by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S., was made on November 22, 1958, at Wichita Falls, honoring Walter D. Cline, Sr., which sets out other interesting facts concerning this remarkable man who I am proud to call my friend:

One of our greatest imperial potentates began his annual address, 18 years ago, with these words:

"My long experience in public activities and the field of business has convinced me that many times the simple statements are the most convincing."

These words of wisdom were uttered in Memphis, Tenn., on July 11, 1940, by Imperial Sir Walter Dearing Cline, whom we honor today.

Walter D. Cline has been described as an inspiring leader, an authority on oil, an authority on sports, a great soul, a superb public speaker, an entertaining companion, a loyal friend, and a rugged individualist.

He is, in my opinion, the embodiment of all those attributes and many more.

After earning his way through college, Walter Cline helped educate his younger brothers and subsequently served as president of Centenary Alumni Association. In later years he was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Starting at a salary of \$30 per month he worked as a muleskinner, a roustabout, a derrick man, a pumpman, a digger, and a driller.

Working as a driller Walter Cline was blinded several times. He saved the life of W. S. Farish, a fellow worker who was overcome with sulphur fumes, who later became chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. During the early days, Walter Cline suffered a broken arm, a fractured hip, and numerous minor injuries.

Early in life Walter Cline learned two lessons which guided him in the years that followed: First, people will do just about anything if they know that you expect them to do it and that you have confidence in them; and, second, people are innately honest.

Forty-nine years ago Walter Cline engaged in the oil business. He made fortunes without boasting and he lost them without whimpering.

Walter Cline gave to others.

He gave to his community.

He gave to his county.

He gave of himself.

He gave of his intelligence, his wisdom, his counsel, his interest.

He gave of his energy.

He gave of his ability.

He gave of his fortune.

Walter Cline subscribes to the philosophy that we should give cheerfully and quickly, as we receive; for there is no grace in a benefit that sticks to the benefactor's fingers.

Walter Cline served his communities as president of the volunteer fire department, as a member of the school board to which he gave the site for a new high school, as first mayor under a new charter of a city government which he had helped to prepare, and as mayor in another city he offered to buy the property of any person who felt that his property had been unjustly appraised.

He was not called upon to buy a single piece of property.

Police and fire protection was improved, a modern sewer and water system established, and streets paved.

Walter Cline found time for baseball, golf, fishing, and a little loafing.

Thirty-six years ago he organized the first community chest in the South.

Walter Cline has been described as a master money raiser. His greatness is due to the fact that he gave unselfishly, generously, and magnanimously of himself and substance, often anonymously.

In addition to serving his community Walter Cline worked for the welfare of his State and his Nation. While his contributions have been numerous, I shall call to your attention a few of them.

1. He was a leader in bond drives during World War II.

2. He served as a member of the Federal Fuel Advisory Board.

3. Was director of Red Cross and a regional director of Federal housing.

4. He organized the West Texas Chamber of Commerce and the Texas Centennial Exposition.

5. Served as president and district governor of Rotary International.

He was one of Maskat Temple's ablest illustrious potentates.

Walter Cline has been designated the "Most valuable citizen of West Texas." He has been honored by the king of Belgium. He has been the guest of King George V of England.

Time does not permit of more than a casual reference to Walter Cline's fine cultural background, his many personal attributes, his appearance and affability, his excellent library, his art treasures, his flowers, and his grandchildren.

Beneficiaries of his goodness, his greatness, and his generosity are legion.

Walter Cline's devotion to Freemasonry is exemplary and his achievements on behalf of our fraternity are enduring.

I am happy to pay tribute to this man of character; God-fearing, home-loving, community-serving, dedicated to the highest ideals of Americanism, carrying in his heart the spirit of the Shrine, and exemplifying good fellowship in his daily life.

A man who is a credit to the glorious State of Texas, an honor to our great Southland, and a cherished son of one of the finest Nations in the history of mankind.

Walter Cline's modesty is equal to his valor, and that surpasses the power of any language I possess.

Walter, I bring you the greetings and best wishes of the A.A.O.N.M.S. for which you provided sterling leadership almost a fifth of a century ago.

It is the fond hope of your friends, who are legion, that the great Architect of the Universe will further reward mankind by leaving you with us as long as you want to stay.

Right-To-Work Laws—The Results Do Not Justify the Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the November 24, 1958, issue of Time maga-

zine on the subject of right-to-work laws. This article presents some very interesting facts as to the effect of these laws in States which now have these statutes. It would appear from this article that right-to-work laws have little or no effect on the size, strength or growth of organized labor except in some cases where they have tended to weaken the smaller unions by driving members to the larger unions.

The article follows:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS—THE RESULTS DO NOT JUSTIFY THE TROUBLE

In the recent elections, right-to-work laws went down to defeat in five of the six States where they were proposed. But they are far from a dead issue. Already, unionists are getting set for a drive in Congress to outlaw State laws that forbid the union shop. The arguments over such laws have ranged all the way from the position of Labor Secretary James Mitchell that they do more harm than good to the stand of General Electric chairman Ralph Cordiner, who says his company takes right-to-work laws into consideration as a plus factor when locating new plants. But the debate has been more emotional than factual. The big overlooked question: How do right-to-work laws work in the 18 States that have them?

In Florida, which passed the first right-to-work law in 1943, the law has had little effect; it has no teeth and is largely disregarded. The building-trades unions, biggest in the State, do not protest the law simply because they fear that if they get it revoked they might get a law that would hurt them. In four other States—South Carolina, North Dakota, Georgia, and Arizona—the situation is much the same; the laws have had virtually no effect on union or labor relations. There are many ways to get around them. In Virginia unionists in the building trades have found a simple way to defeat the anticlosed-shop provisions of the State law: when a nonunion member shows up on a construction job, union members just get "sick" until he is fired. Union growth has hardly been hampered. Since the Virginia law was passed in 1947, union membership has grown from 100,000 to 150,000. There are other dodges to get around the restriction on the closed shop, such as the agency shop in which non-union employees pay union dues.

While union leaders in Texas complain that the law has hurt them, they are hard put to find figures to prove it. Ed Burris, executive vice president of the Texas Manufacturers Association, cites union membership, which has grown from 110,500 before World War II to 400,000 today. He feels that the law has not inhibited the growth of unions or their functions as bargaining agents. Unionists charge that the law has had other bad effects. Jerry Holleman, head of the Texas AFL-CIO, says the law has weakened union discipline, causing more wildcat strikes, and that the union must take many more grievance cases, often trivial ones, to arbitration lest the union members withdraw from the local on grounds that they are not being ably represented.

Perhaps the biggest effect of the laws has been to hamper organizing by weak unions. In Iowa, says Federation of Labor President Ray Mills, "it has become almost impossible to organize areas where workers are in an especially weak position." In Utah, which has probably the only right-to-work law with real teeth in it, unionists complain that it is hard to organize workers at all. In fact, there has not been an organizing strike or picket line for the last 3 years.

Many a unionist feels that the prime purpose of most of the laws, which was to curb the power of big unions, has had the opposite effect. Some of the weak unions, said

Gordon Preble, president of the Nebraska AFL-CIO, have been broken up in Nebraska and the members have joined the strong unions. Thus, says he, the effect has been to make the strong unions stronger. The strong unions have also had to mend their fences, become more responsive to their members. It has knit them together.

Whether a right-to-work law helps lure industry to a State, as proponents claim, is also debatable. Backers of the law in Indiana cite the fact that the State has gained 85 new industries since the law was passed last year. But industries were entering the State at almost the same rate before then. Moreover, 16 industries have decided to leave since the law went into effect, e.g., Chrysler Corp. will move its Evansville plant to Missouri, which has no right-to-work law.

In almost all the right-to-work States, unionists agree that where labor and management got on well before the law, they still get along well. Those who fought unions before have tried to use the laws to kill unions or to knock down union pay standards. Says Edmond McGoldrick, president of the big, active Reno local of the Musicians' Union: It is helping the chiselers.

In sum, the statutes have had little effect on labor or on business, but a considerable effect on the Republican Party's election losses. Said John W. McConnell of the U.S. Mediation and Conciliation Service: Right-to-work laws are at best symbols of the conflict between organized labor and organized management. They do not improve the organization and responsibility of labor; and make no fundamental contribution to the rights of workers or to industrial peace.

Latin Americans Not Only Our Good Neighbors but Our Best Friends

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during part of November and December 1958, I visited several South American countries, notably Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and some of the West Indies islands, in connection with my resolution to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—to help unite the Western Hemisphere for its own well-being and security. On previous occasions I had visited other Latin American countries, that is, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Cuba. In these countries I met with top government officials and parliamentary leaders with whom I discussed the aims and purposes of my resolution, and I also had the opportunity to familiarize myself with conditions there and with some of their pressing problems.

I came away with a feeling stronger than ever that the idea proposed in my resolution is not only most timely, but that its realization is most urgent. I am now revising and expanding the resolution on the basis of my findings during these Latin American trips, and I plan to introduce the revised version in the very near future.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the original resolution which I had offered before the closing days of the 85th Con-

gress had been approved in principle by 12 of the 20 Latin American countries, with not a single objection. Furthermore, I was encouraged by our State Department to visit South America and discuss the proposal further with legislators of those countries. I am now pleased to report to you and to all my colleagues of the House that my resolution and its central purpose was very well received in the countries I visited.

The chairman of the foreign affairs committee of Argentina's Chamber of Deputies, Juan Lopez, was extremely enthusiastic about my plan, as was also President Rancier Mazzilli of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies. Mr. Lopez made a public statement in which he said about the proposed Pan American Parliamentary Association:

It could mean a new stage in the relations among our countries, a new era of good friendship.

Remembering how strained relations had been between Argentina and the United States during the Peron regime and Argentina's recent \$100 million loan deal with the Soviet Union, the words of Deputy Lopez were welcome indeed.

The major fault which the Latin Americans have found with us is that we have not dealt with them as equals. You must remember that Latin Americans are a very proud people. They do not want any charity from us, but neither do they desire to be looked down upon. Argentina is a striking example of this national pride. Although Peron milked the country dry, so to speak, and completely emptied its treasury before he fled, Argentina today will not accept anything from the United States or from any other country unless it be on a straight business basis.

We have been hearing a great deal in the past year regarding Communist inroads into the Latin American countries. I have found that the people of those countries do not want communism; in fact, they are very much opposed to it. Christianity is too strongly embedded all through Latin America. Those countries will take Communist help only as a last resort—that is, if we should turn our backs on them and refuse to recognize their legitimate aspirations and their desires for equality and mutual respect from their brother-Americans of the North.

There is a feeling among many of the Latin American leaders that in certain instances the United States had taken unilateral action in matters where they should have been consulted. They feel that our policy decisions have been formulated in such a way that only U.S. interests and the security of the United States alone appear to be the primary objectives, rather than the interests and the security of the whole Western Hemisphere. In seeking to promote our own self-interests, they say, we have given little or no regard to the government heads nor to the form of government of the Latin American countries. If it suited our purpose, we promoted or allowed to prosper oppressive dictators.

In such cases where we have been guilty of these practices we must revise

our thinking and refuse to deal with, or give aid and comfort to, dictators who suppress human rights. This latter course would be more expressive of the true feelings of the people of the United States. It would also prevent the exploitation of our Latin American neighbors by the communists. A policy which places the aspirations of all peoples of Latin America on a par with our own achieved goals of freedom and equal opportunity for all human beings, regardless of race, color, or creed, would be as successful in Latin America as it must be in any part of the world.

There is no doubt in my mind, based on discussions with leaders of the countries I visited, that they are strongly in favor of multilateral inter-American action against any possible foreign aggression. Furthermore, it is my sincere conviction that our neighbors to the South will enter into any agreement with us to help stem the tide of communism in the world and to join with us in any action aimed to enforce such agreement, provided it is arrived at by the joint and fair contributions of each of the participating nations of the hemisphere.

It is for these very reasons—equal treatment, fostering of human rights and joint participation—that my proposal to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association has been not only welcomed but actually hailed by Latin Americans and called by them “the key to improved relations of the future.” In PAPA each legislator will have an equal voice in the organization, whether he be a representative from the United States or from Uruguay, the smallest country in South America. This free exchange among the legislators of the Americas on all matters affecting their security, their cultural development and their economic well-being is the kind of recognition and mutual respect which they have always sought, but seldom obtained, from the United States.

In summarizing my views, I want to stress the following:

For the past few decades we have come to regard the Latin Americans as our good neighbors. But they are more than that. They are also our best friends. In Latin America today the United States has a golden opportunity of regaining much of the ground we have lost in other parts of the world, because of our failure to give due recognition to the aspirations of independent nations and by not hitting hard enough against colonialism.

The United States has a glorious chance to enhance its prestige and moral position in the eyes of all Latin Americans in becoming the champion of human rights, democratic principles, and true independence for all nations. But this must not be merely lip service. We must cooperate with them as brother-Americans and as friendly neighbors to assist them in their hour of need.

May I also offer the suggestion that in our dealings with Latin America we take advantage of the help which our very strong and devoted ally Italy can render in this direction. Latin American countries are heavily populated by people of Italian origin. The strongest influence in Brazil, Argentina and

Uruguay is Italian in nature. Italians occupy very important offices in these countries and are leaders in industry, business, commerce, and other phases of national life. São Paulo, Brazil, a city of 3,500,000 people—probably the fourth largest in the whole Western Hemisphere—is more than one-third Italian. This is also true in similar measure of Buenos Aires, the capital of Argentina, and Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay. The Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil, Mazzilli, and the President of Argentina, Frondizi, are born of Italian immigrant parents.

It would seem most logical to utilize this friendly influence in the interests of democracy, and most especially in helping to cement the most cordial relationship among the nations of the Americas in a spirit of real neighborly cooperation. I might add that we should also extend the practice of utilizing our allies in other parts of the world where they are more familiar and in a better position to deal with certain problems in such areas affecting the United States and our allies, as well.

I now wish to cite some specific examples concerning Brazil, Uruguay, and Argentina—in the order that I visited them—where assistance would be appreciated, how such assistance could be most helpful, and how it would serve to achieve genuine friendship and inter-American cooperation.

BRAZIL

This is the largest country in all of Latin America, almost the size of the U.S., with a population of approximately 62 million.

Brazil has rich natural resources, which, if properly explored and utilized, could make her one of the wealthiest nations in the world. Its president, Juscelino Kubitschek, recognizes this fact and is exerting all his efforts to encourage his people to move out from the eastern areas and settle the Brazilian west, that part of the country which is today almost totally uninhabited. It is a fact that 93 percent of the Brazilian population inhabits only 36 percent of the country's territory, with their backs to the deserted hinterland. This is the area where the soil is richer than that presently explored and settled. Gold, crystals, diamonds and gems are hidden there. Throughout Brazil are also to be found rich deposits of iron ore, manganese, nickel and zinc.

In order to encourage Brazilians to leave the congested environs of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, Kubitschek is moving the national capital, which will be called Brasília, from Rio de Janeiro to the interior in the hinterland. He is confronted by inadequate transportation and power, as well as many other obstacles, but present indications are that he will succeed in this effort if he obtains the necessary financing and technological assistance.

Here, then, is a country which hates communism so much so that up until this day Brazil has refused to have diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. How long this situation will last depends largely upon our actions. Without any financial sacrifice on our part,

we can help this country become self-sufficient and economically independent through reasonable loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as well as by the proper exercise of our own Public Law 480, known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

In 1958 Brazil had a 50 percent shortage in her production of wheat. At the same time, we have wheat bulging from our warehouses and rotting away. We could easily enlarge our Public Law 480 program for Brazil to make available to her some of our surplus wheat, corn, tobacco, cotton, and other commodities which we have in surplus. A large part of Public Law 480 funds could be used by Brazil to improve her transportation, power and communications systems. Thus, her settlement of the western areas and her goal for self-sufficiency would be realized.

URUGUAY

Here is the smallest country on the South American continent with a population of only 2,200,000. Of significance to us, however, is the fact that Uruguay has recognized Soviet Russia, is doing business with the Communists and allows them to maintain an Embassy there which is the largest in South America, much larger than our own. The Soviet Union maintains a personnel force in Uruguay of 72 people—all spies. Obviously, their interest in not merely Uruguay. Russia uses Uruguay as a base through which she hopes to penetrate Brazil, Argentina and other Latin American countries. In this respect, she is aided and abetted by the Embassies of the other iron-curtain countries in Uruguay. It is common knowledge that the Communists have complete control over the waterfront in Montevideo and that they can tie up transportation at any time.

It may be asked: Do the people of Uruguay want communism? It is significant that in the recent elections held there the Communists polled less votes than they did in previous elections. At the present time there are only 2 Communist deputies out of a total of 99 in the Chamber of Deputies. But the control of the waterfront by the Communists and their strength in labor circles, in addition to their use of Uruguay as a port of entry for the penetration and infiltration of all of South America, presents a very serious threat which we must recognize and with which we must deal immediately.

Here again it takes only sympathetic understanding of the problems facing Uruguay and simple honest dealing to check the Communists and to nullify their influence. Let me give you several examples where we have failed in our relations with this tiny country and where the Communists utilized these incidents to their advantage:

I. In 1949, under GATT—the General Agreement for Trade and Tariffs—the United States concluded an agreement with Uruguay for certain reciprocal reductions in import duties. The U.S. Government postponed action in proclaiming these duty reductions because

Uruguay was not yet formally a member of GATT. When Uruguay's membership in GATT was ratified in 1953, the Uruguayan Government also ratified the duty reductions promised by Uruguay. By that time, however, it was more difficult for the United States to put certain of its promised duty reductions on canned and preserved meats into force because U.S. producers of meat were not prospering as much as they had been in 1949. The United States, therefore, put into effect the other duty reductions it had agreed upon but did not proclaim the following duty reductions which were the ones most desired by Uruguay:

First. A reduction from 20 to 15 percent in the minimum ad valorem duty on corned beef.

Second. A reduction from 7½ cents per pound to 3¾ cents per pound duty on meat extract.

Third. A reduction from 20 to 10 percent in the minimum ad valorem duty on pickled or cured beef and veal.

The delay in proclaiming these duty reductions agreed upon in 1949 has now been the longest delay in any such pending action by the U.S. Government.

II. In 1953 the U.S. Treasury Department applied an 18 percent additional duty against Uruguayan wool tops—the longer, higher grade wool which has been combed out of the raw wool, leaving behind the short fibers or noils. The reason for this additional duty, which was called a countervailing duty, was that the combers of wool in the United States had protested that the Uruguayan Government was giving assistance to the exporters of Uruguayan wool tops by granting them a rate of exchange for their product that resulted in their receiving more pesos per dollar than the exporters of most other Uruguayan products. A calculation of this exchange benefit showed that the rate for export of wool tops provided, in fact, 18 percent more pesos than the weighted average of exchange rates on all other Uruguayan exports and imports. This is the only countervailing duty applied by the United States because of a subsidy granted by a foreign government through special incentive exchange rates.

A few years ago, the countervailing duty was decreased to 6 percent because the Uruguayan exchange rate incentive was calculated to have decreased to that amount. We now expect that it may soon be demonstrable—when certain new exchange rates are announced—that the incentive has been eliminated as compared with the average rate on all other Uruguayan exports and imports. The Treasury Department has indicated that, when that can be demonstrated, the countervailing duty will be abolished. It is the opinion of our Embassy officials in Montevideo that this measure, which the Uruguayan Government and public have considered to be discriminatory, has been prejudicial to U.S. relations with Uruguay to such an extent that serious question may logically be raised as to whether the maximum U.S. interest has been served by applying this isolated measure against Uruguayan wool tops.

III. For several years there has been in effect in the United States a tariff quota governing the importation of various classifications of textiles into the United States. The tariff quota for woolen textiles provides that a certain total quantity of these materials may be imported from all sources of supply at a 25-percent ad valorem rate of duty; when that quota is filled, which is usually in June of the calendar year, the rate of duty goes up to 40-percent ad valorem. Very good quality woolen suiting materials are manufactured in Uruguay, and since this product is made entirely out of Uruguayan raw material, it would seem to offer more hope than any Uruguayan manufactured product of finding an increasingly large market abroad with resulting obvious advantages to the Uruguayan economy. Uruguayan exporters, however, complain that they have difficulty in marketing their woolen suiting materials in the United States because their buyers can never be quite certain of the exact cost throughout the year in comparison with domestic sources of supply.

President Eisenhower requested, a year or so ago, that an interdepartmental committee be formed to determine upon a more workable system for governing the duty of this type of imports because of complaints about the tariff-quota system. It would be very beneficial for the Uruguayan economy if the tariff system could be arranged in some way that would provide some modest preference for this unique Western Hemisphere source of supply of woolen suiting materials. In fact, it would not seem unreasonable to exempt Western Hemisphere sources entirely from the higher ad valorem rate of duty on woolen textiles. Uruguay would be the only country that would profit from this and the quantity of material that could be imported from Uruguay, even with a very large increase, would probably not noticeably disturb the market for domestic manufactures of competitive materials in the United States.

Fourth. The largest Uruguayan export is wool, usually about 55 percent of total exports. The largest buyer of this wool is now the Soviet Union. In return, the Soviet Union offers crude petroleum at a bargain price—about 50 cents less per barrel than the same petroleum would cost in the regular world market. The Soviet Union has also recently sold a cargo of cotton to Uruguay—presumably cotton which Russia obtained from Egypt. The Uruguayans do not like to depend upon the Soviet Union as a market for their products, or even as a source of supply for essential imports, such as petroleum, because, first, they know that the market or the source of supply can be closed off arbitrarily at any time; second, they know that they are likely to be asked for cooperation of other kinds as a quid pro quo for continuation of this trade; and third, they do not wish to encourage the kind of relationships that naturally follow trading relationships. However, with the Soviet Union now purchasing about 20 percent of

their total wool exports, and with other purchasers buying slowly at present prices and with greater demand for quality, the Uruguayans feel that they are trapped by the necessity of trading with the Soviet Union.

It has been suggested by Uruguayans that the U.S. Government might solve this problem by purchasing wool for stockpiling. Since there is no provision for such stockpiling, another possibility might be a reduction in the U.S. duty on raw wool. However, the extensive repercussions from such a measure would be obvious, and it would not seem logical to consider such a difficult solution until it has been demonstrated that the much simpler problems outlined in the preceding paragraphs can be solved.

ARGENTINA

Argentina is about half the size of the United States and has a population of approximately 20 million. It is more of a melting pot than any other Latin American republic and its population is based on European immigration rather than on indigenous people. In contrast to most Latin American countries, 96 percent of Argentina's population is Caucasian. The country is predominantly Catholic and the literacy rate is about 85 percent—the highest in Latin America.

Argentina inherited serious economic problems from the Peron regime. Dictator Peron left an empty treasury which has stagnated economic growth and real per capita income, decapitalized industrial plants, deteriorated transportation networks, and has caused a serious domestic inflation of its currency. Argentina is not to be sold short, however. It still has one of the highest per capita gross national products in Latin America, the best average level of living in the area, and the largest middle class. Agriculture is still the chief source of wealth and provides about 90 to 95 percent of the country's export earnings. Chief products are meat, grains, vegetable oils and wool.

Argentina's basic problem, at present, is one of reconstruction and rehabilitation. Perhaps the basic requirement in this situation is the securing of capital to finance here needed rehabilitation and development program. I discussed this matter with our very able Ambassador to Argentina, the Honorable Willard L. Beaulac, and I gathered from such talks that our State Department was au courant with the situation in Argentina and sympathetic to the problems of the new administration of President Frondizi. I was happy to learn, immediately after my return to the United States, that Argentina is to receive a \$329,000,000 loan from the U.S. Government, from the International Monetary Fund, and from 11 private banks in the United States and Canada in order to carry out sweeping economic reforms and its development program. In my opinion this is a great forward step.

President Arturo Frondizi, whom I had the pleasure of meeting at his resi-

dence, although he was supported by the Peronists in the general elections of February 23, 1958, shows no inclination of following Peron or encouraging anything for which the latter stood. He is an ardent foe of communism and gave me the impression of being desirous of maintaining the friendliest relations with the United States.

We must always remember that the Argentines, perhaps more than any other Latin American people, are an extremely proud people. They want loans at reasonable rates to develop their potentially wealthy oilfields and to otherwise strengthen their economy. But they want these loans with no strings attached. In this respect they are behaving like all proud, freedom-loving peoples. We would be no different. If we recognize this fact and treat the Argentines—as we must treat all peoples—fairly and squarely as equals, they can prove to be among our best friends in Latin America.

We have lost many friends in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere in the world by giving the impression at times that we were a superior people, or by trying to outsmart in business and otherwise those whom we regarded as inferior. The sooner we correct these impressions, the better for all concerned.

From my conversations with President Frondizi and with Dr. Federico F. Monjardin, President of the Argentine Chamber of Deputies, I got the distinct impression that the Argentines have a strong admiration for their brother Americans in the United States, but they have a high regard for themselves, too. They want to join us as partners, not as servants to a master. In my estimation, they are most fitting partners and brothers as well. If we help Argentina now we risk nothing, but we shall have gained a very strong ally and a very valuable friend.

Finally, it should be understood that as the benefits of independence and economic self-sufficiency grow and continue to increase in the Latin American countries, they will want to align themselves—not with the Soviet Union—but with the United States, in order to protect their economic gains, their political freedom, their national independence, and the security of the whole Western Hemisphere. We have a marvelous opportunity here, let's not fritter it away.

To me, the race to better all mankind and life as we know it here on earth is far more important than the race to conquer other worlds. I believe that if world opinion were permitted to properly express itself, it would compel the search into the unknown, into other planets, to be directed by the combined efforts of all nations on this earth. In this way, the benefits or losses from such exploitation could be proportionately shared without unduly wasting the resources, human and material, of the earth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In conclusion, I wish to express several acknowledgments of appreciation for the cooperation and assistance given me during my trip to South America. I am happy to report that our diplomatic

representation in the countries visited is of the best. Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs in Brazil, Ambassador Willard L. Beaulac in Argentina, and Ambassador Robert F. Woodward in Uruguay are all careermen, each with an excellent background and understanding of Latin American affairs.

I also wish to acknowledge the inestimable assistance which I have received from the Moore-McCormack Lines, on whose ship, steamship *Brasil*, I made the trip, for allowing me to use their facilities in and out of ports in South America. Without their excellent cooperation, much of this simple report would not have been possible.

Address by George J. Feldman, Director and Chief Counsel, Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, U.S. House of Representatives, Before the Federal Bar Association, in New York City, October 9, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid and informative address made by George J. Feldman, director and chief counsel of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration on October 9, 1958, in New York City before the Federal Bar Association. Mr. Feldman is a dedicated American who, at a great sacrifice to himself, made marked contributions to the success of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

The address follows:

JURISDICTION IN OUTER SPACE

We live today in a wondrous age where people and governments, and not just science fiction writers, talk of traveling to the Moon, to Mars, and elsewhere in the vast infinity that stretches all around us.

What was yesterday the figment of men's imaginations, of Jules Verne and the comic strips, bids fair today to become soon the world of reality.

Manmade satellites are orbiting around the earth, plans are underway to land an expedition on the Moon, and scientists tell us that a flight to Mars is feasible within the near future.

As satellites, space platforms, space ships and other astronomical bodies begin catapulting above us, what legal position shall be taken by the governments and peoples concerned?

The space above us is a veritable legal jungle. On Earth there is some international law. In outer space, there is none. Shall each nation decide for itself where it shall hold legal sway? Where does one nation's sovereignty begin and another's end in the limitless void above us? Will man battle one day for supremacy in the black, icy stillness, as he once did on the high seas, or will he this time peacefully agree in advance upon a set of rules to govern each nation's conduct in outer space?

These are some of the things I would like to discuss with you at this time.

The United States has recently enacted what I believe to be the world's first statute dealing with astronautics. The National Aeronautics and Space Act,¹ signed by the President on July 29, creates a new agency of government known as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In addition to planning and conducting both aeronautical and space activities, the new agency is directed to arrange for scientific observations and measurements, like those of the International Geophysical Year, and to promote the spread of scientific knowledge relating to outer space. Top policy and overall coordination will be provided by the President himself, with the advice of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, over which he presides, and which consists of high-level Government officials and distinguished private citizens. The new agency is authorized to engage in a program of international cooperation, in the interest of scientific progress and world peace. The act declares it to be the policy of the United States that activities in outer space shall be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

Although the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not given regulatory powers, the appropriate committees of Congress contemplated that it would conduct legal and related research with a view to domestic legislation and regulation as well as international agreements governing the use of outer space. Witnesses before the House committee agreed that the legal regime of outer space would be the primary problem confronting the new space agency.² At any rate, it seems clear that space law must be developed in order to prevent anarchy in the use of outer space. The problem is grave and urgent because of the military potentialities of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles.

What is the nature of the legal problem which the new space agency will meet in considering the international control of outer space?

Flight through outer space is not expressly governed by international law. The only generally accepted international flight agreement is the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation (1944) to which the United States, though not the Soviet Union, is a party. The Chicago Convention provides that: "the territory of a state shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto," and that, "every state has complete and exclusive jurisdiction over the air space above its territory."

Similar language is used in the domestic legislation of many countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union.³ But the term "air space" is not defined in the Chicago Convention, nor is any equivalent term such as "air" or "atmosphere." Although not defined in the Convention itself, the related term "aircraft" is defined in later annexes in language adopted from the Paris Convention of 1919 as "any machine which can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air."

Most writers on the law of outer space have taken the position that the definition of "aircraft" contained in the Chicago Convention does not apply to satellites or other space vehicles.⁴ This view is usually based either on a lateral interpretation or on the argument that the Chicago Convention was not intended to regulate anything but conventional aviation. Whatever the intention of the draftsmen or signers of the Chicago Convention may have been, it seems unwise to fit its definition of "aircraft" mechanically (even if literally applicable) to new and then unforeseen devices and situations.

Footnotes at end of speech.

There are two reasonable analogies for space law: Air law and the law of the sea. It will be worth while to examine these parallels a little more closely. Furthermore, the discrepancies between rights of passage at sea and in the air suggest conclusions for the law of outer space.

In the 15th century, when international law was taking shape, freedom of the seas was by no means a universally accepted principle. Many claims of sovereignty were made to regions of the sea as well as to the newly discovered lands. Gradually, the principal maritime nations accepted the view that some exercise of dominion was necessary to sovereignty over *terra nullius*. In "Mare Liberum," Grotius made the converse argument that the seas must be free because they are not susceptible of dominion.

In the early 20th century, opponents of absolute air sovereignty borrowed this *mare liberum* argument. Their position has been questioned¹ on several counts.

1. Grotius himself later, in "Jure Belli ac Pacis," abandoned this argument on the ground that dominion can in fact be obtained over regions of the sea—for example, by fleets or coastal guns.

2. Certainly dominion can be exercised over portions of air space, even though the air cannot be occupied.

3. If sovereignty is nothing more than power, then might makes right and international law is a mere delusion.

4. The decisive consideration should be the common social and commercial interests of the international community. Though some may call this view utopian, it commends itself to commonsense and is confirmed by the historical development of maritime law.

In the end the high-seas analogy was not applied to airspace. Article 1 of the Paris Convention of 1919 recognized the complete and exclusive sovereignty of every state in the airspace above its territory.

The chief reason for applying different rules of passage to ships and aircraft appears to be the factor of national security and defense. Because of their greater speed and mobility, aircraft present a greater military threat to national territory. This consideration applies to space vehicles a fortiori.

A secondary reason historically may have been economic protection, a policy of excluding the competition of foreign airlines. In the near future, at any rate, this consideration is not likely to apply with much force to space vehicles.

No doubt these reasons for not applying the law of the sea to aircraft were sufficient. Even in their absence, however, certain difficulties would remain. The law of the sea is not a simple matter of freedom of the high seas together with a right of innocent passage through territorial waters. It recognizes a diversity of zones and regions for different conditions and purposes. Freedom of the seas is a qualified freedom. The right of innocent passage does not, for example, include freedom from reasonable rules of navigation. Furthermore, although the United States is committed to a 3-mile limit for its territorial seas, it has long claimed jurisdiction for customs purposes in a contiguous zone extending up to 12 miles from the coast.² The basis of jurisdiction in the contiguous zone is the right of a state to regulate and control conduct occurring entirely outside its territory which may have direct effects within its territory.³ Such jurisdiction is not territorial or spatial but causal. On similar reasoning, defense identification zones in contiguous airspace or waters beyond the limits of the territorial sea are justified by the right of self-defense. The principle involved in customs zones and defense identification zones could well be invoked to support a claim of jurisdiction in contiguous outer space.

In this connection, it should be said that none of the various proposals for purely

spatial solutions to the problem of jurisdiction and sovereignty in outer space seems to be appropriate. For example, some writers have postulated a zone of sovereignty extending into outer space from the center of the earth through the land boundaries of each State and the limits of its territorial sea.⁴ It is evident, however, that with the movement of the earth and other astronomical bodies such zones of sovereignty would overlap and their content in outer space would constantly change. Other writers have proposed to divide airspace and outer space into static zones based on physical properties such as aerodynamic lift or drag.⁵ Although such static divisions would at least be logical, they do not appear to be pertinent to the problem.

Another difficulty in extending the law of the sea to air space and outer space is that the terms of the analogy are not always specified. If the air space is regarded as the counterpart of territorial waters, standing in the same relation to outer space as territorial waters do to the high seas, the legal implication is that the sovereignty of a state would not be violated even by the passage through outer space above its territory of a strictly military satellite or space vehicle. A Soviet writer has in fact likened the legal status of a satellite in outer space to a vessel on the high seas.⁶ In general, however, the analogy is probably intended to be more modest, implying that outer space, while not free like the high seas, is subject to a right of innocent passage.

Like the proposals for the division of outer space and airspace into static zones with different legal regimes, the crude spatial analogy with the high seas and territorial waters seem inappropriate and largely irrelevant to the problem. It is reasonable to conclude that security considerations alone are likely to preserve the principle of national sovereignty in airspace, and to prevent the use of outer space above national lands and waters by foreign vehicles except for peaceful purposes.

The acquiescence of nations to the passage of scientific satellites through outer space above their territories implies that consent to such flights is either unnecessary or has been given. It is true that other interpretations are possible. At least one deserves to be mentioned as a matter of interest. A Soviet writer has explained that the passage of satellites above national territory is not caused by the movement of the satellites but is due to the rotation of the Earth.⁷ It seems fair to compare this statement with the defense of a hunter, arrested for shooting ducks out of season, that he had not shot at the ducks at all, but the ducks had flown into his bullets.

To repeat, therefore, there are only two likely explanations for the failure of nations to object to the passage of satellites through outer space above their territory: consent to such flights is either unnecessary or has been given. It is tempting to accept the first explanation,⁸ which would appear to mean, for example, that President Eisenhower's open-skies proposal is an accomplished fact. However, any such assumption would be premature and unjustified. Probably no nation would agree that it has waived its right to object to the passage of every kind of satellite above its national territory at any future time. Even though the law of outer space has not yet taken definite shape, there is wide agreement that freedom of space flight is subject to some restrictions in favor of the states below.

The present satellite flights appear to be sanctioned by an implied international agreement based on the acquiescence of other governments in the announcements by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. that satellites would be launched in connection with the International Geophysical Year. This agreement is evidently limited to the types of satellites contemplated in those governmental announcements (i.e., scientific and

peaceful satellites) and (as to launching) to the duration of the International Geophysical Year.

Is it at present desirable, or for that matter possible, to broaden this temporary and limited agreement into a code of law for outer space?

Such a development seems desirable, not only for reasons of national security but in order to establish reasonable uniformity of navigational aids, radio codes, routes, landing procedures, and similar matters.

On the other hand, it has been argued convincingly that not enough facts are yet known about outer space to justify the formulation of a body of governing law.⁹ Even if we accept this argument as to comprehensive international agreements, however, it does not follow that limited agreements on the uses of outer space either cannot be reached or would not be observed. In fact it is likely, for reasons of urgency, that explicit agreements will play a larger part in the historical development of space law than they have played in that of maritime or air law.

At the same time, care should be taken not to enter into international agreements (a) without adequate preparation or (b) which are more comprehensive or explicit than our present knowledge warrants.

What kinds of limited agreement might be reached in the near future is a matter for astronauts and diplomats as well as lawyers. Certainly I cannot speak for our Government, and my views on this subject are purely personal. Certain possibilities are nevertheless obvious on even brief reflection.¹⁰ The most promising possibility is simply to continue the International Geophysical Year or some form of international cooperation similar to that. Next, it should be possible, to a greater extent than in the past, to exchange tracking data and navigation and signal codes. Agreements could be made on the use of radio frequencies. Some international projects, such as relay or postal satellites or missiles, could be undertaken bilaterally or multilaterally or by an existing or newly created international organization. The next step might be an agreement for advance notice and coordination of launching schedules. Such notice might include information on flight plans, contents and proposed activities of the satellite or space vehicle, and ultimately involve consent to international inspection prior to launching.

In addition to making such operating agreements as have just been described, the nations of the world could greatly contribute to the rule of law in outer space by announcing their adherence, as our Government has done,¹¹ to the twin principles of freedom of outer space for nonexclusive peaceful purposes and the prohibition of military uses, including, particularly, atomic and nuclear warheads.

It is true that the rigid enforcement of such principles would be very difficult. However, reasonably effective control could be exercised by a system of international pre-launching inspection, together with worldwide surveillance by orbiting space stations and the willingness and ability of two or more nations to destroy on sight any satellite, missile, or space vehicle that had not met the requirements of notice and inspection prior to launching.

To say that such operating agreements and principles as have just been described would be both possible and desirable is not to imply that they would be sufficient. In time, however, they might develop into a code of international space law or perhaps an explicit comprehensive agreement by accretion from particular agreements and practices. Under present world conditions, furthermore, they would constitute at least a good beginning toward the rule of law in outer space.

Footnotes at end of speech.

¹ Public Law 568, 85th Cong. (1958).

² See hearings before the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 1286 (also pp. 1269, 1288).

³ Air Commerce Act of 1926, sec. 6 (44 Stat. 568, 572; 49 U.S.C. 176).

Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, sec. 1 (31 Stat. 973, 980; 49 U.S.C. 401(33)).

Air Code of the U.S.S.R., Coll. of Laws, U.S.S.R. 1935, No. 43, p. 459b.

⁴ E.g., Cooper, "Legal Problems of Upper Space," 23J. Air L. and Comm. 308 (Summer, 1958); Jenks, "International Law and Activities in Space," 5 Int. and Comp. L.Q. 99 (1956); Pepin, "The Legal Status of the Airspace in the Light of Progress in Aviation and Astronautics," 3 McGill L.J. 70 (Autumn, 1956); Ward, "Projecting the Law of the Sea Into the Law of Space," JAG Journal, March 1957, p. 1.

⁵ E.g., Goedhuis, "Sovereignty and Freedom in the Air Space," in "Problems of Public and Private International Law" (The Grotius Society, 1956).

⁶ 1 Stat. 700; Anti-Smuggling Act, 49 Stat. 517, 19 U.S.C. 1701.

⁷ Cf. *Missouri v. Illinois*, 200 U.S. 496 (1906).

⁸ See Ball, "Shaping the Law of Weather Control," 58 Yale L.J. 213, 236 (1949); Jenks loc. cit., pp. 103-104.

⁹ E.g., Cooper, "Missiles and Satellites"; "The Law and Our National Policy," 44 A.B.A. Journal 817 (1958); Murphy, "Air Sovereignty Considerations in Terms of Outer Space," 19 Ala. Lawyer 11 (1958).

¹⁰ Zadorozhnyi, "The Artificial Satellite and International Law," *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 3.

¹¹ See for example Danier and Saporta, "Le droit arien et les satellites artificiels," 3 *Revue Generale de l'Air* 297 (1955); Schachter, "The Law of Outer Space" (address to the International Law Society, Apr. 11, 1958).

¹² See testimony of Loftus Becker, legal adviser of the Department of State, hearings before the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, 85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958, p. 1273.

¹³ See, for example, McDougal and Lipson, "Perspectives for a Law of Outer Space," 52 *Am. J. Int. Law* 407 (1958).

¹⁴ See: H. Con. Res. 332, 85th Cong., National Aeronautics and Space Act, sec. 102(a). President Eisenhower's expression of willingness, in his 1957 state of the Union message, to enter any reliable agreement for the international control and peaceful exploration of space.

President Eisenhower's proposal to Chairman Bulganin for a ban on the production of missiles with atomic or nuclear warheads (Jan. 12, 1958).

Secretary Dulles' proposal for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only (Jan. 16, 1958).

Ambassador Lodge's proposal in the United Nations for international inspection of satellites, intercontinental missiles, long-range unmanned weapons, and space platforms (Aug. 29, 1957).

Our Policy in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article by Henry Haz-

litt which appeared in the December 8, 1958, issue of Newsweek entitled "Our Policy in Europe." Mr. Hazlitt presents some interesting ideas on our foreign economic aid program and suggests that we should add some self-respect to the European recovery program by adopting a policy of freer trade in place of economic aid. The article follows:

OUR POLICY IN EUROPE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

A visit to seven European countries in a total of 8 weeks is apt to produce kaleidoscopic impressions, but one or two stand out clearly. The first is a striking growth in prosperity compared with 10 or even 5 years ago. Everywhere people are better dressed. Almost everywhere there is an astonishing amount of new building. This is most impressive in West Germany; but almost as remarkable is the new building in Belgium and in the northern half of Italy.

This new building has gone on in spite of—and even partly because of—rent control. All seven countries (except Belgium) have retained some sort of rent control. This usually takes the form of rent control on old houses and freedom from it on new ones. The result is increasing disrepair in old housing but some incentive to new housing, to which is commonly added the incentive of direct or indirect state subsidies. Where, because of the extent of inflation, rent control is most out of line with realities, as in France, the dilapidation of old housing and comparative lack of new housing is most noticeable.

BRANDS OF SOCIALISM

What stands out is not the differences in the economic policies of the various countries of Europe but the similarities. This applies even to Spain, which is under a dictatorship and still seems in large part cut off from the rest of Europe. Though all of Europe has been moving in the last 5 or 10 years toward a relaxation of controls, most European economies are still marked by a continuation of socialism, protectionism, deficits, and inflation. While European democratic leftists have for 20 years been denouncing the reactionary, dictatorial, and Fascistic policies of Franco, it is hard, economically, to distinguish between their policies and his.

It is not easy to describe the difference, for example, between Italy's socialism of the left and Franco's socialism of the right. The Italian Government, through its holding company, Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale, popularly known as IRI (pronounced Erie), controls or owns stock in most large Italian industrial companies. The Spanish Government owns or controls large industries through a similar agency, Instituto Nacional de Industria, the INI. Both organizations came into existence because of an alleged emergency, but neither government seems in any haste to sell its securities back to private hands. If Italian industry has forged ahead faster than Spanish it is partly because IRI makes more effort to emulate the principles of private enterprise than INI, and partly because Italy does not put the appalling obstacles in the way of new private industry that Spain does.

WHAT WE COULD DO

Yet what is most puzzling in Europe is American policy. Why, for example, do we give our actual support and blessing to the proposed six-nation common market? This would discriminate against American goods, make it more difficult on net balance for American exporters to sell to the countries involved, divide Europe into rival trade blocs, and tend to increase and perpetuate bureaucratic controls and protection rather than to move toward free trade. Why do we in Spain (or anywhere else) pour in American aid that obviously goes to subsidize

foreign socialism and to prolong government controls, which in turn retard rather than promote economic growth and freedom?

There are two main things that we could do, in the economic sphere, for Europe and the rest of the world. The first would be to keep the dollar strong and beyond suspicion, a hitching post and a model for other currencies until they are restored to soundness. The second would be to open our markets to European goods, to encourage European industrial growth through the self-supporting and self-respecting method of trade, not aid. We are doing neither. At home we are pursuing policies of inflation, undermining the integrity of the dollar. In trade we are moving toward more protectionism, exclusionism, and quota systems. Abroad we are subsidizing, at the expense of the American taxpayer, exchange control, socialism, and inflation. Our so-called foreign economic policy is in need of thorough reform.

Final News Release of Congressman Charles A. Wolverton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we of the New Jersey congressional delegation miss the comradeship of, counsel and good works of the Honorable Charles A. Wolverton, of Camden, N.J., who retired at the close of the 85th Congress after 32 years of distinguished service to his constituency and the people of the United States. We are glad, however, to welcome as his able successor the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL, former member of the New Jersey State Legislature and prominent member of the New Jersey bar.

There recently came to my attention a copy of Mr. Wolverton's final congressional news release of January 3, 1959, which read as follows:

FINAL NEWS RELEASE OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

JANUARY 3, 1959.

Frankly, as I write this, my last official news release, there is a feeling of sadness that the end has come to a long and treasured relationship that has existed for 32 years between the constituency of the First Congressional District and myself as I have served as a Member of Congress representing this congressional district.

However, there is also a feeling of happiness in the knowledge that my service has proved acceptable to the people whom it has been my privilege to represent. The expressions of satisfaction I have received with respect to the service I have rendered, together with expressions of regret that I have relinquished my duties as a Member of Congress, are most gratifying. My remembrance of these kind expressions of good will upon my leaving the office of Congressman will ever remain a pleasing memory through all the years that may remain to me. The fact that these friendly expressions have come from every section of the congressional district, and without regard to political affiliations, increases my pleasure.

My task has not always been an easy one. The problems that have arisen have at times been serious and difficult to solve. I have endeavored, as God gave me light, to solve

each with no other thought in mind than to do what was best for the people whom I represented and the Nation at large. I am conscious of the fact as I close my congressional career that at no time have I permitted my action to be dictated by political partisanship or any other unworthy motive.

My task, however, has been made easier by the helpful assistance that has so graciously been given to me by letters and words of counsel and advice, not only from my close personal friends, but also from individuals in my constituency whom I did not always have the privilege of knowing personally. These expressions have been most gratifying because underlying each, although at times differing with my own thought, there was an acknowledgment that whatever my action had been, or would be, I was sincere and honest in whatever action I took. This attitude of confidence in my having right motives has been a source of great strength to me in the performance of the many and varied activities that I have had to participate in. I am most grateful to one and all.

In this connection, I consider it appropriate that I should also acknowledge my indebtedness to the faithful, efficient, and conscientious service rendered throughout my entire congressional service by those who have served in my secretarial force. This applies to all without any exception. Whatever success I may have had was in no small part due to their loyal and highly capable service. The quality of service that a Member of Congress, particularly a new Member, can render to his constituency can be greatly enhanced or hindered by the presence or absence of qualified secretaries, both locally and in Washington. I have been greatly helped and blessed in having this type of secretaries.

To my successor in office, the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL, I extend my best wishes. The problems, both domestic and foreign, that face our Nation are numerous and important. It is my hope and prayer that each will be solved in a manner that will promote the welfare of the people and bring peace to this troubled world.

In concluding this, my final official message as your Congressman, may I again express my deep and sincere appreciation of your kindness in permitting me to be your Congressman for these many years, and be assured of my continuing interest in all that pertains to your welfare and a willingness upon my part to be helpful whenever you may call upon me for any further service that is within my power to render.

As God has richly blessed me during all my service by His helpful guidance, may He likewise give each of you His richest blessings. Au revoir.

Under date of Saturday, January 3, 1959, the Camden Courier-Post printed as a lead editorial the following editorial tribute to Mr. Wolverton captioned "Great Congressional Career Ends":

GREAT CONGRESSIONAL CAREER ENDS

With the end of the 85th Congress, a distinguished congressional career unprecedented in the history of New Jersey also comes to an end.

Charles A. Wolverton has retired from the political scene after 32 years as Representative of New Jersey's First Congressional District at Washington, the longest period of time any Jerseyman has ever served in either the House or the Senate.

Wolverton's service is notable and will always be remembered not merely for its duration but for its accomplishments. As a colleague has said, he "has contributed much to the history of our times." For many years he has been one of the outstanding members of Congress and one of the most influential on both sides of the aisle despite his quiet ways and his genuinely modest, unassuming personality.

The record shows how Wolverton first went to Washington in 1926 and how he was re-elected time and again, as regularly as he submitted his candidacy to the people. It shows how he won overwhelming personal triumphs in years when the Democrats swept all else before them. The record is the best proof of the esteem in which its people have held him, the confidence they have had in his judgment and ability—esteem and confidence that were fully justified and which redounded to the enduring benefit of the First District and the Nation.

"I like to think," said Wolverton a short time ago, "that the people recognize me as an individual who was seeking to represent them in their best interest without regard to political affiliation."

Wolverton can be certain that the people did so recognize him. They knew that, as he says, he "never considered the party label on a bill—if it was good for the people I was for it." Democrats joined with his fellow Republicans at election after election to demonstrate their knowledge of these facts and enable him to set his historic 32-year record of service at the Nation's capital.

Early in his career at Washington Wolverton obtained assignment to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee because he felt he could better serve his constituency on that committee than on any other. His judgment was correct, as usual, and for many years he was either chairman of the committee when the Republicans controlled the House, or ranking minority member when the Democrats controlled it. In either role he was one of the hardest working and most invaluable Members of Congress and received the unstinting admiration of his colleagues.

As one colleague has said, as chairman or ranking member of the committee, Wolverton "has left his firm and constructive imprint on some of the most important legislation ever to be enacted into law." At the same time, he "established a reputation unsurpassed for independence, integrity, and solid legislative accomplishment."

Former Speaker MARTIN is authority for the statement that "Mr. Wolverton is without a doubt one of the best legal minds in this country." That was obvious long before he went to Congress. While he will be mainly remembered as a Congressman, he was as able and brilliant a prosecutor as Camden County ever had. Those not old enough to know that of their own knowledge will readily accept the statement when they recall Wolverton's great flair for congressional investigations and the leading part he played in the recent probe of the Federal Communications Commission during his closing months in Congress.

One of the finest aspects of Wolverton's character is his sincere solicitude for younger persons, his eagerness to aid them. This is manifest in both his public and private life, and the number of younger Members of the House who arose in its closing sessions last summer to pay tribute to the aid he gave them as neophytes in Congress is a striking testimonial to the fact.

Wolverton sponsored or played a leading part in enacting legislation in so many fields that no effort will be made to list them here. But it is probable, as more than one colleague has suggested, that his activities in the field of health legislation, his share in such things as the creation of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, are most truly representative of him and have given him his greatest satisfaction. Certainly the good that he has done in this field will live long after him, the Nation will be grateful to him for it, and his name will be forever associated with it.

It is ironic that just at this time, in the midst of the honors and tributes being bestowed on him, Congressman Wolverton should have suffered a deep and irreparable

personal tragedy. He and Mrs. Wolverton, both ardent travelers, expected to have the opportunity to travel more extensively in the next few years than ever before. At the very moment when pleasurable anticipation was about to become realization, she has been taken from him in sudden bereavement.

No words of sympathy can temper such a blow. Suffice it to say that Congressman Wolverton does have the profound sympathy of all his constituency and his friends, just as he has their wholehearted love and affection. They at least have the consolation of knowing that he is in vigorous health, that his mental powers are at their peak, and they pray that he will be spared to us for many years. For we shall not soon see his like again.

Address by Commissioner Robert T. Bartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting and informative address made by Commissioner Robert T. Bartley of the Federal Communications Commission, made in Boston, Mass., on October 15, 1958, before the Massachusetts Broadcasters Association, Inc.

The address follows:

Boston is renowned the world over as an educational center, but it has particular significance to me. It was here that I got my start as a practical broadcaster. It must have been amusing to have sat on the sidelines and watched but, believe me, I had some uncomfortable moments. For here I was working directly with John Shepard 3d who knew all there was to know about broadcasting, and I knew nothing about broadcasting except that it seemed that the programs I liked didn't have ratings. Shepard had a way of letting you get yourself all fouled up and enjoyed watching you try to get untangled, that is, if it didn't cost him any money. If it cost money—that was stupid—and the method of conveying the message to you was not smoke signals nor sign language but it had both heat and motion.

But we all loved the guy and broadcasting is a better service because he was a part of it. His influence is still felt not only here in New England but across the land from coast to coast. He was Mr. Broadcaster in my book and we all owe him tribute.

Most places I go to visit with broadcasters, I try to leave a message. If the area is a little weak on local news, I try to stimulate that activity. If they seem a little timid in their approach to controversial issues, I urge them to take an editorial position on matters of local importance, being careful, of course, to so label it and being fair in providing equality of exposure to opposing views. Where they are lagging a little in their co-operation in Conelrad, I explain its value as a public service and why from even a selfish standpoint they should participate. If the station is in a particularly significant area to the system, I might even resort to a little of the lifted eyebrow technique. The newest wrinkle on this is, of course, the use of Conelrad alerting for weather warning. This, incidentally, is growing like wildfire, Boston being one of the earliest to adopt it.

Then there are some of the experiences I've been pretty close to that I sort of let slide by or intentionally ignore. Like the time the eager young news hawk looked up the address in the phone book of a man charged with a robbery. Well, he had the right name, all right, but the wrong address. The upshot was that the man with the same name, but at the wrong address, had some extra income tax to pay that year. We simply settled out of court. We were like the accommodating Negro down home—I call Texas home, too. A newly employed, young and eager constable working overtime found Rastus in Widow Brown's chicken-house. The young constable wasn't too impressed with Rastus' explanation that he was simply being neighborly, that he was gathering up the eggs for Widow Brown who was feeling poorly. So, he threw Rastus in the jug. The next morning, Rastus explained the whole thing to his friend, the judge, who asked how he wished to plead. Rastus, sizing up the situation, replied, "Well, Judge, I plead guilty and waives the hearing."

The judge quizzically asked, "What do you mean, Rastus, you waive the hearing?"

"Seeing's as how the way things look, Judge, I just don't want to hear any more about it."

I don't talk too much to them about how we laid a license on the line in the great tradition of freedom of speech in taking an editorial position and came within a gnat's hair of losing WAAB in the famous—or infamous—decision, the Mayflower case. Well, we won renewal but the dicta in the case handcuffed broadcasters for years until the Commission reversed that position in its very worthy report "Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees." You ought to make it a point to read it at least once a year.

I don't say too much either about the dither that was caused in one region when an unidentified plane set off Conelrad. There were no casualties and we got a fine exercise out of it. As soon as we get a couple of more ulcers cured, all will be back to normal.

Nor do I say much about that snow in New York the other day when it was 80 in the shade. Well, there's one boy who won't punch the wrong button again.

I don't need to tell you Massachusetts broadcasters how to make section 315 of the Communications Act work for you instead of against you. It was right here that I learned—the hard way, to be sure—that if you plan ahead for political campaigns you can make much smoother sailing for yourselves. If the candidates know the rules of the game ahead of time, they will be reasonable, and it pays to treat them right. Remember, one of them will end up an incumbent. There's just one thought I would like to leave with you on this. Don't be carried away when the networks, Broadcasting magazine, and the NAB campaign for repeal or changes in 315. Think for a moment what 315 means to you as a shield against pressures for favored treatment. It merely says treat all candidates for the same office alike. What could be fairer than that? By the way, we have just republished a notice entitled "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office." That, too, I can recommend as required reading every year, before the campaign gets under way.

Well, if I don't have a message, why did I accept this invitation? It's very simple. In the relatively short time I was here, I made many lifetime friends and I wanted to feel young again. Though many of them have gone along, I still feel their presence—people like John Shepard. Then I remember Major Armstrong and Doc Pickard upon Mount Washington when we were pioneering FM—that was 20 years ago to you who weren't around yet. I remember how gallantly they tried to tell me the difference between how FM worked and AM. Up to

then, I thought AM was before noon. Then there was Ted Hill over at Worcester, Al Moffatt, and many who are still around like many of you here—also, Paul de Mars and Sam Walte. Sam and I built an entirely new air castle of broadcasting. We had FM doing bilingual. Now they've fixed it so I can't pronounce it—stereophonic. While people were sleeping, we delivered their morning newspaper by FM—facsimile.

Well, here 20 years later, stereo is the hottest subject on the dealers' shelves and we are running out of FM assignments; so, we are having to hold comparative hearings for FM stations. And, I still believe facsimile will become practical sooner than most of you think.

Yes, I came up here to be with some friends. If one depended on the newspapers and other publications, congressional reports, newsletters, and so on, one might gain the impression that it would be foolish if not downright dangerous for an FCC Commissioner to appear in public. After all this adverse publicity, who would have any friends left?

Well, I've got some Dutch in me, some English, some Scotch (left over from last night), a lot of Texas and New England, and a little bit of Irish. But, I'm not going to take Pat's advice.

Pat, it seems, was on his death bed and the Father had been summoned.

"Pat, you must renounce the devil."

"But, Father, I'm feeling a wee bit weak."

But the Father kept insisting that Pat should renounce the devil. Finally, Pat, in a rather weak response said, "Father, at this late date, I'm in no condition to start making new enemies."

Well, I can't take that tack. I'm in public life and I well recall the day some 6 years ago when Senator McFarland attended my inauguration as a member of the FCC. I was brought up in the tradition that it was an honor for one to be selected to serve his fellow man. For the inauguration, there was a gathering of pretty prominent Washington officialdom. I was proud to become a member of the Federal Communications Commission. When the ceremonies were over, Senator McFarland, who had been in public life for many, many years, said to me, "Bob, you're more popular today than you will ever be again."

No truer words were ever spoken. I knew something of the job I was taking on. I wasn't out to win any popularity contest. I just wanted to do a good job with a job somebody had to do.

Our Founding Fathers had amazing wisdom in their concepts of government. Evidently, this wisdom of theirs derived from the fact that they were more experienced in the abuses of governmental power. They lived in times of monarchy, feudalism, military dictatorships, colonialism, and, yes, even anarchy.

They devised a constitution which provides for all the powers necessary to govern and yet leaves that power in the hands of the governed. Our Government has been termed one of "checks and balances." Its powers are entrusted to three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial.

Our Founding Fathers did not believe it wise to entrust the regulation of commerce to the executive branch of Government but lodged such authority as close as it possibly could as a practical matter to the people. So, the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce, that is, to prescribe the rules by which commerce is to be governed.

Well, that was all right in the early days, but commerce expanded and became so complex and changed so rapidly that it became unworkable for Congress to revise the laws rapidly enough to keep up with changes in industry or for the courts to render decisions fast enough.

How, then, was Congress to exercise its

responsibility in this field? Well, after thorough deliberation and sound thinking it created a series of independent commissions. The ICC lays claim to being the first of these alphabetical agencies. It was created in 1887, 71 years ago. The stewardship of the ICC was such that the pattern was followed by Congress in establishing the FTC, FPC, SEC, CAB, and, of course, the FCC. They were to be independent of the Executive. They were to have legislative authority in the sense that they could implement the law passed by Congress by the adoption of rules to carry out the intent of the law. And they were to adjudicate cases involving complaints by users against the regulated industry, or decide between contenders for a certificate of convenience and necessity or select among applicants for licenses to engage in the service affected with the public interest. The Congress provided that the courts could reverse any action of one of these agencies which was arbitrary or capricious.

And, finally, and of immense importance was the concept that these independent agencies should be bipartisan. Congress wanted the benefits of our two-party system. It had rejected the idea of delegating these powers to the Executive or an executive department or to a single administrator. These commissions were to be composed of an uneven number (like the Supreme Court—and for the same reason—to avoid tie votes). No more than a majority of one to be from the same political party. The concept is that the commissions should have the benefit of conflicting viewpoints in order that their decisions and actions reflect not partisan political convenience, of whatever party happens to be in power, but that their decisions should be based on the merits as reflected in a record developed through bipartisan participation—just as laws are enacted by Congress. Members of these commissions are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for fixed terms.

The six commissions which I named earlier are in daily contact with every corporation of any size in the United States. These commissions regulate the interstate rates and services for such mammoths of industry as the railroads, bus and truck land transportation, aviation, and power and gas. And practically every other corporation of any size comes within the purview of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

With respect to the FCC, our rate and service jurisdiction encompasses the world's largest corporation, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and its interstate subsidiaries, the Western Union's domestic landline system, and the several international communications carriers.

And, would you believe it, there are more than a million licensed radio transmitters.

For the regulation of these industries in the communications field, we have approximately 1,100 employees. One-third of these employees are stationed at monitoring stations throughout the country for the purpose of seeing that users of radio operate in such a manner that they do not interfere with other stations. That leaves around 700 people outside the Commissioners' offices, to handle the application processing, to carry on hearings and investigations, and advise the Commission with respect to short-term and long-term policy matters.

So far as the Commission's budget for its activities is concerned, I have in the past referred to it as the plugged nickel, which means simply this. The budget for FCC's operations amounts to less than 5 cents per annum per person in the United States. With that plugged nickel, the Commission is supposed to "regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communications by wire and radio, so as to make available so far as possible to all the people of the United States

a rapid, efficient nationwide and worldwide communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges for the purpose of national defense, and for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication." That's lawyer language for saying "the public is entitled to fast, cheap communications service."

It is only natural that the regulator would be unpopular with the regulated—if the regulator is doing an effective job. We Americans just naturally react unfavorably to being told "No," even when we understand that must be the answer for the good of all.

One complaint against us, though, is legitimate and gives us great concern. That complaint relates to the delays encountered by the parties in securing decisions.

Remember, one of the reasons for the creation of commissions was to avoid the long delays experienced in court. Now, for a long time, these agencies were able to operate in such a way that interested parties received answers expeditiously and the public was, I believe, better served. Remember, too, that even then actions of the commissions which were arbitrary were reversible in court. But that was not enough for those who lost cases or who, for one reason or another, wanted an impending unfavorable decision delayed. So, gradually over the years, we have seen a whittling away of the powers of these commissions in providing expeditious service to the public.

Now, one of the reasons for these delays lies in the fact that the personnel force provided for these agencies has remained about the same as before the war; whereas, some of the industries regulated have doubled and trebled in size. Indeed, in the case of television, a completely new complex industry has been born, an industry in which the public has invested some 13 billions of dollars in 40 million television sets. To help us execute our duties with respect to the 4,500 standard, FM and TV stations, our Broadcast Bureau operates on a budget of approximately \$1 million with only 160 people. This simply is not an adequate force to handle the innumerable problems in this field with expedition.

Another contributing factor for delay is the recent increase in the laws providing for more "due process".

Let us see how this has come about.

Back in 1938, after Congress had set up a whole administrative pattern of independent regulatory commissions, attempts were made to break down this pattern. James Landis wrote a book entitled "The Administrative Process," in which he pointed out:

"Only a year ago (meaning 1937) a distinguished group of scholars, reporting to the President of the United States—in language hardly indicative of academic restraint—described the independent administrative agencies of the Federal Government as constituting a headless fourth branch of the Government, a haphazard deposit of irresponsible agencies and uncoordinated powers, whose institution did violence of the basic theory of the American Constitution that there should be three major branches of the Government and only three."

Although this frontal attack on independent commissions was defeated, a pincers movement succeeded some years later and resulted in the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. I believe Congress was seeking to remedy abuses which had arisen in the functioning of certain agencies within the executive departments which led primarily to this statute—not from abuses in the six agencies I am discussing.

But, even when early bills preceding the Administrative Procedure Act were being considered, there were warnings raised against attempting to remedy abuses by general legislation affecting all administra-

tive agencies. And these cautions were spoken not by partisans of the agencies themselves, but by eminent judges experienced in judicial review of administrative matters, and by members of the bar practicing before administrative agencies. For example, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, whose committees on administrative law was then headed by John Foster Dulles, put itself on record as disapproving the bills. Its report pointed out that administrative law is an intricate field encompassing numerous agencies dealing with a variety of diverse subject matters; and that no one procedure is adequate or appropriate for the handling of all these different fields.

In summation—what does all this add up to?

We have seen that Congress set a statutory course for independent commissions to follow. It established what it presumed would be a fair and qualified group of people to administer an act on a bipartisan basis. For a long time, and without interference from the executive department, it provided these commissions with adequate funds and personnel to operate effectively. It prevented the courts from interfering with the decisions of the commissions on matters of judgment by limiting the power of review to those cases in which the commission had acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

But, what has happened in recent years?

The basic intent of Congress in creating independent commissions is slowing but surely being defeated, in my opinion, by the following factors:

First. The executive department has been extending its influence upon independent commissions in a crippling manner through restricting their budget and personnel justifications before Congress—and has been encroaching upon the important functions of certain administrative agencies. In addition, the independent regulatory agencies are required to secure prior approval from the executive department before they submit to the Congress their views concerning legislation affecting their respective agencies and the laws entrusted to them by Congress. Moreover, in certain important situations, the independent agencies must secure the prior approval of the principal legal officers of the executive department in order to petition the United States Supreme Court to review court decisions made against such independent agencies.

Second. The judiciary, through restrictive and hampering interpretations of the law and requisite procedures, has hamstringed the expeditious handling of cases and has apparently indicated in certain decisions an intent to exercise its judgment in place of the Commission's. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court has had occasion in a recent case to remind the lower court that the Communications Act must be read as a whole and with appreciation of the responsibilities of the administrative body charged with its fair and efficient operation. The Court also pointed out that the growing complexity of our economy induced Congress to place regulation of businesslike communication in specialized agencies with broad powers; and that courts should be slow to interfere with the agency's conclusions when they are reconcilable with the statutory directions.

Third. And, finally, Congress itself has made it difficult for the independent commissions to function effectively. Through certain basic procedural restrictions (such as the APA) and crippling amendments of the basic statutes (1952 amendments), Congress has followed a trend of removing from members of commissions their latitude of action and exercise of discretion and judgment—which tools, I believe, are essential to a fair and expeditious handling of the complex matters with which we have to deal.

Through these three means—the intervention of the Executive, the courts, and through legislative acts themselves, it has become more and more difficult for these arms of Congress to carry out efficiently, effectively, and expeditiously the very policies which Congress itself delegated to them.

The public has a direct and vital interest in the effective functioning of the FCC. All of our actions have a direct impact on the public—from the institution of service by a new local radio or television station—right through the efficient operation of your police and fire departments, public utilities, and industrial companies through the use of radio—all the way to the rates you pay for interstate and foreign telephone and telegraph service.

It is rare, however, with the exception of public utility rate cases, that the public participates directly, or voices its opinions before the Commission. Therefore, as I see it, the Commission must itself represent the public interest in its deliberations. It must, in fact, be an affirmative defender of the public's right to the best possible communication service, in carrying out the mandate of Congress in this branch of commerce.

Currently, more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned with the declining prestige of the independent commissions and with their declining efficiency. It is interesting to note that a recent report by a House Small Business Subcommittee made five recommendations after studying the activities of independent commissions. They take a column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1957, since they are written in legal language, but basically this is what they say:

1. Authority to name the chairman of these Commissions should be placed in the Commissions themselves instead of with the Executive. For years, the ICC and Federal Trade Commission rotated the chairmanship among their members and this arrangement worked very well.

2. That these agencies should not have to clear their requests for appropriations with the Bureau of the Budget.

3. That they should not have to clear their requests for information from the industries they regulate with the Bureau of the Budget.

4. That they should not have to clear their legislative proposals with the Bureau of the Budget.

5. They should be allowed to seek Supreme Court review of lower court decisions without having to go through the Solicitor General.

Subsequent to this report, Congress appropriated \$250,000 to its House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a study of the manner in which these agencies operate.

These are the basic questions being studied by the House Committee on Legislative Oversight. But the public is not being made aware of these important matters. You'd think from reading the newspapers that all the Harris committee is doing is playing cops and robbers.

Now, I would be less than candid if I did not admit that all this adverse publicity has hurt and has interfered to some extent with our efficiency but let me tell you this. I have never seen seven harder working, more conscientious men, than now make up the FCC.

These men are all dedicated public servants. They are in their prime of life. They average 53 years of age and have an average background of 22½ years in Government service.

As you know, I was recently reapointed for another 7-year term, and it was gratifying to me—after all this adverse publicity—to find the spontaneous general acceptance by, it seems like everybody. It made me proud to be a member again.

All the present members of the FCC are proud to be members and we intend to make the people of our country proud of the FCC.

Statement by Hon. Walter H. Moeller of
Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, on this, the second time that I have been present on the floor of the House as a Member of this distinguished body, I think it fitting to give voice to a few of the sentiments which have been in my mind and heart during the past few days, sentiments which I hope and pray will color and in a sense guide my future actions as the elected Representative of the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio.

First and foremost I am deeply grateful to Almighty God for having been granted the honor and entrusted with the solemn duty of helping to guide the destiny of this great Nation in these epochal times. With His constant help I shall do my utmost to prove myself worthy of that trust and to redeem the pledge that I have given to my constituents and to the whole people of the United States.

I feel also a strong sense of obligation to the voters and indeed to all of the citizens of the 10th Ohio District. I take this moment to assure each and every one of them that my door and my heart will always be open to them. Their legitimate concerns and their problems, great or small, will come first with me, either at home or here in the Nation's Capital. I ask only that they not spare me the opportunity to serve them.

I reflect also on the high privilege of being one of the chosen few to occupy these Chambers, dignified by history, by time, by the distinguished and even illustrious Members of years past, and made even more distinguished by the spirit of generations past, present, and to come which we feel in the atmosphere about us. Without thought of sacrilege I can honestly say that it is almost as though I were experiencing a second ordination. Only my life's calling as a member of the clergy can be said to have made me feel the depth of emotion and the feeling of consecration to a holy cause which now hold me, in my head and in my heart. Pray God that this spirit will abide with me always and that I do not lose it in the days and months to come.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to trespass upon the patience of my colleagues with more than these few words. I have spoken from a full heart and I pledge that whatever I may say from this floor in the future it will always be said in the same Christian spirit and with the same respect for truth and for the rights and feelings of my colleagues, my constituents, and the whole of humanity of whatever color or creed.

Omnipotent State No Guarantee of
Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, in an informative and well-reasoned article appearing recently in the Cincinnati Enquirer, sets forth in no uncertain terms that the omnipotent state is no guarantee of security. I feel that the Members of the House and Senate should have the benefit of his observations at the beginning of this 86th Congress.

The article follows:

OMNIPOTENT STATE NO GUARANTEE OF
SECURITY

A monthly investment letter circulated by Cincinnati's Westheimer & Co., expressed the opinion that regardless of any definitions given the words "Republican" and "Democrat," the last elections indicated no return to orthodox economics or fiscal sanity in the next year.

"We can expect to live," the letter states, "with a hybrid capitalism in which high taxes, unbalanced budgets, unrestricted labor unionism, rising production costs, and mounting farm surpluses, will be considered normal and continuing."

This view is shared by a startling number of people who are trying to be realistic, but they are not shared by those of us who see in the rising ground swell of public resentment against brink-of-war headlines; against staggering deficits; broken promises; labor racketeering; confiscatory taxation; destruction of small business; and unparalleled industrial greed—the deeper interest that exists in any proposal which could lessen these evils.

It is true that much of this interest is generated by fear, but most of the greatest reforms in history were born of fear. Today people know that a dollar that loses 50 percent of its value in 20 years, can lose more of its value every year under present inflationary trends. They are waking up also to the mounting threat of monopoly power building up in the huge chainstore systems, in colossal corporate combines, power-crazed labor unions, and overcentralized Government.

In meeting this challenge, I think our first big job is to prove that the omnipotent state is absolutely impotent when it comes to guaranteeing the freedom and security of the individual. Consider that 40 million people last year received checks paid out of tax money, with more than \$11 billion going to Federal employees alone, yet all this outpouring of money didn't contribute a dime's worth of economic freedom or political liberty—to the future.

Alfred Friendly, editor of the Washington Post, put it in a nutshell when he said: "Never has an older generation had less valuable counsel to offer a younger one."

Like the Soviet Union, our whole effort, our whole life is being mobilized for military and industrial goals, and like the Soviets, we find justification for whatever loss of individual independence that may incur. This emphasis on mass production geared to militarism; on mass distribution; mass communication; mass unionism and mass government, is the direct opposite philosophy to the emphasis on self-reliance and independent enterprise which made our country great.

It would, therefore, seem unarguable, that our second or "twin" obligation is to set in motion any force that encourages the development of an economic climate in which all persons of sound mind and body are provided a fair chance to create their own security.

According to the dictionary, capitalism is a system that "concentrates wealth and power in the hands of the few," which, of course, dooms the system. So, how else can we preserve the system and perpetuate it except through the widest possible independent ownership of farm, home, and business enterprise (wherever practical and possible), with local control over local affairs in government?

When capitalists (which includes anyone who owns anything privately) understand thoroughly this Jeffersonian approach to economic freedom and political liberty, the "power groups" who are mopping up in the corporate field, in banking, and in the labor movement, will be turned back. No other objective is more important in the New Year that lies ahead.

A Word About Charley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is fitting for me as the Representative of the congressional district in which Charles F. Kettering was born and reared, to speak a few words today in his memory and to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial about his life and works.

Incidentally, this editorial was written by one of my good friends, Ken Woodman, who has captured some of the spirit of Mr. Kettering in this eulogy.

In some respects, it is superfluous for me to try to add to the fame and name of Charles F. Kettering, for his was a unique genius which manifested itself in countless ways for the benefit of our industrial economy and, in fact, for the whole world. For decades, the name of Charles Kettering has been known internationally for his management skill, his inventive and creative mind, for his many philanthropies, and for his humanitarianism.

The folks in our area, who remember him as a youngster, still refer to him as a "queer duck," for his genius, even in his youth, led him to make experiments and to wear his clothes and to act in ways that caused others to smile. They did not realize, and perhaps did not appreciate, the workings of his marvelous mind in those days. But, of course, as he became famous, they understood why he had seemed to be eccentric to them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the November 26, 1958, issue of the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal:

A WORD ABOUT CHARLEY

(By Ken Woodman)

The trouble with Charley was he believed a person could do almost anything he set his mind to.

Just because a rule said something wouldn't work, didn't mean there wasn't a

way to make it work. You just had to find a new way.

Another trouble with Charley was he wouldn't hurry.

He had weak eyes and he suffered from splitting headaches but he figured if he took his time that wouldn't prevent his studying. He was kind of slow in school but he plugged along until he had enough training to be a schoolteacher. On the side he studied Greek. By the time he was 28 he managed to graduate from Ohio State University.

Charley was born on a farm near Loudonville. There were no IQ tests in those days to warn that Charley had a mind that was something special. He was just a lad with a slow way, a big sense of humor, and curiosity you couldn't crush.

While teaching school he spent evenings hanging around a drugstore, tinkering with chemicals and electricity.

That was another thing about Charley. He loved to tinker.

His headaches forced him temporarily out of Ohio State at the end of his sophomore year. He got a job with a telephone company and started tinkering and ignoring rules and came up with a central battery system that took the resistance out of old-time phone lines.

The National Cash Register Co. heard about this and invited him to come with it as an inventor after he left Ohio State University.

Well, Charley said, "Let's get rid of that crank." And he did. Within 5 years he had produced the first electric cash register and a complex accounting machine.

Of course, he had to do a little tinkering on the side. He did it in a hayloft with a couple of other fellows and they figured out a way to improve auto ignition systems. Cadillac Motor Co. showed interest and in his own good time Charley came up with the first self-starter for automobiles.

United Motors, which later was to become General Motors, bought out Charley's hayloft project for \$9 million, which was quite a chunk for a Loudonville farm boy in those days.

Charley sort of sold himself along with the deal—but on condition that he be permitted to do his own tinkering. In his deliberate way it wasn't long before he had devised the Delco-Light farm ignition plant which brought electric lights to thousands of rural areas which had depended on kerosene lamps and lanterns for a generation.

Then Charley got to putting around with electric refrigerators, trying to make them better. That meant he had to look into chemistry a bit. Before you could say, "What have refrigerators got to do with automobiles?" Charley's chemical tinkering had produced the first ethyl gasoline to take the knock out of motors. He had the help of a young engineer named Thomas Midgley on this.

Charley was now a big wheel with General Motors. He bought a yacht. The "durn" diesel motor didn't work right. Charley got to tinkering with it and came up with ideas that made GM a leader in the diesel engine field.

Every once in a while Charley would come back to Loudonville and Ashland. He would put up the money for a hospital or a college building—provided others dug in and worked a little bit too. He liked to talk with old friends.

He built himself a summer home near Loudonville overlooking the beautiful rolling country which he called Ohio's Alps. He had a private plane in which he flew up from Dayton and which he complained cost too much money.

He served on a score of boards of directors for industry and colleges. He kept right on taking ideas that wouldn't work and making them work until he had an almost uncounted list of useful inventions to his credit.

Charley took sick Sunday at his home in Dayton. It was the end.

Everywhere typewriters flew into action hailing the stupendous accomplishments of Charles Franklin Kettering, known more familiarly as "Boss Ket."

Charley would have chuckled good-naturedly at that. It would have been just like him to say, "Don't those fellows have anything better to write about?"

He once inaugurated a complicated telephone system with the jest: "Well, I guess she's gonna work." Which, when you come to think of it, was a much profounder and more practical speech than most inaugurals.

That was the thing about Charley. He had a way of seeing through the shell to the meat of the nut.

Charley was one of the greatest geniuses of our times and it didn't faze him one bit. God rest his wondrous soul.

Reduction of Premium Rates for FHA Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since February of 1955 I have had legislation before the House of Representatives providing for a reduction of the premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing to one-fourth of 1 percent.

In June 1955 the Housing and Home Finance Agency reported unfavorably on my bill, H.R. 4443 to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and again in August of 1957 the Agency recommended that the bill, H.R. 8674 not be enacted.

At that time I had pointed out that it was obvious that the 213 cooperatives were in serious financial difficulty because of circumstances over which they had absolutely no control. Section 213 of the Housing Act was originally designed to alleviate critical shortage of housing for the middle income group—to fill the gap between public housing for the low income group and private homes and luxury apartments for the higher income group.

Unfortunately, inflation has also affected the operation of the 213's. Heavy increases in carrying charges have occurred over the years, and these increases have forced many of the tenant-stockholders, most of whom are veterans, to vacate their apartments because of their inability to meet such increased charges. There have been practically no foreclosures of section 213 cooperatives and thus the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums has not been touched. Section 213 cooperatives have proven to be excellent insurance risks in the past, and there is no reason to believe that this condition will not continue in the future. These people are entitled to every possible consideration, and a reduction in the mortgage insurance premiums would be a tremendous help to the tenant-stockholders.

I am reintroducing this bill in the House again today. Several years have

elapsed since there has been anything done and it would be particularly bad to keep accumulating this money when it would give many people who need the help, the benefit of it.

I am very happy to see that the Committee on Banking and Currency has just announced that it would now be in favor of such a reduction in the FHA insurance premium, and agrees with my efforts to reduce the premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. The committee has stated that the FHA now has reserves more than ample to weather a real estate crisis even as serious as the great depression.

Such a position by the committee certainly would indicate that we can finally look forward to some favorable action by the Congress on this legislation which I have been advocating for the last 4 years.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this legislation promptly so that we can correct a basic inequity and thus discharge our obligations and responsibilities to the people.

He's Spent 50 Years in Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, in July of last year, Mr. George Washington Weaver marked 50 years of outstanding service with the postal service in Denton, Tex. He is deserving of recognition for his fine and long record of service. On July 7, 1958, the Denton Record-Chronicle, in an article written by Mr. Jim Neal, recognized Mr. Weaver's half century of service to the citizens of Denton. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article paying tribute to Mr. Weaver's postal service. It follows:

HE'S SPENT 50 YEARS IN POST OFFICE

(By Jim Neal)

Half a century of service to Denton residents and to students of what's now TWU.

That's what George Washington Weaver of 305 West Sycamore passed Sunday. The superintendent of the Denton Post Office's TWU substation, he's spent 50 years helping Dentonites and university students get their mail on time.

To celebrate the occasion, which falls on the 75th anniversary year of the Nation's civil service, Weaver's fellow civil-service employees gave him a surprise party today in the Denton headquarters of the region 5 Federal Civil Defense Administration office. Both the FCDA and the TWU substation are housed in the same building.

When he was invited upstairs for a cup of coffee, Weaver was busy trying to clean up some work so he could take some annual leave. He said later he thought it was odd that he should be invited upstairs for coffee when the TWU pub snack bar is located in the basement of the building with the substation. He had no inkling of the surprise party.

Questioned about his early days in the Denton Post Office, Weaver recalled that in

1908, all the mail coming to Denton was brought from the train station to the post office in a wheelbarrow.

"It took just two loads, one incoming and one outgoing," he said. On an average day in 1958, the Denton Post Office gets in about 250 sacks of mail and sends out about the same amount.

During his 50 years in the Denton Post Office, he's seldom missed work because of illness. He said he had accumulated a total of 1,700 hours of sick leave during that time.

Asked about his future plans, he said he just didn't know. "I have several propositions in mind. But one thing's for sure—I'm not planning to retire at the moment. There's a bill before Congress now that may allow postal employees to get paid for unused sick leave. I don't intend to quit till I know what they're going to do with that bill." Weaver chuckled.

LETTER

At the informal surprise party, Weaver was given a letter of congratulations and appreciation for his cooperation with the FCDA. The letter was signed by FCDA Regional Administrator Welcome W. Wilson.

Now 68, Weaver was 18 when he was employed as a substitute mail carrier by the Denton Post Office on July 6, 1908. Before the year was out, he had become a full-fledged carrier, a position he held until 1916 when he became a postal clerk.

In 1918 he went into the Army, but the armistice was declared before he got overseas, and he was back at his old duties in the Denton Post Office within 3 months. In 1925 he was appointed a special clerk, and 2 years later he was assistant postmaster.

During his 50 years with post office, Weaver served under seven postmasters, including John B. Schmitz, A. L. Banks, Howard Fenton, C. A. Scott, B. W. McKinzie, Ray Bishop, and M. D. Penry, the present postmaster.

"The Post Office Department considers Weaver one of its topflight men," Penry said. "He's about the only postal employee I know in Denton who's ever received a grade of 100 percent on a post-office inspection."

It was in 1934 that he was appointed station superintendent of the TSCW (now TWU) substation. He's been there ever since.

And according to students and faculty members, he's made a success in the position. The students, for example, dedicated their 1950 yearbook to him.

It came as no surprise to anyone that the students thought so much of Weaver. During the 24 years he's been there, he's helped Tessies with a number of problems—including the searching out of postage stamps whose colors won't clash with the students' specially hued stationery.

It was also Weaver who took care of another problem at the TSCW substation several years ago. When a letter from a lonesome Texas A. & M. student arrived bearing the address, "To Just Any Tessie," Weaver personally took charge of delivery.

The result led to wedding bells.

Review of U.S. Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John W. Vandercook, ABC commentator, has some constructive thoughts regarding improvement of our unemployment insurance law.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his article as follows:

VANDERCOOK SAYS

Twenty years have now passed since the legislative act establishing U.S. employment insurance became more or less operative. Twenty years and a couple of wars, a couple of booms, and several recessions later, we can now gain an intelligent perspective on that vitally important law—or, rather, hodgepodge group of laws.

What has been the most remarkable result of our having established an unemployment compensation system has been the truly phenomenal effect it has had on the stability of the whole American economy. Unemployment compensation was intended to lessen misfortune's load on the shoulders of individuals who had lost their jobs.

No one, until the 1957-58 recession, had imagined how astonishingly the distribution of jobless compensation checks would lessen the recession's impact upon the whole economy.

Yet, at the human, private level, experience has taught us that the present scale of unemployment benefits, in almost all States, is grossly inadequate, both in amount and in duration.

But one major fault stands out in the operation of our unemployment insurance program.

With the best of intentions, it was established that companies with good records for steadily maintained employment—to put it simply—were to get back most of the sums they had paid into unemployment insurance funds.

In the light of 20 years of practice, there's now reason to think that maintained employment in any given firm is not so much a proof of virtue as it is an accident of the economy; that perhaps we have been recklessly open-handed in rewarding corporations for circumstances over which they turned out—under the pressure of harder times—not to have as much control as they pretended.

More money, obviously, has to go into the unemployment pot. More of it, the next Congress may decide, will therefore have to come from previously favored companies.

Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State for the year 1959. This program, which undoubtedly will be of particular interest to similar groups throughout the country, was adopted at a meeting of the organization's State executive committee on December 27, 1958. The Honorable Harold R. Moskowitz, State president of the organization, presided. Following is the text of legislative program:

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., FOR 1959, ADOPTED AT A STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING ON DECEMBER 27, 1958

This legislative program will be introduced in the 1959 State legislature by their mem-

bers, of which there are 17 in the State senate and 31 in the State assembly.

The Affiliated Young Democrats pledge ourselves to devote every effort to the enactment of the following program. We have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position on the vital issues, and we do so now.

1. Reapportionment: We support the enactment of legislation reapportioning both congressional and legislative seats in fair proportion to population, so that all segments of our State may be fairly represented both in Albany and in Washington. Only by such reapportionment can the popular will be effected.

2. Primary elections: The Democratic Party is irrevocably committed to the proposition that government belongs to the people, and that the people should have the fullest possible participation in the selection of those who fill high public office. The State of New York is today one of the few States in which candidates for U.S. Senator, Governor, and other offices filled by statewide election are not selected in primaries. The confusion which has existed with respect to the selection this year of a candidate for U.S. Senator demonstrates the wisdom and need for selecting the candidates for such offices in primary elections. We advocate the speedy passage of legislation permitting statewide primaries.

3. Presidential primaries: 2 years hence the Democratic Party will surely have the responsibility for selecting the next President of the United States. The Democratic voters in the State of New York under present law will be one of the few segments of our party who will be unable to participate directly in that process of selection. We support the enactment of legislation permitting presidential preference primaries permitting the voters in each party to indicate their preference for candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and to elect delegates committed to the nomination of such candidates.

4. Presidential vote: We favor the abolition of the electoral college and the election of a President and Vice President by popular vote. Pending such amendment to the Federal Constitution, and in order to achieve an equitable division of the electoral vote, we urge the enactment of legislation at Albany permitting the allocation of the State's electoral vote among the candidates for President and Vice President in direct proportion to the popular vote.

5. Voting machines: We favor the mandatory use of voting machines in all primary elections in which there is a contest.

6. State offices: We favor a clarification of the law so as to eliminate any question of the power of the Governor to fill vacancies in the office of attorney general or in any other State office.

7. Lieutenant Governor: We favor revision of the State constitution so that separate votes may be cast for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and to permit a vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor to be filled at next election following the vacancy.

8. Eighteen-year-old vote: We again urge that the right to vote be given to those 18 years of age.

9. Election laws: We favor the establishment of a permanent spring primary, the mandatory direct election of district leaders, and simplification of election petition procedure.

10. Board of elections: We favor a revision of the manner in which the board of elections of the city of New York is constituted, so that its members will be selected on a nonpartisan basis, and so that residents of Queens, the Bronx, and Staten Island may be eligible for membership.

11. Board of regents: We urge that the selection of the board of regents be placed on a nonpartisan basis, so that all segments of

the population may be represented in the educational system of the State.

12. City income tax: We favor the abolition of all legislative authority permitting the imposition of an income tax by the city of New York or any other municipality.

13. Court reorganization and simplification: We favor a continuation of the program for court reform, and intensified efforts to bring about its enactment.

14. Family court: We favor the establishment of a family court in the city of New York and in other communities throughout the State so that all actions relating to the family will be centralized in a single court with adequate resources and judges of special competence and qualifications.

15. Education: We favor a substantial increase in State aid for education so that the city of New York and other municipalities will receive a fair share of the taxes paid by their residents, thus enabling them to meet the enormous shortages in adequate school facilities and teaching staff.

16. New York City Charter Commission: We urge the passage of enabling legislation permitting the appointment of a New York City Charter Commission which can submit its recommendations directly to the people.

17. Discrimination in housing: We support a bill to extend the ban on racial discrimination in housing to all multiple dwellings and to one or two family houses throughout the State.

18. Child care: We advocate a program of State aid for child day care in the public schools.

19. Rent control: We favor the extension of rent control throughout the State, and to strengthen the law by requiring landlords to provide services and maintenance equal to that provided in 1951.

20. Subway fare: We favor maintenance of the present 15-cent subway fare by requiring the State to contribute its fair share to the cost of operating the subway system.

21. Fair Sabbath law: We favor the enactment of a law permitting the city of New York to enact a fair Sabbath law. We further favor and support a policy of permitting the city of New York home rule, and ceasing efforts to govern the city from Albany.

22. Legislature: We again advocate that a printed record be published and made available to the public of the full proceedings of the legislature, including the names of all persons employed in the legislative establishment and the amount of compensation received by them, so that the public may be fully informed of what goes on in Albany and so that the abuses recently disclosed may be eliminated.

23. State taxes: We favor a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatible with a solvent State government.

24. Public health: We advocate encouragement of prepayment plans for meeting the cost of medical care, by giving aid to sound voluntary plans now in existence, and stimulating the development of new plans; the development of centers for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; a program of State aid for the training of medical and nursing personnel to meet the shortage of physicians, nurses, and technicians; establishment of State programs for the care of the chronically ill; and expansion of the State's facilities for the mentally ill.

25. Securities dealers: We believe that persons engaged in the investment of other people's money should demonstrate affirmatively their qualifications for such responsibility by examination, and to this end we advocate the establishment of a State licensing system for securities dealers and investment advisers.

26. Juvenile delinquency: We favor vigorous continuation of the programs to combat juvenile delinquency. The State's facilities for the handling of delinquent boys and

girls must be expanded, and additional funds must be made available for the probation bureaus of the criminal courts. State aid should be made available for the so-called 600 schools. We also favor an expanded rehabilitation program for young people in correctional institutions.

27. Motorists: We support the exclusive allocation of funds collected from gasoline taxes and motor-vehicle licenses to the development of the State highway system. We also support an extension of the gasoline tax to industrial users of gasoline to the same extent that it is now imposed on motorists. We favor examinations of all motor-vehicle operators to be given every 3 years to help curtail automobile accidents.

28. Science colleges: Urge a new State science college be built to meet the new advances in science.

Address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks I include a very informative address made by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the U.S. Army, at the opening ceremonies, solar furnace dedication, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command at Natick, Mass., on September 30, 1958.

The address follows:

Today we gather here in Natick, Mass., to dedicate a great solar furnace marking another step in man's attempt to provide new sources of power and energy for his betterment. This, along with similar efforts being made elsewhere, should teach us eventually how to harness the unlimited energy of the sun for mankind's use.

The worship of the sun by the ancients and by many peoples even today in outlying areas of the world is well known to all of us. The essentiality of its life-giving heat and light have been known to men of all ages. In the fifth dynasty of ancient Egypt, as early as the year 2500 B.C., its capital was called Heliopolis and the god it worshipped, peculiar as it may seem, was named Atum Re. The existence of this fact when associated with the brilliance of atomic explosions today is indeed one of interest, if not significance.

If we search through the history of man's development we can pick out many, but particularly several significant steps in increasing his power beyond that provided by his own muscles. The lever, the wheel, the use of draft animals, development of hydraulic power from the natural fall of streams, the development of the steam engine, the employment of electricity, and the extensive development and use of internal combustion engines and fossil fuels mark but seven of these steps.

Today we are faced with many more possibilities as mankind approaches new thresholds in scientific achievement. The employment of the atom for peaceful purposes to provide nuclear power is well underway. A companion development, using fusion instead of fission, seems likely within the foreseeable future. The scientific investigation of further energy developments through the use of chemical, thermal,

electromagnetic, and thermal-ionic sources is proceeding apace. The harnessing of the energy available from the heat in the bowels of the earth and the movement of the sea from wind and tide is still to be accomplished but the massive amounts of energy available therein will undoubtedly be utilized to some greater degree in the coming decades and centuries.

In the sun, in particular, we have an obvious source of tremendous energy and most of us are convinced that substantial amounts can be harnessed for mankind's use.

The need for a breakthrough into new sources of energy other than those obtainable from fossil, hydraulic, and hydrocarbon sources is readily apparent. With each passing year, the world's reserve of economically recoverable fuels is being depleted at an ever-increasing rate. Estimates have been made that maximum production of oil and gas in the United States may quite likely be reached by 1970 and that coal production in this country will peak prior to 1990. With the projected increase in our energy requirements and consumption by the turn of the century to 10 times what it is today, we are faced with a very disturbing prospect. Other nations of the world face similar problems to varying degrees. It is estimated that all fossil fuels will be exhausted within 100 years and, while such estimates are usually pessimistic, it still points up our need to develop the vast energy sources existing in the sun and the sea and the earth. Even with respect to uranium and other fissionable materials, it is estimated that within the next century projected population increases and pyramiding power requirements may consume practically all of these materials that can be made economically useful.

We have reached, therefore, in this solar furnace being dedicated here today, another milestone in man's effort to advance himself and his progeny. While this furnace has been placed here for specific purposes in connection with military uses, it need not be confined to such uses and it is my hope that it will be utilized to the maximum extent practicable for the advancement of American science and industry as well as in the interests of national defense.

This furnace will stand as a monument not only to American science and technology, but to the Army and its Quartermaster Corps which has had the vision to proceed with this important project. The value of military developments to our people as a whole is well known. The acceleration of development in the motor industry, in the aircraft industry, and in the electronics industry, including radio, television, and radar, has been a product of military necessity in earlier conflicts. Many great medical advances, including the advanced surgery of today, are also a result of military necessity. Many of the developments we are seeking today will have similar impacts on our health, economy, and way of life in the future. Two developments for which we can pay tribute to the Quartermaster Corps today are the food irradiation plant which is underway on the Pacific coast and will provide new knowledge and new techniques to our food industry as well as to the military in the handling of produce from our great agricultural resources and this solar furnace here on the Atlantic seaboard which we have the privilege of seeing unveiled today.

I am pleased that this will also serve as a focal point for those of you in science and technology who have joined us here today and who will have further deliberations regarding the important subject of solar energy during the next 2 days. I hope that you will be encouraged by our efforts here to stimulate further activity in the field of solar energy.

So while this solar furnace marks a goal, its real measure may be in its service as a

stimulus for greater breakthroughs and achievements in widely different scientific fields.

In these perilous days with our survival at stake, we need a greater sense of urgency and boldness to overcome the complacency and fear so prevalent in many circles. Accustomed as we are to the comforts and blessings we enjoy, we fail to gauge the thinness of the veneer that bonds our own civilization to the struggling mass of mankind. The cracks in the highly polished surface are widening as the stirring demands and promises of demagogues generate explosive temperatures beneath the surface.

In all the fields of science and technology we need to make vast and rapid strides as time is not on our side. The release of dangerous pressures by enlightened management of human relations and substantial improvement toward a better distribution of food and other basic essentials for sustaining life more adequately among the suffering masses of mankind is certainly as vital as the production of destructive devices in this critical period. The harnessing of the God-given rays of the sun offer great hope that in the social sciences as well as in the physical sciences we may be looking to new horizons.

I believe that one of the greatest advances in this regard will occur shortly when we attain a real capability to convert the salt water of the sea to pure water usable to meet human requirements and, particularly, to develop the wasteland on much of the world's surface to a point where it can produce the food essential to sustain the world's rapidly expanding population. The recovery of the great mineral wealth available in the oceans will not only be of real value toward meeting our industrial requirements, but will also greatly offset the cost of converting and distributing the waters of the seven seas to a thirsting and hungry mankind in the arid land areas of the world.

I am honored to be here today and to have this small part to play in the dedication of the Army's first solar furnace. May it serve America well.

Thank you very much.

"Theodore Roosevelt"—An Address by Judge Filbert L. Rosenstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the year 1958 marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Among the personal friends and admirers of the great Teddy is former judge and Rotary governor, Filbert L. Rosenstein, of my home city of Paterson, N.J. Late last year Judge Rosenstein made seven addresses before Rotary clubs in connection with the Roosevelt centennial year, one of them before the New York Rotary Club, the members of which gave him a rising ovation of several minutes. After this address, the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, who was present, called the address one of the most magnificent he had ever heard.

"I was thrilled both by its content and manner of presentation," he said. Mr. Peale went on to say that "Theodore

Roosevelt was and is the great political ideal of my life."

Judge Rosenstein in his New York speech spoke as follows:

Theodore Roosevelt was born 100 years ago, on October 27, 1858. In that year, human slavery was still lawful in this land of liberty. But before he was 7 years old, it had been forever abolished. Thus, his earliest years beheld the striking of a mighty blow at the then free enterprise system—a system by which some men—white in color—were free to keep in slavery certain other men—black in color. Undoubtedly, this experience left a deep impress upon the future social and industrial reformer.

Of this career of reformer, however, his earliest years gave little forecast. For Theodore Roosevelt was born into the conservative family of a merchant-banker of New York City. Moreover, he was sickly as a child and timid, nervous and short-sighted as a boy. But, in his 14th year, he resolved to have a strong body, and so, he took up boxing, and later, wrestling and horseback riding, with the result that, in manhood, he was able to live that strenuous life which he constantly preached "Better to wear out than to rust out."

The timid, nervous boy also grew into the fearless man. Thus, while living the life of a ranchman in the Dakotas, he personally brought in two horse thieves. At the age of 39, he served as a volunteer in the Spanish-American War. In 1909, he went to Africa to hunt big game. In October of 1912, as he left his hotel in Milwaukee, during his campaign for President, he was shot pointblank. His friends entreated him to go to the hospital. He refused, because he was scheduled to make a speech. And make it he did. Only after he concluded, did he go to the hospital. In 1913, he went to Brazil to explore the jungle. There he discovered the River of Doubt and almost lost his life because of jungle fever. At the age of 58, he offered to raise and lead a division in France in World War I.

Roosevelt was not only a man of action, but also a man of intellect. While at Harvard, he was a member of the boxing team and of Phi Beta Kappa, national college scholastic society. He was both an omnivorous reader and an author of note. Shortly after graduation from college, he published his "Naval History of the War of 1812" and later, "The Winning of the West." And, yet this omnivorous reader and author was that same soldier who faced fire in the field in Cuba. And this soldier, in turn, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1905 for having successfully mediated the Russo-Japanese War.

He was a born preacher. As he himself said, "My problems are moral problems, and my teaching has been plain morality." He wrapped up his whole political and social philosophy in a moral phrase—the square deal. He thundered against race suicide, corruption in government, waste of natural resources, and monopoly and greed in industry.

Yet, moralist though he was, he was always marked by a strong sense of reality. Thus, in 1897, he wrote of Russia, that, if she "chooses to develop purely on her own lines and to resist the growth of liberalism . . . she will sometime experience a red terror which will make the French revolution pale." Twenty years later came the Bolshevik Revolution to turn prophecy into reality.

However, with it all—moralist and realist that he was—he was always intensely human, a devoted family man, a man of many sides, gay and warm, full of the zest of life. Theodore Roosevelt was a composite of morality, reality, virility.

He was still a young man when he entered public life. He was only 23 years old when

he was elected to the Assembly of his native New York. There, he soon attracted statewide attention by his independence and courage. Then, in 1884, in his third year in the assembly, tragedy struck him a double blow—his mother and his wife both died on the same day. Grief-stricken, he left politics and went out to the Dakotas, to live the life of a ranchman.

Two years later he returned to New York City to run for mayor, but he was defeated. In 1889, President Harrison appointed him to the United States Civil Service Commission. In 1895 he returned to New York City to serve as president of the police commission, and did much to improve a force suffering from corruption by saloonkeepers, gamblers, and prostitutes. Frequently, at midnight, the tireless police commissioner would prowling the streets of the great city to make certain that his patrolmen were on their beats.

In 1897, President McKinley named him Assistant Secretary of the Navy. With the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, he resigned in order to raise and lead the famous Regiment of Rough Riders.

Upon his return home, he was a national hero, and, in the fall of 1898, he was elected Governor of New York. In 1900, he was elected Vice President of the United States. In September of 1901, after only 6 months in that office, he became upon the assassination of William B. McKinley, President. He was only 42 years old, and he was at the top—the youngest President the United States has ever had.

The country, which had always respected him for his sincerity and independence in public life, soon came to respect him even more for his readiness to fight powerful forces opposed to the public good. And the country, which had always admired the pluck that had turned a sickly child into a vigorous man, now came to love him for his humanness. He showed himself equally at home with prizefighters and authors, cowboys and Phi Beta Kappa men, industrialists and labor leaders, military men, and statesmen. People were delighted with the President who led panting diplomats on long walks over the rocks and hills and through the fields around Washington. They were fascinated by a President who ordered Army officers on 50-mile horseback rides, because he thought they were out of condition, and then, when they grumbled, went on a 100-mile horseback ride himself.

And then, too, he was so colorful in his speech. When pleased, he was "dee-lighted." Any achievement was "bully." He created his own club, the Ananias Club, and elected to it those whom he meant thereby to call liars. He scorned alike, muckrakers, mollycoddles, and malefactors of great wealth.

When Roosevelt came to the Presidency in 1901, the country was facing, even as it is today, a time of great change and perplexity. However, the country was not long in learning that, in him, it had a leader who led.

At home, our natural resources were being dissipated at an alarming rate. Immediately he threw himself into the battle to stop exploitation of our mineral and timber resources and our waterpower. So hard and so successfully did he fight, that, when he left the White House, conservation of natural resources was a firmly fixed national policy.

An even greater domestic problem was the rise of great and powerful monopolies and the feeling of angry frustration on the part of labor. Roosevelt had entered public life as a conservative. But, soon after he finished his term as Civil Service Commissioner, he realized that mere improvement in political conditions by the removal of corruption from Government was not enough. For now he began to sense that all labor was crushable and in need of protection. Moreover,

business had become so powerful that laws were needed additionally against unfair competition, monopoly, and restraint of trade. And, noting that such regulation and control of corporations could not be done effectively by the States, because the very corporations that needed regulation all did business across State lines, he urged that the Federal Government must undertake the required regulation.

Almost immediately upon becoming President, Roosevelt embarked upon his crusade for social and industrial justice, and when he left the Presidency, he had completed a historic readjustment in the relation of government and industry. He instituted the first successful suit to break up a monopoly and went on to earn for himself the title "Trustbuster." In the fall of 1902, he entered a bitter, long-drawn-out coal strike, that was threatening the Nation with disaster, and forced a settlement. And this was at a time when the Federal Government had no recognized general authority to intervene in labor disputes.

During his 7½ years as President, he secured passage by Congress, often over great opposition, of many laws regulating industry. These included the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor, with a Bureau within it to investigate the operation and conduct of corporations; the Hepburn rate bill, which gave the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix the rates that railroads could charge; a Federal employer's liability law; a Federal meat inspection law; pure food laws and a District of Columbia child labor law.

By his acts and pronouncements as President and by his later preachments as ex-President, Theodore Roosevelt, because of his deep hold upon large segments of the population, largely prepared the way for the New Deal. Thus, in 1910, he said, "I stand for the square deal. But I mean not merely that I stand for fair play under the present rules of the game, but that I stand for having those rules changed so as to work for a more substantial equality of opportunity and reward." He advocated, in 1910, an income tax and an inheritance tax. He advocated price control in extreme cases of regulating corporations, such control to be similar to that of the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroad rates. In the Progressive Party platform of 1912, he advocated insurance against the hazards of old age—what we now call social security. For years, he favored collective bargaining for labor.

Theodore Roosevelt was not only the father of the Square Deal—he was also the grandfather of the New Deal.

On the international scene, the country was likewise facing change and perplexity. Long before most of his countrymen, Roosevelt realized clearly that the day of isolationism was gone forever. Accordingly, he emphatically preached preparedness. He more than doubled the U.S. Navy and sent the battle fleet around the world. No other fleet of like size had ever done it before. He thoroughly reorganized the Army and created the general staff. He settled the Alaska boundary dispute. He built the Panama Canal.

Theodore Roosevelt was only 60 years old, when, weakened by the fevers of Cuba and Brazil and the bullet in Milwaukee, worn by a lifetime of strenuous exertion, and weighed down by grief over the recent death of his youngest son, Quentin, in aerial combat in World War I, he died in the dark hours of the early morning of January 6, 1919.

And now, in this, the centennial year of his birth, we bring our tribute to the memory of this great and gallant American, even as we draw inspiration from his memory for our own times.

If we wish the strength to overcome the perils we face, let us follow his example of

subordinating personal interest to service for the common welfare. The challenge he flung to his own generation is still valid in ours. Practical efficiency is common and lofty idealism not uncommon; it is the combination which is necessary and the combination is rare.

If we are distressed by the treatment of the Negro in some parts of our country today, let us recall his act in inviting Booker T. Washington to the White House. It was the first time a Negro had ever dined there other than as a menial. The South fulminated with rage. But the moral of Negro equality had been pointedly and eloquently preached to the Nation by the President of the United States.

If labor's right to collective bargaining is now firmly secured and, if industry is largely regulated by the national Government, as he desired, let us remember that he was also firmly opposed to carrying the reforms to the extreme of socialism. It is not the affair of the Government to run industry, he said, but only to see that it is run in the interest of all the people. Against his strong opposition to government by a plutocracy, he set up the counterweight of equally strong opposition to government by the mob.

If we seek guidance in the conduct of our foreign affairs, let us remember his admonition to "speak softly and carry a big stick". And never forget his passionate Americanism. In his day, he lashed out against hyphenates with their dual loyalties. Today it is not a matter of hyphenates in the literal sense that it was in his day. In certain American Communists and their sympathizers, we have people today, who are ready to advance the interests of Soviet Russia over those of America. We quarrel with no man over a difference of opinion. But we do demand of them, as we demand of every American citizen: One Nation, one flag, one language, one loyalty.

And lastly, let us follow his example of sublime courage. This is not the first time America has faced a crisis. Indeed, there have been times in the past, when our country was far weaker than she is today. And yet she triumphed, for she faced those other crises with courage, and courage is faith—faith in ourselves and faith in our destiny. And our destiny was marked with brilliance at the very birth of the Nation, for, when this Nation was brought forth, it was brought forth in a pattern that was to be a pattern of freedom for all nations, because it was a pattern wherein the rulers are selected for prescribed terms in free elections by majority vote of all the people.

Let us, then, take heart from the flaming words in which Theodore Roosevelt left to America a lasting testament of faith: "We know there are dangers ahead, as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but, stout of heart, we see, across the dangers, the great future that lies beyond, and we rejoice, as a giant refreshed, as a strong man girt for the race. The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. There are in store for our people and for the causes we uphold grander triumphs than have ever yet been recorded."

Send that message to the men in the Kremlin and bid them make the most of it.

Bombing Lawlessness Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, the opening day

of the 86th Congress, I introduced my first bill of the new session. It is a bill calling for the most severe penalties for anyone bombing or attempting to bomb a house of worship, a school, a community center, or any other public building. I consider the recent wave of bomb terrorism a most serious situation which we cannot afford to tolerate, and for this reason, I feel we should adopt the most stringent means to prevent and to stop such terrorism in the future.

In October of 1958, when this wave of bombings of churches, synagogues, and schools began, I announced that I would have a bill ready for introduction at the beginning of the 86th Congress which would provide severe punishment for such crimes. The bill I introduced, if enacted into law, would amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to crimes and criminal procedures by adding a new section to chapter 39 which would provide for the following:

Whoever uses, or attempts to use, an explosive which has been imported into the United States, or which has been introduced, delivered for introduction, or transported in commerce, to damage or destroy a church, synagogue, school, community center, or other public building without the consent of the owner thereof shall be punished by imprisonment of not less than 20 years or by death.

The United States is the showcase of the world. The means of communication are such today that what we do here, good or bad, is reflected all over the world. If a synagogue or a church is bombed in any State of the Union, the criticism is directed not against the particular State for its refusal to abide by the law of the land but against the United States as a whole.

Dictators and tyrants all over the world use the incident to justify their own misdeeds, while the Communists play it up as a breakdown in law enforcement in America, as hypocrisy and insincerity toward freedom of religion, and as a clear demonstration that we are not to be trusted with the moral leadership of the world.

Recognizing the fact that one of the major differences between communism and the free world is over the issue of religion, we cannot afford to weaken our cause as the chief advocate of freedom of worship by failing to take all necessary precautions to prevent all such incidents in our own country.

While most crimes of this nature can be prevented or discouraged by long prison sentences, the right of the courts to impose the death penalty whenever warranted will act as a strong deterrent when dealing with fanatics and otherwise distorted individuals who are perfectly sane in the eyes of the law.

I strongly advocated and supported legislation calling for the death penalty in kidnapping cases and those involving dope peddlers who, for all intents and purposes, were killing children addicts of the drugs. The passage of death penalty laws to deal with such cases greatly reduced the extent of these crimes.

I feel certain that the passage of a similar law applicable to persons who place bombs in a church, synagogue, school, or other public building, endan-

gering the lives of not one but of many people, will help put an end to this new form of lawlessness and direct attack on all free institutions.

Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I received from the general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, together with a pamphlet relating to the need for Federal action to restore the industry to prosperity and stability:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., December 19, 1958.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: The facts of life in the textile industry underline the pressing need for Federal action to restore it to prosperity and stability. They also demonstrate that the industry, on its own, is unable to cope with its many, complex problems which cast a long shadow directly upon the lives of nearly 1 million textile workers and the hundreds of communities in which they live.

The Textile Workers Union of America maintains that when management cannot act effectively to save a basic industry, the Federal Government has an obligation to provide help in the interest of the general welfare.

During the recent special investigation of textile industry problems by a Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, our union proposed the creation of a Federal Textile Development Agency to expedite a program to rebuild and stabilize the textile industry.

The enclosed pamphlet spells out that proposal. I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy not only to acquaint you with its details, but also in the hope of enlisting your support in its behalf.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
General President.

TEXTILES: A DIAGNOSIS

Under our private-enterprise system, the problems of industry should be met through private initiative. This, of course, is the theory or ideal; but even our most prosperous industries depend heavily upon the Government for encouragement.

In the case of textiles, there has been none. Moreover, textile millowners have not demonstrated the ability, nor even a concerted willingness to cope with their complex problems.

If the textile industry operated in a vacuum, there might be some justification for labeling it "expendable" and letting it sink or swim without Government intervention. But the textile industry's ills cast a long shadow directly upon the lives of many hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Entire areas become stagnant when it is in distress and the impact is felt regionally in New England and the South. In short, the textile industry presents a problem to the Nation as a whole.

Thus, the Government cannot remain indifferent to its plight. It has a clear responsibility. In a case such as this, where management cannot act effectively to save the

textile industry, the Government must move to protect the general welfare.

The Government has a further obligation to do so because many of the basic problems which plague the textile industry stem from Government policy and action. This is not merely a case of indifference.

TARIFFS, TAXES AND RAW-COTTON PRICING

Government policy has had a depressing effect upon the textile industry in at least three areas: tariffs, taxes, and raw-cotton pricing.

In general, U.S. tariffs are aimed at promoting a liberal foreign-trade policy. The Textile Workers Union of America recognizes that need, but we see neither justice nor practical gain from a policy that singles out a basic industry as a sacrifice on the altar of foreign trade.

Even where safeguards appear in the law, they are so loosely administered that their effect is nullified. Our foreign-trade policy must take into account the difficulties faced by basic American industries, as well as the need to provide markets for foreign producers. It is not in the national interest to destroy the jobs of hundreds of thousands of textile workers to achieve such an end.

A more sensitive approach to tariff policy can help to revive and rebuild the textile industry.

As our tax laws now stand, they contain a variety of loopholes which serve as incentives for the liquidation or relocation of textile mills.

Abuses permitted under the capital-gains tax and under provisions for tax-loss carryovers permit speculators to reap much greater rewards from closing down plants than from continuing to operate them.

The exemption from taxation of interest on municipal bonds helps to provide bait for communities in luring textile mills to new locations.

Not only are workers the victims of such maneuvers, but taxpayers in general must assume the burden of making up this loss of revenue to the Treasury.

Closing up these loopholes can drive speculators out of the textile industry and stop such evasions of taxes.

Despite the objections of cotton farmers, the textile industry and our union, the Federal administration continues to support domestic raw-cotton prices at an artificial level. At the same time, it subsidizes the export of cotton at world price levels 6 cents to 8 cents a pound lower than the domestic price.

This policy has deprived domestic cotton plants of much of their market at home as well as abroad because they must compete with foreign producers who not only have the advantage of lower wage scales, but also of lower raw-cotton prices.

An end to this double standard would revive demand for domestic cotton products and help to rebuild the industry.

We are not suggesting that these steps, in themselves, would solve the textile industry's dilemma. While Government policy and indifference have contributed to the decline of the industry, many of its problems are of management's own making.

Demand for domestic textile goods has been sagging steadily. A smaller and smaller portion of the consumer dollar is going to textiles. Management has lost many markets to substitute products devised by rival industries. It has failed to meet these challenges.

It has not reacted to changes in household and industrial needs by developing new products and new uses for textiles. It relies largely upon other sources for primary research when it should be devoting an increasing portion of its capital and energy to this activity.

It has neglected new advertising and sales-promotion techniques. Even where it can otherwise hold its own with foreign competition, it often fails to initiate fashion-setting trends of its own. Domestic competi-

tion is largely a case of large textile combines waiting for smaller firms to fall by the wayside.

There is no sign of traditional American enterprise. No concerted steps have been taken to usher in a new era of growth and expansion. The trend is not to develop new techniques to meet these challenges; it appears to be largely a matter of simply riding out the storm, and that storm has yet to end.

This managerial failure has caused great suffering among the workers who rely upon the textile industry for their livelihood. To compound their dilemma, management continues to pursue a feudalistic labor policy.

It works constantly to deny its employees the right to self-organization. It resists collective bargaining, the cornerstone of labor relations in all stable and progressive industries. And, more than any other group, it employs the Taft-Hartley Act and right-to-work laws to implement this policy.

The end result is to keep wages and working conditions depressed.

Whether it realizes it or not, management is paying a dear price for this negative approach to labor relations. There is a steady drift of skilled workers from textile plants into more rewarding industries. And there is a genuine reluctance on the part of technicians, so essential to textiles, to cast their lot with an industry which is so backward in its relations with its employees.

Full acceptance of collective bargaining would provide labor-management cooperation in solving the industry's problems.

Teamwork to revive and rebuild textiles is essential, but a third ingredient is needed—the active encouragement and participation of Government in such a program.

The Textile Workers Union of America has devoted considerable thought and energy to the role Government can and should play in this direction. We long ago had proposed a Federal investigation of the textile industry's problems. This is now a reality. During the course of this study we have called upon the Government to set into motion a plan to redevelop the industry and stimulate its growth.

Our proposal calls for the establishment of a permanent Federal Textile Development Agency.

It should be an official body, with representation for industry, labor and the public.

Its members should be appointed by the President with congressional approval.

Its activities could be financed by a small levy upon the industry's products.

It could sponsor a continuing study of economic and technical developments in the industry.

It could make an annual survey of textile problems and recommend action by Congress, by the administration, or by private industry.

It could promote basic research with reference to technical and economic problems.

This could be angled at household and industrial needs, with emphasis upon consumer purchasing habits; and it could investigate the possibility of adapting textiles to such needs and habits.

It could establish a fabric library and design centers to spur the promotion of a variety of textile products.

Such facilities would stimulate textile consumption by focusing the attention of designers and decorators upon textiles in their constant search for innovations.

It could publish literature to promote textile consumption.

It could collect and distribute statistics on production, inventories, and prices so necessary to the efficient operation of the industry.

It could organize conferences to promote mutual understanding between manufacturers, suppliers, industrial users, workers, and consumers.

It could administer special legislation to help the industry and its workers.

For example, textile workers stranded by mill closings deserve protection similar to that which railway workers get under the Transportation Act of 1940. The Agency could distribute severance pay and direct retraining of these workers for new jobs.

The foregoing is but a partial index to the role such an agency can play. Its potentialities are much greater, and we intend to spell them out in detail as a formula develops to halt the contraction of the industry and usher in a new era of growth and expansion.

But beyond the establishment of such an agency, the crisis in the textile industry demands positive legislation and administrative action.

We have already set forth our proposals in the area of tariff, tax, and cotton-pricing legislation. But other measures are needed.

Surplus textiles should be distributed on a larger scale as part of our foreign-assistance program; by the same token, such goods should also be distributed to the needy at home.

Federal contracts should be allocated to distressed areas. The administration must stop blocking area redevelopment legislation.

THE MANPOWER SURPLUS CRISIS

There is a critical surplus of manpower not only in the textile industry, but in textile areas. This situation calls for a direct attack on unemployment and short time.

New production techniques are steadily eliminating jobs in the textile industry, leaving tens of thousands of workers stranded. What we actually are witnessing is a preview of what automation can do to the jobs of workers in all industries.

Technical progress is fine, but it is meaningless, and worse, if it creates unemployment and hardship. Increased man-hour productivity must be reflected in shorter hours as well as lower prices and higher wages.

THE SOLUTION: 35-HOUR WEEK

We believe an economic adjustment must be made now to deal with a situation that may grow entirely out of control, once the effects of automation are felt in all industries.

The textile industry offers an ideal starting point. The times call for serious consideration of the establishment of a 35-hour week at 40 hour's pay for textile workers.

TWUA ASKS YOUR SUPPORT

The textile industry is basic to our economy; it is essential to our national defense and to the necessities and comforts of all Americans.

We are convinced that the program we have outlined can restore this industry to full health. We do not regard it as the perfect solution. We offer it, rather, as a base upon which to develop the ultimate formula.

In that very same vein, we earnestly ask you to support this program. You can help immeasurably by enlisting the aid of your community leaders and of your State and Federal legislators in its behalf.

Given such support, the textile industry will once again take its place as a dynamic force in our Nation's economy.

November 7, 1958, shortly after the general election, in the Austin Statesman, of Austin, Tex., Texas' second oldest daily newspaper, which points out so splendidly why our beloved Speaker is held in such high esteem everywhere.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the Record. It is as follows:

SAM RAYBURN PHILOSOPHIZES ON ELECTION AFTERMATH IN CONGRESS

That very wise and experienced majordomo of legislation in the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, has reminded the country of the good old American political tradition that finds all campaigns, even sometimes the most bitter, ending in a show of good sportsmanship and fair play.

"Mr. SAM" expects no bad blood between the President and Congress as a result of the excesses of the recent campaign.

In some campaign speeches, RAYBURN sadly noted, the President "had gone pretty far in accusing us of being radicals and left-wingers." But he made it clear that that would not affect the harmonious pattern of relations between the White House and Capitol Hill, which have been established in the last 4 years of Democratic control of Congress. Now that control has been greatly broadened by the Nation's voters.

RAYBURN says that 85 percent of the President's program was just an extension of Democratic principles. He ticked some of these off as being foreign aid, reciprocal trade, and a strong defense, the three prime legislative aims of the President's program. Differences, where they occurred, were, in extent and method, not in principle.

Most Democrats accept the President's campaign stance, even when it referred to them as radicals, as a part of his obligation to his party. Some of the President's most partisan utterances rankle and may imperil, from some Democrats, the President's goals in the last 2 years of his term. Vice President Nixon will be a particular target in the next 2 years.

The individual winner in the congressional election was Speaker RAYBURN, whose district, with Bonham his home, reelected him to his eighth full term in Congress and insured his position as Speaker. This is an all-time record.

Since RAYBURN was elected by his colleagues to serve out the term of the late Speaker William B. Bankhead on September 16, 1940, he has been continuously the Speaker when his party was in control, the Democratic House leader when the Democrats were in the minority.

RAYBURN long ago passed the only other man in the Nation's history to serve more than four terms as speaker, Henry Clay, of Kentucky. Before RAYBURN, Clay held the record at six terms.

Texans, despite occasional differences over party issues, hold a deep and deserved affection for "Mr. SAM." He is one of its finest "public institutions."

which I made before the National Foreign Trade Council on "U.S. Taxation of Foreign Source Income" on November 19, 1958:

In examining the subject of this discussion, I think we can accept the fact that it is the policy of the United States to promote the economic growth of the free nations of the world and to do all that is prudently possible to help the less developed nations to achieve that momentum of progress in agriculture and industry to make it possible for them to look forward to substantial economic growth. It would seem equally clear that it is the policy of our country to contribute to and assist our friends in the world to the largest extent possible by encouraging the unhampered operation of our dynamic free enterprise system.

All agree that this can best be accomplished by providing incentives for private American capital to go abroad and take with it the vitality, the skill, and the imagination that has made our system the strongest economic system in the world.

Private investment of American funds abroad is preferable to Government spending for many reasons. Not the least of which is the fact that such investment assures the most economic use of limited U.S. resources. The plain truth is that the need for capital by the free nations of the world is far larger than the amounts which our taxpayers can reasonably provide. For this reason alone private American capital must be encouraged to go abroad and take upon itself the task of preserving in the world the free system which we earnestly believe deserves to be fostered and preserved.

The foreign aid program is day by day losing favor both at home and abroad. So it becomes even more essential if we are to meet the full thrust of the Soviet economic offensive to create a favorable climate for intelligent and active free enterprise abroad. The socially conscious businessman must, in a sense, supplant the bureaucrat.

The concern of the President of the United States for the free nations of the world in this regard was most recently expressed in his address to the Colombo Plan conference. I was pleased to note the great emphasis that he placed on the necessity for encouraging private United States investment abroad. Considerations such as those underlining the President's address before the Colombo Plan conference prompted the membership of the subcommittee on foreign trade policy of the Committee on Ways and Means to announce public hearings on the subject of United States private foreign investment beginning on December 1, 1958, in Washington, D.C.

We felt the need to provide a forum in which the issues involved could be fully discussed by competent witnesses and information accumulated with which to guide possible legislative implementation of the public policies which I have alluded to. In this connection the impact of United States taxation of foreign source income is of the greatest importance, and will be of great interest to the subcommittee. We of the subcommittee have come to know as a result of our studies and travels that foreign trade policy cannot be divorced from other aspects of United States foreign economic policy. We have also been impressed with the fact that uppermost in the minds of those considering private foreign investment is the impact of U.S. tax policy on foreign source income.

Among other things the subcommittee expects that the December hearings will develop information, views and recommendations with respect to the following types of questions:

What are the facts about United States private foreign investment?

Sam Rayburn Philosophizes on Election Aftermath in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial which appeared on

Private American Capital Must Be Encouraged To Go Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following remarks

What are the reasons American capital goes abroad?

What forms does such investment take? What are the effects of such investment on the host country?

What contribution does such investment make to the development of foreign trade with the United States and other countries?

What are the effects of such development on the economic development of underdeveloped countries?

What are the obstacles that stand in the way of new and expanding investment, both here and abroad?

What are the factors that condition the climate for investment abroad?

What is the proper concern of the U.S. Government in this field?

What types of governmental programs are appropriate in the light of our national interests?

What modifications in the tax systems of the United States as well as foreign countries are indicated?

What has been the effect of existing governmental programs in this field?

These questions are by no means the only ones pertinent to our hearings. They are merely illustrative of items of specific interest in the foreign investment field. You will agree, I am sure, that this inquiry is needed and that the findings will be helpful.

As a member of the committee of the Congress which is charged with the primary responsibility of formulating the tax laws of the United States, I am particularly aware of the need for a searching review of our revenue laws as they apply to foreign-source income. A most charitable appraisal of the Internal Revenue Code as it applies to such income would find it to be capricious in result, formalistic in impact, and difficult to administer, understand, and apply. I know no one who is familiar with taxation who does not believe that a thoroughgoing legislative overhaul is long overdue and badly needed not only as a technical matter but as a matter of policy as well. How this can best be undertaken will be one of the chief concerns of my Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy.

In considering ways and means to encourage private American investment abroad we must, of course, be mindful of the fiscal condition of the United States. We will begin our hearings in December at a time when the United States is facing a potential \$12 billion deficit for the fiscal year 1959. If statements of some administration officials can be taken at face value, we can expect that there will be proposals during the next Congress for increasing taxes upon some segments of the domestic economy. Further, in light of recent administration pronouncements, we cannot expect the existing level of Federal expenditures to decline. Reforms here can be made, however, in my opinion, without loss of revenue. Over the long pull, there should be substantial gains in revenue from these sources. Perhaps more important than the facts of Federal fiscal life in appraising the chances for effective implementation of a policy of encouraging private foreign investment is the incomprehensible bias found in many quarters against foreign-source income. I do not understand this bias. It arises from a lack of public education, from a lack of understanding. It is not unusual to pick up a newspaper or magazine and find an article on "Foreign Tax Havens." The gist of such stories often lumps a reputable American business with modern-day Al Capones and implies, if not fraud, at least evasion of U.S. taxes.

It is in this context which we must view the possibility of providing needed incentives for the encouragement of foreign private investment. It portends an uphill fight and behooves us, if we have the interest of the United States at heart, to at

least begin by considering recommendations which, though they may not go as far as we believe and know to be necessary, have a chance of adoption. There is strong evidence to support the principle of territoriality in taxing foreign source income (which would tax foreign-source income only in the country in which is situated the principal establishment to which such income is properly allocable) or at least a rate differential such as the 14-point differential considered in connection with the 1954 code. Nevertheless, it may be necessary in the light of existing conditions for organizations and individuals who are interested in spreading the doctrine of free enterprise throughout the world to consider all approaches for achieving this end in addition to those which have received prominent attention in the past. In this regard, among other things, I would think it wise for those who have skill and competence in the field of the taxation of foreign-source income to direct their attention to the proposal of deferral of U.S. tax on foreign-source income until it is severed for domestic use. This proposal has already received some attention.

You are, of course, aware of the possibilities for the deferral of U.S. taxes on foreign-source income which now exist under the Internal Revenue Code. But the benefits of such deferrals through the utilization of foreign subsidiaries or foreign-base companies are not available except at great price in many instances. The historical development of the statute and the rather fragmentary gloss which has been placed upon it by administrative and judicial interpretation has effectively denied the benefits to many companies. Consider, if you will, two companies manufacturing similar products. Company A at great risk embarked upon the unknown of foreign investment in the 1920's. The legal advice then available to it was, by present standards, poor because of lack of experience and interpretations. The attitude of the U.S. Treasury Department was then certainly far different from now. There were few regulations or rulings to guide it. Accepting the best advice available, company A organized its foreign undertaking in the form of a subsidiary incorporated in, say, Brazil. The vision of company A has been rewarded by success. The risks have proved worthwhile. The market was there. The demand for American ingenuity and products was there and company A has known for some time that similar markets existed in Argentina, Peru, South Africa, and elsewhere. One would think it a simple matter for company A to transfer a part of its hard-earned foreign-source earnings to any one of the countries named and establish a similar successful venture for the ultimate benefit of the United States and the countries involved. We know it is not.

Now take the case of company B which manufactures a product similar to that of company A. For years company B watched the experience of company A and, convinced of the wisdom of such foreign investment, decided to move into the foreign field in 1953. It established a base company and by utilizing this third country arrangement is developing the markets in, say, Argentina, Peru, and South Africa which should be available to company A as well. Its accumulated earnings and profits in any one of these countries may be transferred without the imposition of U.S. tax to the subsidiary where they are most needed. Additional benefits accrue to company B such as the averaging of foreign tax rates for the purpose of achieving the maximum benefit of the U.S. foreign tax credit. And it may achieve many tax savings on branch or other agency operations because its base company is not subject to U.S. tax jurisdiction.

Surely if we were proceeding de novo no one would support such an inherently un-

equitable and discriminatory result as exists in the case of company A. Yet we today condone it by inaction and thus perpetuate precisely this situation. History is responsible for the genesis of the laws which make this result possible, of course, but they seem to be perpetuated by an overdeveloped concern for the bare possibility of tax avoidance in some cases.

I have reference, of course, to the operation of what is today known as section 367 of the Internal Revenue Code and which began in less difficult times as section 112(K) of the Revenue Act of 1932 in a campaign against foreign personal holding companies which were then being utilized for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. capital gains tax. Section 367, as you know, applies only to exchanges which involve an inherent gain and provides that, in determining the extent to which gain shall be recognized, a foreign corporation shall not be considered as a corporation for purposes of most of the important sections of subchapter C unless, before any exchange is undertaken, it has been established to the satisfaction of the secretary or his delegate that the exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax. Of course, with tax rates what they are today it is not difficult for the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service to find that a purpose of a contemplated exchange is the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Deferral is so deemed. Of course, referring again to the example, company A has no desire to avoid the payment of U.S. tax. It simply wishes to compete with equality under U.S. law with company B for foreign investment opportunities. This it cannot do because section 367 has fixed not only company A but perhaps a majority of the primary companies in the field of foreign investment in the cement of organization inflexibility. Business decisions cannot prevail and are frustrated, efficiency is denied. We are thus confronted with the absurdity of a nation that prides itself in having developed the greatest industrial and commercial complex in the world denying to its entrepreneurs the fruits of their imagination and initiative because of a reluctance to rid the Internal Revenue Code of deadwood.

Even if we were to assume that rare thing which is the Commissioner's approval of an exchange involving a foreign corporation, company A is by no means out of the woods. Subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code was framed with domestic business problems in mind. It does not take into account the vagaries of foreign law and the policy of many foreign countries requiring a high percentage of ownership therein. Thus, even assuming that company A can overcome what is almost the irrefutable presumption of section 367 it may, nevertheless, find itself unable to invest where investment is needed because of a statute which should have as one of its principal objectives neutrality of impact between similarly situated taxpayers.

It may be that we were unaware of the existence of many of the problems confronting the businessman who wishes to invest abroad when first we framed these provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This is no longer the case. We have been informed of the existence of the problems and the manner in which the Internal Revenue Code is distorting business decisions and preventing our American system from being carried abroad by our businessmen. We must do something about this situation.

In reflecting upon these problems to which I have so briefly alluded, I have devoted some attention to the possibilities inherent in deferral of U.S. tax on foreign source income. I have wondered why it is necessary for us to force our businessmen to seek out countries such as Liechtenstein, Monaco, and Panama to achieve a business result. I have

come to the conclusion that no reason for forcing them to do so exists. It is within our power to provide the means of organizing base companies for the conduct of foreign business operations in the United States itself. We have the example of Canada's 4-K companies and Britain's overseas trade corporations. As a matter of fact we have the example of practically every other trading country in the world before us to follow.

Enactment of a law permitting the creation of a unique class of domestic corporations organized for the conduct of business abroad would achieve a great deal and do much to provide incentives to foreign investment. Such companies would be in a position to utilize the earnings derived from their foreign operations for the expansion of their activities in the free countries of the world without the immediate payment of U.S. tax and would permit maximum efficiency and economy in conducting foreign business operations. Such corporations would pay U.S. tax on their foreign source income only when such income was severed from the foreign operation by a distribution to shareholders. Such corporations, and I shall refer to them hereafter as U.S. base companies for want of a better term, could and should be permitted to carry on all operations now conducted by foreign base companies. I wish to emphasize that exporting activities should in my opinion be included within permissible activities.

Provision for U.S. base companies would not in my opinion require any change in existing law providing for Western Hemisphere trade corporations. Additionally, I see no reason for not permitting any company desiring to do so to continue to operate abroad through a branch operation.

In discussing the possibilities of deferral and of establishing a special class of U.S. base companies for the purposes of achieving deferral I wish to make it clear that no member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy or the Committee on Ways and Means has a fixed mind on the subject of how best to provide the incentive which we all believe necessary to encourage foreign investment. I have merely attempted to explore one or two proposals that have been put forward that seem to me, at this stage, to have considerable merit. If tax policy affords an appropriate device for providing incentive, and I believe that it does, we have an open mind as to how best the tax system can be utilized to provide an incentive. I welcome your advice and suggestions. I have mentioned the possibilities of deferral and the potential benefits of permitting the establishment of U.S. base companies only because I believe that deferral has been neglected in much of the thinking of people concerned with this field.

It is fair to state that the present fiscal condition of the United States should make deferral attractive to those in the executive department who are responsible for securing the revenues with which to meet the Government's bills. Deferral involves no loss of U.S. revenue since by hypothesis every dollar of foreign earnings would be subject to tax when repatriated to the United States and severed from the base operation by distribution to stockholders.

Another reason why deferral and the establishment of a special class of U.S. base companies should be considered by the Treasury Department lies in the possibilities for better administration which such companies would present to those charged with enforcing the tax laws of the United States. For example, it might be provided that such companies file an annual return setting forth the results of the foreign operation for the year. At present a foreign corporation is under no obligation to inform the United States Treasury of its operation with the result that many problems are encountered in computing the proper amount of accumulated earnings and profits from the foreign operation and the amount of foreign taxes paid

and creditable. These costly administrative problems could be avoided.

From the investor's point of view the benefits to be expected from such companies are so obvious that I do not need to catalog them. Suffice it to say that not the least of them arises from the fact that the stability of United States law would be available and to a degree at least it would no longer be necessary to attempt to divine the law of a foreign country in selecting a base.

If the laws of Liberia, Luxembourg, Tangiers, and Liechtenstein pose problems of understanding for the businessman and even for legal specialists, this is understandable. After all, we expect problems when we deal with other languages and peoples of diverse customs and ways of doing business. But the paucity of information available to the American businessman contemplating foreign investment from our own Government about our law is not understandable. The regulations promulgated for the purpose of implementing those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide for the taxation of foreign source income are less than full. This, along with the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has issued few public rulings in the field makes it difficult for even the tax specialist to advise in this area. Here, as perhaps nowhere else, certainty is a prime requisite. It is not fair to expect a businessman to feel his way into a situation which may rob him not only of the fruits of his foreign endeavor but of his domestic profits as well. I hope, therefore, that some attention will be devoted during the course of our hearings by both administration and public witnesses to the possibility of making more information available to the public as to the policies which are guiding the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service in administering these statutes.

It has not been my purpose this afternoon to exhaust or even to mention all the tax problems confronting those engaged in foreign business activities nor even to touch on the many ways in which the tax system of the United States affects foreign operations. My purpose has been to impress you with the seriousness of my belief that something must be done, whether through the tax system or otherwise, to encourage American capital to go abroad and to make the slogan "trade not aid," meaningful. It has also been my intention to convey to you an awareness of the fact that we in the Congress of the United States know that you have problems and our sincere desire to do something about them. I would like to impress upon you the necessity of being your own advocate; to let you know that while I appreciate all that has been done by this and other organizations, which exist for the purpose of carrying our way of life abroad, that nevertheless a great deal more has to be done by you, both at home and abroad, to create an understanding of the contributions of American business not only to the United States but to the free world; and that herein lies the world's best answer to Communist imperialism.

Thank you.

America's Answer to the Soviet Bloc's Economic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my

remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I made before the International Management Division Briefing Session on "Preparing the Country for Soviet Trade Strategy in World Markets; Terms and Procedures for East-West Trade" at the Hotel Savoy-Hilton, New York City, November 5, 1958:

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO THE SOVIET BLOC'S ECONOMIC WARFARE

At the close of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, Congressman Timothy Sheehan and I introduced identical bills to create a U.S. Trading Corporation in order to cope with the Soviet Union's declaration of war upon the United States in the peaceful field of trade. The formal declaration of war was made by Nikita Khrushchev on October 19, 1957.

We would be foolish, however, to look at this declaration of war in the field of peaceful trade as confined to the field of private enterprise trading. Indeed, in a totalitarian state there is no firm line drawn between economics and politics. It is perfectly true that economic laws cannot be repealed by political action, but it is certainly true that economic mistakes can be socialized, that is absorbed by the full society rather than born by the specific segment of the economy where the mistake has been made. Likewise deliberate economic losses may be accepted in one segment of the economy and born by the full economy in order to achieve certain defined economic or political goals of the totalitarian society. Indeed, short run economic losses may be financed by the totalitarian state in an economic sector in order to destroy competition and then have the losses recouped in the same sector by raising the prices once the competition has been destroyed. This was a familiar bit of economic strategy the United States experienced in its private enterprise sector toward the end of the 19th century and brought about the passage of the Sherman antitrust law.

I believe that a calm appraisal of the private sector of our economy will reveal that strong as some of our industries are they are not strong enough to combat the concentration of economic and political power of Soviet Russia if it is directed to their area of economic endeavor.

I also believe that it is politically naive to think that American industries when confronted with this sort of threat will fall to make their situation known to those in the political government in Washington, D.C., in order to gain assistance. Indeed, there are sufficient examples both in the past and in the present where this kind of assistance has been both sought and obtained. In the past this operation at times has extended to the ultimate—a declaration of war.

I believe it is important that assistance be granted to American industries when they are being attacked by the full weight of the Soviet totalitarian state under circumstances which we would define as unfair competition, or which I should prefer to describe as uneconomic competition. That is competition which is uneconomic to the extent that it produces economic losses which are absorbed outside the particular economic segment engaged in the competition.

However, I believe that this assistance should not be granted in camera by our Federal Government based upon no fixed set of standards or rules of procedures as is presently the case. It is entirely too easy for an industry confronted with strong competition to classify this competition as "unfair" when in actuality it is fair economic competition and all that is required is for the industry involved to look into its own internal affairs to bring about needed reforms for efficiency and increased productivity. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that an industry may not know it is being attacked or from

whence it is being attacked in international trade war while the United States Government through its State Department and other intelligence sources not only can know but does know of the attack. Finally the manner in which a segment of our economy which has been placed under unfair economic attack is to be helped should be such that the competing industries within that segment can remain competitive with each other. Lack of proper standards and procedures can easily result in one competitor being favored over another within our own economy.

It is for these basic reasons that I have proposed a U.S. Trading Corporation be set up which would only come into the economic fray when certain well-defined principles of fair economic competition have been violated or are about to be violated by Soviet Russia and it would come with the fray only to keep the competition equal. Once this objective has been achieved it would retire and let competition prevail. In other words, if Soviet Russia plans to concentrate her totalitarian powers in the economic and political fields on selected areas or segments of international trade we should be ready to match such a concentration with sufficient concentration of our own economic and political powers to equalize the situation. I am satisfied if Soviet Russia knows we are set up to do this we probably will only have to demonstrate our ability to do it once or twice. That will be the end of this kind of trade war I am certain Russia contemplates.

After having introduced the U.S. Trading Act bill I have become quite disturbed about the favorable reception it has received from many prominent groups in the United States. The favorable reception has come with an accentuation on the concentration of political and economic power ensuing to the Federal Government and a minimizing, indeed an ignoring, of the basic checks I believe must accompany such a creation of power. If this power is not accompanied with strict rules setting up the circumstances under which it will apply and strict procedures for the establishment of the fact that these tests have been met, then it may indeed become a Frankenstein's monster.

I am particularly disturbed about the favorable reception this proposal has received from groups which in my opinion have viewed the Russian threat hysterically rather than realistically. I think Russia is a threat, or I would not have proposed this legislation, but I certainly do not believe it is the threat, for example, that is posed in the recent book "The Ruble War" by six top CBS news correspondents.

There are always those who will resort to "bogeyman" tactics to get through their own preconceived notions of what needs to be done to reform our society or merely to push our society ahead. For example, our regular military establishment, Army, Navy, and Air Force have found the Russian threat a very handy weapon to get appropriations out of the U.S. Congress over a period of many years. Having studied the military appropriation bills with considerable care over a period of years and the statements before congressional committees by their spokesmen as well as their public statements, I state without equivocation that there has been a deliberate and gross overplaying of Russia's military might which has damaged our own defense posture and assisted Russia in the game of bluff she has been playing with her satellites and the smaller neutral countries.

Certain groups of our scientists recently have resorted to the same tactics in order to push ahead their particular ideas of where we need more rapid scientific advancement. Just recently the most dangerous venture of all in this game of "bogeyman" has been started by some of our leaders in education. Education is the most dangerous field in which to play fast and loose with

the truth. We have so much to lose. Essentially we have a system of education much superior to Russia. We can badly damage it through hysterical action instead of action stemming from healthy self-criticism. After all we have achieved something no large society has ever achieved before, a fairly close approximation of mass education. The fact that having concentrated on this goal so extensively we have somewhat neglected the important goal of quality education, should be no great cause for alarm. We seem now to be aware of the neglect and the concentration we are now making on quality should bring us into proper balance. After all the hard job was quantity and indeed quality depends upon sifting great quantities. I see no problem in having both quantity and quality education and I am satisfied we will be the first society to achieve or approximate this dual goal if we keep our heads and persevere with enlightened self-criticism.

Certainly Russia has advanced in military power, in economic power, in scientific achievement and in the field of education and it is important that we do not minimize these achievements. Indeed, it is important that we carefully appraise them. But we can do great damage, as I have suggested, by overestimating them and using this overestimation as a weapon to whip our people and the Congress into hastily conceived plans and actions. And I suggest the Congress under the lash of bogeyman techniques has badly overestimated the achievements of Russia in all of these areas.

Furthermore, it is important to see what else is happening to Russia and to the form of its society as it moves forward in economic, scientific, military, and economic achievement. Can anyone believe that these achievements can be made without changing radically the rigid and self-defeating straitjacket of political and economic communism? The straitjacket of the totalitarian state where there is no separation of economic and political powers? Can anyone believe that these achievements can be made without a separation of the powers embodied in the field of religion from those powers embodied in the field of politics and economics, no matter how hard the totalitarian state may try to hide the fact that its subjects have, as all human beings must have, a religion, a set of beliefs, a faith? As the Russian people advance in the fields of economics and education, indeed they also must advance in politics and religion and accordingly become less of a threat to a nation such as ours which is dedicated to peace through justice.

However, it is not my desire to dwell further on the subject of whether we presently are overestimating or underestimating Russia's achievements in economics, education, science, and military power. My plea is for honest appraisal of Russia's achievements. The U.S. Trading Corporation can be a bane to our society if dishonest appraisals are made of Russia's prowess, particularly her economic prowess.

Three years ago I was so disturbed about the loose talk concerning Russia's economic status and the dearth of objective information on the subject, I requested our staff of the Joint Economic Committee to have an objective appraisal made. This was done with the help of the scholars in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and was published by the Economic Committee in 1955. This document was checked with people in and out of other sections of our Government for accuracy. Read realistically it is no cause for hysteria or the extreme statements that are constantly being made about Soviet Russia's economic development. Anymore, I might state than is the book "Soviet Professional Manpower," by Nicholas DeWitt of the Russian Research Center, Harvard University,

which was published in 1955, a cause for hysteria or the extreme statements that have been made about Soviet Russia's advancement in the field of education.

I would like to revert back to the trade area. During the recent hearings by the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements I asked the witnesses representing our various departments of the executive branch of Government if they did not have some suggestions for new tools they might need in the event that Soviet Russia's declaration of war in the peaceful field of trade was serious. From the State Department down through the Department of Commerce the witnesses all testified that they did not need any more powers.

I think the few cases we have had proved them to be wrong. I cited the case of Iceland, a country with population of only 160,000 people and an annual income of only \$130 million based almost entirely upon the fishing industry. Under the most-favored nation clause in the reciprocal trade laws any attempt we make to treat with Iceland specially in regard to fish creates the same treatment for all other nations dealing in that fish. We have only a few weapons aside from trade treaties to assist Iceland. One is through direct aid by the U.S. Government, the other is by loans through the International Bank. These are all inadequate to keep Russia from making an uneconomic deal with Iceland to buy all her fish, absorb the economic loss in her totalitarian political economic society, in exchange for the political and military advantage of tying this strategically located island to its orbit.

Here is how the U.S. Trading Corporation could come into play. The American importers of Icelandic fish cannot meet the high uneconomic price Russia will pay to Iceland for its fish. The U.S. Trading Corporation, however, could go to them and let them bid for their customary purchases of fish and meet Russia's uneconomic price and then permit them to market the fish at their traditional margin of profit based upon what a fair competitive price for the fish would be and make up the difference between the actual cost and the fair economic cost. As I stated, I do not believe it would be necessary to meet Russia in this area very often once Russia gets the idea her tactics can be countered. Our major difficulty will be to be certain that certain countries do not play us off against a fictitious Russian play.

A second illustration is the Sudan a few years ago straddled with an unexpectedly large cotton crop. Russia was unsuccessful in her attempts to move in with uneconomic offers for this crop, but the United States was certainly limited in its ability to meet this thrust by a lack of trade weapons at her command. The U.S. Trade Corporation could have easily met the threat.

A third illustration was the threat Russia made to underseal the aluminum market of Europe. Our aluminum companies are certainly strong companies but I doubt if they could win out in an economic war with the Russian state aluminum industry if Russia really decided to make the economic sacrifice to grab this market. In this instance the U.S. Trade Corporation could meet the uneconomic selling price of Russia by making up the differential between a fair price our aluminum companies could offer their customers and the undercut price Russia was offering.

From this latter illustration I believe the dangers of abuse by our domestic companies which I referred to can be visualized. However, if we carefully set up the standards which must be met before the U.S. Trading Corporation can act and the procedures under which these standards are found to be met, then I believe this difficulty can be minimized.

I cannot leave the subject of international trade without saying a few words for my proposal for a system of flexible tariffs designed to measure economic differentials as opposed to rigid tariffs designed for protection. If we had adhered to a system of flexible tariff differentials in the past we would be in a much easier position to administer the type of U.S. Trading Corporation I am speaking about, because we would have established considerable knowledge of economic costs of production. We would have a great store of information on the techniques of political governments subsidizing and assisting the private sectors of their economies. We would have a great store of information on the techniques of cartels and state trading devices. As it is we have little information and what we have is not assembled or sorted out.

As a matter of fact, I proposed to this administration, in order to realistically grapple with the problems involved in international trade, that they sponsor legislation for the establishment of a Department of Foreign Trade in the Cabinet where all the factors which bear on the problems involved in foreign trade could be assembled instead of having them scattered through the State Department, the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Labor, and Treasury, and only coordinated by the ineffective inter-Cabinet Trade Policy Committee. I believe that world peace is inseparably bound up in the problems of international trade and that to solve these problems we must treat them with greatly increased study and attention. A Department of Foreign Trade is the way both to do it and also to dramatize its importance to our people and the peoples abroad.

The tariff is the most unrestrictive form of trade barrier among the many kinds of trade barriers that exist in international trade. Licenses, quotas, monetary exchanges, health restrictions, subsidies, etc., are the most illiberal method of restricting the flow of trade. This rests on a very simple reason; these forms of trade restrictions depend upon bureaucratic administration. The economic unit which can present and argue its case before the Bureau is the one which will win the race. This places a premium not upon economic achievement but rather upon political achievement. Economic achievement enters only to the extent that it can be proven by words and figures which the bureaucrat will believe and understand. Even then it depends upon the bureaucrat's ability to conform his administrative action to economic laws. The tariff, on the other hand, is set for all economic units to see and abide by. Once the tariff is set, the economic units are on their own to compete with each other as best they can.

It is the setting of the rate of each tariff that becomes the crucial thing, not the tariff as a device. The tariff rate should be set to measure only economic cost differentials resulting from political actions. I suggest that these cost differentials can fit a general pattern. They can be limited to those costs which result from the imposition of certain business standards by the Government for what are deemed to be good social reasons. For example, the minimum wage law imposes certain standards upon American producers because we have felt that this is good for the entire society. So we impose health regulations, fair-trade practices, antitrust laws, and a variety of other laws designed to promote the general welfare. Many of these restrictions impose costs which must be borne by our domestic producers. If we believe these social laws are important we must be ready to reflect to some degree the added costs they create in a differential tariff imposed upon foreign producers who do not have these costs. It need not be the exact cost by any manner of means, because if our social theory is correct, that the society bene-

fits from these standards, then our producers can do a more efficient job of production than in a society which lacks these standards. The differential need only meet the margin necessary to permit fair competition with those foreign producers who have no standards or who have lower standards. The tariff rate should be flexible so it automatically goes down as the foreign producers approximate the domestic standards.

Through this process our trade would indeed become a great weapon for raising the wages and living standard of the people abroad who want to sell this produce in our great domestic market. As their living standards rise they will find that their own domestic market will increase, as we have proved already in our own economy. This will give their producers greater markets and give our producers greater markets, too.

Only by raising our minimum wages and living standards did we develop our own great domestic market. I am satisfied that in this formula of flexible differential tariffs we will find the long-range solution to the bulk of our trade problems. At the same time, we will find world peace quite close and attainable.

Remarks of Homer Thornberry Before the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives of the United States, 86th Congress, in Nominating Hon. Sam Rayburn as the Candidate of the Democratic Caucus for Speaker, January 6, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I incorporate therein the remarks of the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY before the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, in nominating Hon. SAM RAYBURN as the candidate of the Democratic caucus for Speaker, January 6, 1959.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I am afforded at this moment the greatest honor which has ever been bestowed on me, and that is the privilege of placing before you the name of the man who will be our candidate for Speaker and who on tomorrow will be elected our Speaker by one of the largest majorities ever given a candidate for Speaker in the history of the House.

There is little I can say here about him that is not already apparent to you, my Democratic colleagues.

Having served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress than any other man and having a longer record of continuous service in the House than any other man in history, he is recognized as the superb parliamentarian and is known as the foremost legislative leader throughout the free world.

No one can equal his devotion to the Democratic Party. He has through his leadership of our party insisted that we here conduct ourselves in an orderly, responsible manner and that we provide a legislative program not only responsive to the needs of the people but also one which will deserve and receive the confidence of all of the people of this

Nation. As devoted as he has been to his party, he has in every crisis in this Nation's history risen above the political and partisan differences of the moment to fight with courage for the security of our country and the enduring freedom of men, women, and children throughout the world.

He has walked with kings and notables in high places and never lost the common touch.

He has talked to crowds and never lost the simple dignity which has earned for him the affection, admiration and devotion of all of us who have the privilege of being associated with him.

I have the happy privilege and the high honor on this his birthday to place before you as our candidate for Speaker of the United States House of Representatives the name of that noble American with a thoroughbred heart, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of Texas.

I'm From Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the State University of Iowa convincingly won the Rose Bowl game on January 1 this year it capped a long string of triumphs which has made the Iowa Hawkeyes the outstanding team in the country. Naturally all of us are proud and we search for words to express this pride so that others will know how we feel about this great State. An editorial from the Burlington Hawkeye Gazette of January 2 speaks eloquently for all Iowans and under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

I'M FROM IOWA

Who breathes in this prairie land, with her lush fields, her golden heritage, her lovely rivers and lakes, her wonderful people—who here but doesn't feel a glow in saying, "I'm from Iowa."

It was a great day for Iowa.

Sure, the university won the Rose Bowl. It was a delightful romp, foreshadowed from the moment Forest Evashevski's disciplined troops took the field at Pasadena. The boys were superb. What Iowa has known all along—that the Hawkeyes have the fleet legs of gazelles, the precision of a ballet troupe, the spirit of lancers—was stunningly revealed for the biggest national audience of them all.

There was more.

In the morning, despite the carping of the smalltime critics, despite the fear of spending a dollar that might be saved, despite the inferiority complex that sometimes makes us less than bold, Iowa paraded Colorado Boulevard in Pasadena in a happy show of a great State.

There was the band, the finest. The Scottish Highlanders, unique and colorful. The Big Ten float, in a tribute to the University of Iowa. And finally, the Iowa show, lovely, warm, an emblem of a growing community.

There are those who say a problem with our State is that we have made too great a thing of such coliseum affairs as the Rose Bowl.

We can sympathize with their viewpoint, but at the same time we can bask in the glory.

For what Iowa needs is love, a love of home that brings an outpouring of both af-

fection and selflessness. The path toward any love is recognition of worth, and in at least one field, Iowa found that yesterday.

And what about the others? If we can be so good on the playing fields, may we not also be good as a strong segment of the national economy, as a producer of scholars, financiers, poets, musicians, salesmen, butchers, farmers, writers?

The answer is obvious. We can, and we are.

But the problem is whether we recognize our own strength. I suspect we don't. I suspect we are so intimidated by the cautious, by the miserly, by the Neanderthals, that we fear to move ahead into the future that is ours if we but have the courage to grasp it.

Well, we saw yesterday that greatness is within our grasp.

The reference is not alone to a football game, which after all the sentimentality, remains just a football game.

No, the lesson of this New Year's Day has been that Iowa can lead, if she only will, and that within our borders is the imagination and the strength to provide that leadership.

Defense Will Not Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the December 15 issue of Newsweek entitled "Defense Will Not Win." In his article, Mr. Hazlitt stresses the need for the United States to take the offensive in the cold war, especially with regard to the barrage of brazen propaganda pouring out of Russia today which is going throughout American press unanswered.

DEFENSE WILL NOT WIN

(By Henry Hazlitt)

During the Second World War there appeared a book called: "Defense Will Not Win the War." Its chief importance lay in the title, which stated a self-evident truth. No war is ever won by defense alone.

This applies also to a so-called cold war. We are in the present cold war whether we want to be or not; it is being persistently and relentlessly waged against us. And if we lose it, through appeasement, retreat, or by trying to pretend that it is not going on, we shall surely lose the total war if it comes or be forced to surrender before the mere threat of such a war.

The present Berlin crisis is new, and yet depressingly familiar. We accepted an arrangement in 1945 that enables Russia to put the squeeze on Berlin at any time it sees an advantage in doing so. It did so in 1948. Why were we taken by surprise by the new threats? Why did we act as if we were improvising an answer to a totally unexpected move? Why, above all, was our answer (until recently) merely defensive, and in at least one statement by Secretary Dulles, even ambiguous?

If we had warned Russia immediately that we meant to stand by our obligation to defend and maintain the status of Berlin against any breach by threat or force; if we had replied at the very beginning that we

would be willing to discuss a peaceful change in the status quo in Germany but proposed that this should consist in a free and unintimidated vote of the East Germans as to whether they wanted to reunite with West Germany, much needless anxiety might have been saved.

ANSWER EVERY LIE

We might even have used the occasion to suggest that Russia keep her treaty agreements to allow free and secret elections in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria for governments of their own choice. If Russia were shown that her diplomatic and propaganda offensives might boomerang, she might be less quick to try them.

This need to take the offensive in the cold war, for our own ultimate peace and safety, was emphasized by George F. Kennan in a lecture last year. Speaking of the way in which we often dismiss Soviet lies as just propaganda, he said:

"I'm always startled at the phrase 'just propaganda.' Why just? Is not propaganda a serious and important force in world affairs? * * * A wise Western policy will insist 'no single falsehood or distortion from the Soviet side should ever go unanswered.' This will be tiresome. We do not like repetition. But we cannot afford to dispense with it. Truth does not win over error on its merits. It, too, has to be assiduously propagated."

"I have asserted that there is nothing that could be said to Soviet leaders in the space of a few days that would change their strangely corrupted mentality. But there are things which could be said every day over the course of years which would exert a useful discipline upon them, would make it harder for them to ignore the distinction between the real and the unreal, and would place limitations on their use of falsehood as a weapon of political policy."

ABSURD OUTPUT CLAIMS

To apply this to the particular purview of this column, in recent months a flood of nonsense has been pouring almost unanswered through the American press and through scores of speeches in which increasingly absurd claims of Communist Russia and Communist China regarding not merely military, but over-all civilian production, are solemnly accepted as fact. The effect of this nonsense is to condition people to assume that the terror, force, and regimentation of communism can increase production and even living standards faster than the freedom in choice of jobs and the free consumer choice of capitalism. Many officials of our own Government seem to accept these claims at face value. Their real duty is to check the evidence, or lack of evidence, for every such claim, whenever made, and constantly present the enormous counterevidence. It is important to determine the truth about Russian military production. It is no less important not to be taken in by the brazen propaganda about production miracles and soaring living standards in Russia or Communist China.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my

newsletter "Keenotes" issued on January 5, 1959, as follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

I want to preface this issue of Keenotes by extending my heartfelt thanks for the hundreds of Christmas greetings and messages which I received from friends throughout the district. It will be impossible to thank each of you personally but I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your taking the time, in the midst of a busy holiday schedule, to think of me.

Your thoughts at this time of the year are comforting and inspiring. Your confidence in my ability to represent the Fifth Congressional District in Congress makes me feel proud of the trust imposed in me and grateful for the opportunity to serve you. I trust that my actions as your Representative will never lead you to the belief that I have betrayed your confidence and trust.

As our country once again enters into a new year, it is an appropriate time for me to renew my pledge to serve all the people of the Fifth District to the very best of my ability. Our country faces many grave problems. These are indeed perilous times. It is my wish for the new year that I can contribute, in some smaller manner, to the easing of the tensions which grip the world and a lightening of the burdens which our people are called upon bear.

It is a time, too, for us as a Nation to restate our determination to carry on in a manner befitting the most powerful and wealthy Nation in history. We cannot turn our back on the rest of the world, even if we should choose such a course. History has projected the United States onto the center of the world stage. We have to keep in mind, during 1959 and the years ahead, that what we do—or fail to do—can change the course of history, that it can determine whether freedom prevails in the world.

This role of world leadership is not an easy one. Nor is it free of danger. We are facing a mighty adversary, armed with every terrible weapon known to man. We face a vigilant enemy, one who is content to work patiently over the years to have its way. Should we falter, communism could well sweep the entire world.

It is terribly expensive to develop and build new weapons and to see that nations outside the Iron Curtain are kept out of the Communist camp. No doubt we have made costly mistakes and have tried programs that were wrong.

But I firmly believe that the rest of the world is beginning to realize that our motives are unselfish. We do not want world domination or control. We desire only to create world conditions under which people can live in peace and freedom. Right now, we are the only free Nation with the substance to provide the leadership so desperately needed. I hope that in the year ahead our great country and all its people will keep this in mind.

Our people have to pay high taxes. These are burdensome. The cost of Government is high. But it would be dishonest for me to assure you, at the beginning of this new year, that the cost of Government or taxes can be substantially reduced in the year ahead. After all, it still takes about 50 cents out of every dollar paid in taxes to support the kind of defense establishments we must have.

But to say this is not to turn one's back on sincere and genuine efforts to tighten up on administration of Government, to stretch each dollar as far as it will go and to effect savings wherever possible. This is one pledge I do make for the new year—to help wherever I can to bring about sound fiscal policies.

It is not necessary, in the interest of economy, to end or stifle sound Government pro-

grams which promote the country's growth and, in the long run, help all of our citizens. For example, our area desperately needs a sound program for aiding areas with chronic unemployment. We need a sound research program to bolster the great coal industry and more research for finding new markets for farm products.

These and other things can be done within the context of a sound fiscal policy. And I pledge myself to work for them.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six promises to be a fateful year. I hope it will be a happy and prosperous one for all of you.

We Send Hubert Scudder Our Thanks and Best Wishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal of January 6, 1959:

WE SEND HUBERT SCUDDER OUR THANKS, BEST WISHES

Today, 47 years of public service are coming to a close.

Since 1912, when he was first appointed superintendent of the Sebastopol water system and the town's fire chief, Hubert B. Scudder has devoted most of his life to public service. Now he retires, and a new man takes his place in Congress representing this First California Congressional District.

There is much on which Congressman Scudder can look back with pride and a feeling of accomplishment. He served his town as councilman and mayor. He served his district in the State Assembly. He served the State as its real estate commissioner. He served the Nation as a Member of Congress for 10 years.

Hubert Scudder never ran for a public office he didn't win and he never was defeated while seeking reelection.

But just winning elections and holding political jobs are not in themselves the major ingredient of a successful career. Something must be accomplished as well.

There is hardly an area in the counties of his district where tangible evidences of Scudder's public service are not in evidence.

You can see it in the big Coyote Dam near Ukiah, which will help end the damaging Russian River floods and provide water for Mendocino and Sonoma Counties, possibly even Marin. It is visible in the breakwater up north at Crescent City and in dredged Humboldt Harbor at Eureka, where more and more ocean steamers are stopping and contributing to the economic welfare of the Redwood Empire.

Here in Marin it is visible in the huge bay model the Army engineers are building at Marinship; in the dredged San Rafael Canal; in flood control studies by the engineers in many localities; in schools, cities, and districts which have won Federal lands with his aid, and many other things.

He has championed an accelerated Federal highways program, with the basic premise that gas taxes should go to highways, not elsewhere. He helped establish the principle that schools in areas where Federal activity has substantially increased enrollments

should receive Federal funds. He has been staunch in support of private home building programs, veterans' benefits, adequate social security, to name just a few.

Hubert Scudder has done a fine job for the people of Marin and this district. He has reason to be both proud and satisfied.

We have much to thank him for as we wish him and his wife, long life and every happiness as they retire to their Sebastopol hilltop.

A Tribute to Col. Joseph Harvey Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost citizens of Huntington, W. Va., Col. Joseph Harvey Long, died on December 28, 1958. Colonel Long was 95 years of age at the time of his passing. He was the dean of West Virginia newspapermen. As chairman of the board of directors of the Huntington Publishing Co., publisher of the Advertiser, and chairman of the board of radio and television stations WSAZ and WSAZ-TV, he was a towering figure in the communications field.

It is interesting to reflect that the year of Colonel Long's birth—1863—was also the year of West Virginia's birth. Of West Virginia's growth and development, part of it he saw and much of it he was. With his bare hands he forged new standards in journalism.

Many words will be written about what Colonel Long accomplished in the many fields to which he turned his able hand. But the quality I admire most is the quality of the pioneer. Only he had no road maps but his own vision.

With no tools but his own determination, he overcame obstacles which would have discouraged a lesser man. His life is a monument to the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include excerpts from an editorial in the Advertiser dated December 29, 1958:

JOSEPH HARVEY LONG

As a trained pressman with a native talent for mechanics, whenever need arose, he would take off his coat, roll up his sleeves, and join mechanical employees in repairs and adjustments. Throughout his career he was always also interested in acquiring the latest equipment for improving the quality of the paper.

When the Associated Press was organized as an agency for the collection and dissemination of worldwide news, he became one of the earliest members. His Advertiser was one of the first papers in this State to install an engraving plant for the reproduction of news pictures. It was also one of the early subscribers to AP Wirephoto service, receiving news pictures by wire and radio from every part of the world.

Although maintaining constant supervision over the operation of his business, Colonel Long also found time through his busy life for many outside activities.

He was one of the organizers of the company that built the Huntington-Chesapeake

Bridge across the Ohio River. He was an organizer of the Ohio Valley Bus Co. and for several years served as its president. After erecting the modern building at Fifth Avenue and Tenth Street and moving the Advertiser into it in 1924, he joined with Samuel G. Biggs in leasing land on which the Keith-Albee Theater was erected.

In politics he stood high in county and State councils of the Democratic Party and attended many national conventions for closer observation of the party's leaders.

Under the administration of the late Gov. Howard M. Gore, he served as a member of a special commission for studying and improving West Virginia's tax structure. Many of the important tax laws on the statute books today are traceable to the work and recommendations of the Gore Commission of which Colonel Long was an earnest and influential member.

Because of his devotion to good government he was honored by appointment as a colonel on the staff of the late Gov. William E. Glasscock.

When the young publisher arrived here, Huntington was a small river and railroad city feeling its growing pains and needing energetic leadership toward cleaner politics, moral advancement, civic improvement, and business and industrial expansion.

Undeterred by organized opposition and sometimes threats of physical violence, he threw the weight of the Advertiser and his own personal influence into the endeavor of substantial citizens not only to enlarge but to improve the growing community. His interest and efforts in that direction continued until the last.

As chairman of the good roads committee of the chamber of commerce for many years, he was instrumental in building and improving most of the principal highways leading into the city.

He later served five terms as president of the chamber. During that time he directed efforts to acquire right-of-way and obtain Government funds for Huntington's extensive flood-wall system. The wall, erected after the disastrous flood of 1937, has already saved the city many times its cost of \$8,500,000.

While serving as president of the chamber, he also took the lead in bringing about approval of a previously defeated bond issue for modernization of the physical equipment of the county school system, including the erection of East High School.

Colonel Long's interest in the community and its people also led to substantial help to its other institutions. He served as a member of the board of Morris Memorial Hospital at Milton. He had contributed substantially to Huntington galleries and to churches besides his own, the First Congregational, whose members sought his assistance.

His gifts to individuals, although numerous, were always strictly private. After the 1937 flood he asked his employees whose homes had been invaded by the water to give him an estimate of their losses. As each estimate was presented, he wrote a personal check for the amount.

Whenever sickness or misfortune overtook the family of an employee, Colonel Long always found out about it and presented a gift in proportion to the need.

His door was never closed even to the most lowly resident of the community seeking help.

As a consequence of his interest and activities, he numbered his friends among many classes. None were closer nor warmer than those of every department with whom he was associated in the publishing business.

From editors and publishers of metropolitan papers to the man who daily filled the thermos pitcher in his office with water he

was held in high esteem. Those wrestling with the same problems in the publishing business respected his judgment and not infrequently came to him for advice and instruction in operating procedures.

People who knew him best will recall that he was one of those rare men who counted it a compliment to be asked for a favor.

So while others are paying tribute to an eminently successful publisher, an indefatigable leader in community, State, and national betterment as well as the dean of West Virginia journalism and a grand old man, employees of the Huntington Publishing Co. will feel the loss of a loyal friend and counselor.

The will realize, however, that Colonel Long will never leave Huntington.

The monuments he help build during a long and active life will remain unmarred by time. Younger men whose careers and characters he helped shape will continue his work of community betterment.

His vigorous spirit and sound judgment will continue to help direct through others the policies of the business institution he joined in founding.

Voting Trends Versus Voting Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the average Congressman seeking reelection thinks he must be liberal in his attitude toward legislation desired by farm groups, labor groups, veteran groups, retired groups, and so forth, if he is to capture the majority of the voters in his district. That is a political myth that has been built up by both the New Dealers and the Modern Republicans, a myth that has no basis in fact nor past election returns.

I personally believe that the great majority of American voters—Democrats and Republicans alike—are still fairly conservative, still believe in private initiative as the basis of our American life, American economy, and American prosperity. When the issue is made clear-cut, most American voters will vote for the conservative candidate in preference to the so-called liberal candidate—liberal with other people's tax money.

In support of this belief I include as a part of these remarks an editorial carried in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on December 7, 1958, a Democratic newspaper of Richmond, Va.

A STRONGLY BACKED ARGUMENT THAT MODERN GOP CAN'T WIN

Notions that only modern (rather than old-line) Republicans can win elections, that organized labor was the chief factor in the Democratic sweep last month, and that the farm vote goes to the party which promises farmers the most from the Federal Treasury, are all challenged strongly by Rogers C. Dunn, of McLean, Va., whose Dunn Survey we have cited before.

Mr. Dunn gives chapter and verse to buttress his beliefs. Not only so, but his contentions are hard to refute.

An idea of his prescience can be gained from the fact that he said as long ago as last March: "We expect Vermont to commence to

register a disintegration of Republican strength"—which is exactly what happened. At the same time he declared that Americans "opposed to socialism . . . should be encouraged by a general Republican setback" (in November 1958), "in spite of the inclusion of perhaps a few grievous casualties."

Over against the glib assumption that, in order to win, the Republicans have got to try to outdo the Democrats in handouts to voting blocs, and in favoritism to organized labor, Mr. Dunn argues that since 1948, when the Republicans went New-Fair Deal, "only a handful of Republicans who openly embraced the 'liberal' party line have been chosen by the voters to represent them in Congress or in other high office."

President Eisenhower ran in 1952 as a conservative Republican, and didn't go in for large Federal deficits until after his inauguration in 1957. His influence has declined ever since.

Nelson Rockefeller's astonishing victory last month in New York State is cited by many as evidence that that only a "modern" Republican has any hope of winning in the big populous areas. But the Rockefeller sweep may not prove anything much, except that he was personally magnetic and popular, and that Averell Harriman wasn't. Besides, the Democrats were split into bitterly warring factions.

In an analysis of the labor vote, captioned "The Great American Hoax," the Dunn survey points out that, entirely contrary to the popular impression, Democratic votes in labor's strongholds have not increased as rapidly as Democratic votes in the country as a whole. Here is a paragraph from his study:

"Comparison of recent off-year elections for Congressmen, 1950, 1954, 1958, reveals that the number of Democratic votes in the entire country increased 29 percent between 1950-58; and in the great labor leader citadels of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and New York increased 13 percent."

Going back to 1936, Mr. Dunn finds that between that year and 1956:

"The number of Democratic votes cast for Congressmen in the entire country increased 21 percent; in the giant industrial and labor leader citadels of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and New York City, the number of Democratic votes for Congressmen increased 12 percent."

The foregoing is true, he points out, although labor union membership grew from 4.7 million in 1936 to about 16 million in 1956, the unions were far less active politically in 1936, and the population of the three cities in question, especially of Detroit, has grown.

The Dunn survey also shows that votes by Senators and Congressmen for the Taft-Hartley Act did not handicap these lawmakers in their bids for reelection.

As for the farm vote, the survey has analyzed the balloting in 96 of Iowa's 98 counties. Its conclusion follows:

"For 20 years the vote of Iowa farmers for President and Congressmen has moved away, in growing numbers, from the administration providing Government farm subsidies and controls 1936 through 1956."

This is documented with actual figures. The survey says that "Republicans who bid 'high' for the farm vote fared no better than Republicans whose bid was 'low.'"

Despite such demonstrations, the Republican National Committee has been stressing modern Republicanism for years, on the apparent theory that this is the only basis on which elections can be won.

The committee might well consider whether it hasn't been proceeding in exactly the wrong direction. A political theory shown in the past to be sound is that when the voters of the United States want liberal government, they vote Democratic. Hence if the Republicans become mere carbon

copies of the Democrats, they aren't likely to go anywhere much.

They'd better stay conservative, and thus give the people a real choice. Once it is made clear to the electorate that we'll be heading straight for inflation, continued deficit financing and socialism under the Democrats, there may be a nationwide revolt against such policies. The best way for the GOP to capitalize on such a revolt is to stand for fiscal sanity and private enterprise.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include copy of my newsletter "Keenotes," issued today, as follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The opening of a new Congress is always an inspiring occasion. On January 7, 1959, I was privileged for the fourth time to be on hand for the time-honored ceremonies which date back to the founding of our beloved country. Legislative veterans, men who have served as many as 15 or 20 terms, tell me that regardless of the number of times they have participated in these ceremonies, they are always thrilled and humbled.

The oath of office, administered every 2 years, is always a reminder of the great honor it is to serve in the House of Representatives. Nothing can make one more humble than to realize that, as a Member of the House, he must speak and act for thousands of his fellow citizens. It is a responsibility that simply cannot be taken lightly.

When the 86th Congress convened at 12 noon on January 7, the country embarked upon what promised to be one of the most eventful periods in history. You will recall that in January of 1958, when lawmakers returned to Washington for the 2d session of the 85th Congress, our country was facing the threat posed by the Russian conquest of space. Greeting the new Congress this year were further Russian achievements, notably the lifting of a tremendous missile out of the range of the earth's gravitational pull and placing it in orbit around the sun.

This fact places squarely before Congress one of the most pressing problems it must face. How are we doing in the race with Russia for conquest of space? Here we are dealing with a highly complex and technical question. None of us are experts, but all of us can, I am convinced, detect a sense of uneasiness on the part of the people and a feeling that perhaps we are not doing as well as we should.

This year both the House and the Senate have permanent committees on outer space. We are in a much better position to deal with this problem than we were last year. One of the first orders of business will be for the space committees to take a look at what we have done—which is considerable, incidentally—and try to spur the executive department on to greater effort and achievement.

Also facing the 86th Congress is a tremendous national debt and the outlook for a further deficit during the fiscal year ending on June 30. The business recession brought about the deficit. Tax revenues from both business and individuals took a sharp dive.

Yet the Government had to step into the breach in certain areas—and this cost money. I am convinced that without extension of unemployment insurance benefits and other positive antirecession measures voted by Congress, the recession would have deepened. We are making good economic recovery. No doubt tax revenues will greatly increase during the year.

There will be a battle over the budget. Democrats have been classified as spenders. But I hazard the guess that the coming months will see an exhibition of fiscal responsibility by the Democrats that has been unequalled in recent years. Our record on this score during the 85th Congress was outstanding. Remember, we increased defense appropriations but reduced the overall budget by about \$600 million.

Many people are worried about our defenses. They feel we are permitting the Russians to narrow the gap and threaten the superiority which we still retain on an overall basis. I am sure Congress will insist that we not skimp on defense. After all, money saved at the expense of national security is not true economy.

The Oppressed People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid, in fact, a living sermon, "The Oppressed People," given by Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington, at St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D.C., on Sunday, December 28, 1958, a sermon, with its clear and correct analysis of communism and its purposes, which should be read as widely as possible.

The sermon follows:

"Be on the watch, stand fast in the faith, be the man, be full of courage. And let everything you do, be done in the spirit of charity." I Corinthians 16: 13, 14.

In the midst of this joyful Christmas season, the Catholic Bishops of the United States request us to pray for and not to forget the persecuted peoples of the world. I quote from the bishops' statement:

"The persecution of the church of God continues with undiminished savagery in the lands of atheistic materialism. Our Catholic brethren are denied the freedom to profess and to practice their religion. In some countries even the right to exist has been taken from them and they are being hounded to death in a grim, silent war of extinction.

"Many of them, only God knows how many, have already died for their sacred convictions. Many more are imprisoned and subjected to the most revolting tortures in order to force them to abjure their faith.

"In sober truth, this is the worst persecution in the 2,000 years of Christianity. . . . The enemy would cover this horror with a mantle of silence. But no Catholic may forget the long-drawn-out passion of these fellow followers of Christ. Nor may we, as we raise our voices against all other forms of injustice, allow these our suffering brethren to be consigned to oblivion."

This message speaks for itself. We are of the family of the church. Our brothers and sisters, children of the same Almighty Father, suffer today as few in recorded history

have suffered. The early persecutions of the Roman emperors were indeed cruel. Yet their victims were numbered in the tens of thousands. The victims of Communist tyranny are numbered in the hundreds of millions. The Romans persecuted Christianity as a strange religion, but in a distorted and imperfect way they acknowledged the authority of a Supreme Lord. But the persecutors of today acknowledge but one allegiance: the Communist Party and the organs under its control.

The despots of old would act in a passion of fury, but then they would often forget and become preoccupied elsewhere. But the diabolical persecution of today is total, unceasing, and systematic. Our early martyrs suffered physical torture, but the refined tortures of today aim at breaking man's spirit and poisoning his soul. There are terror and threats today, but even worse is the all-pervading poison of propaganda and lies. The Christian today behind the Iron Curtain is condemned to live in an unreal world, a world of evil fantasy, without mercy, without truth, without justice.

In the Soviet Union two entire generations have lived in darkness. Since the beginning of World War II, the military power of the Red armies has trapped almost a billion people. You remember what happened in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? You remember what happened to Czechoslovakia, to Hungary, to Rumania, to Bulgaria, to Yugoslavia, and to Poland? You recall that half of Germany was crucified. And the hundreds of millions of China, ripening for the harvest sown by Christian missionaries, were plunged into a barbarism so savage that even European Communists quail at its excesses.

In each instance, the pattern was similar. First, there was military conquest and the ruthless extinction of all who openly opposed their loss of freedom. Next there was prison and even death for those who might be suspected of possibly leading an opposition. Then there was the leaden blanket of Marxist conformity: propaganda in the radio, in the press, in books and plays, and in the schools. Here was an unrelenting effort to form generations of robots. Communist scientists openly and admittedly tried to fashion human beings to act like the dogs in Pavlov's experiments, trained to respond to controlled stimuli of their masters.

But their special hatred was reserved for any church, and especially for the Catholic church, that dared to be independent of the all-embracing state. The pattern of persecution has varied from time to time. There were times when temporary toleration could be purchased at the price of total submission to state control. But, with the possible exception of Poland—and even here to a limited degree—no Communist state has tolerated a church that insisted that the law of God and not the decrees of man must come first. And the first victims of such persecution were the bishops and priests. "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered." (Matthew 26: 31.)

In the past 2 years, we have seen examples of cruelty that are almost beyond belief. First, there was the treacherous, bloody, and murderous crushing of the Hungarian revolt. This was so barbarous that even hardened Russian soldiers had to be withdrawn and replaced because they refused to mow down women and children. More recently, we have witnessed the atrocity of the commune system in China. Here entire families are separated and forced into communal barracks. Children are taken from their mothers, husbands from their wives. The old are torn from their family ties and forced to live their declining years, if indeed they are allowed to live, as cogs in a gigantic machine for production. Everyone is compelled to do physical work: Women as well as men, and even schoolchildren before and after

school hours. Here is slavery in its most literal sense, and upon a scale unparalleled in history.

The victims of communism suffer almost beyond the power of human endurance. Yet we may add to their sufferings by our own conduct. We do this in two ways. First, we can betray them by forgetting their agony. Sympathy and understanding can make bearable the cruellest pains. And, in the wisdom of God, He has given us the power to help through our prayers, our penances, and sufferings those martyred souls whose names we may never know. But if we fail them, they have the added sorrow of knowing that they are forgotten, alone in the face of monstrous tyranny. And the bitterness of loneliness is as gall and vinegar.

Secondly, we can betray them by weakening in our devotion to truth, to liberty, and to the rights of man. Nearly 200 years ago, a group of courageous Americans issued a Declaration that electrified the world. They said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." They concluded this historic document with these words: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Jefferson said that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." Patrick Henry asked: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Daniel Webster told us: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." Another American, William Allen White, stated well our historic position: "Wherever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America." Contrast, if you will, these noble sentiments that express the soul of our Nation with the cynical remark of Lenin: "It is true that liberty is precious—so precious that it must be rationed."

What great American statesmen expressed in ringing words, other Americans expressed in immortal deeds. At Valley Forge, Chateau Thierry, and Iwo Jima there was heroism that symbolized beyond the power of words our devotion to freedom. This is the America we have learned and loved. But questioning voices arise today to ask if there is another America, one sunk in indifference, apathy, and the pursuit of special interests? Two weeks ago a respected American, who has given much to his country, posed this question. Bernard Baruch asked why so many people have lost the capacity for indignation. He noted that "There are too many special interest groups in America today and not enough groups interested in America." He asks: "Have we grown so apathetic that we will not rouse ourselves before some terrible tragedy overwhelms us? In time of peril, apathy is the unforgivable sin, the irredeemable error."

At the same time, a distinguished Washington clergyman, Chaplain of the United States Senate, gave an example of this apathy. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris referred to those who believe that we must yield before the blackmail of Red China. He quoted a delegate to a religious convention who said: "The Chinese will soon number a thousand million. We had better make peace with them." And Dr. Harris' reply was: "Shame. When did the Christian church ever quail before mere bulk?"

Contrast, if you will, this desire for peace at any price with the plea of our holy father at his most recent consistory:

"Would that all upright men were able to hear the cries which pierce our ears. They pour forth from the lips of persons who, oppressed but not broken by most bitter trials, seek to manifest their love and fidelity for the Roman pontiff. Not for the sake of their bodies, but for the sake of their souls, do they request prayers and supplications, and by their plaintive sighs they bear witness that, no matter what happens, they will truly, sincerely, and tenaciously preserve unblemished to their dying breath their fealty to the vicar of Christ."

The Pope testifies to the courage of those who bear the cross of persecution. Is this courage to be greeted by indifference and apathy on our part? I do not wish to enter into a discussion that could be termed political. I realize that leaders of government may at times seem to be faced with a choice between evils. But surely, when the desire to stand for principles, to stand fast against tyranny and to proclaim the value of freedom for all men, they should be supported and not be undercut by the timorous and faint-hearted so-called liberals.

In this regard, our Secretary of State only last month stated moral principles that all of us can and should follow. Mr. Dulles said in Cleveland:

"We oppose international communism for its creed and practices are irreconcilable with the principles of our faith. Our faith is that each individual has his origin and destiny in God and thus has a spiritual nature and personal dignity. Therefore we must oppose the treatment of the individual as merely an animated bit of matter to be used to promote the organization of the world in accordance with materialistic principles.

"Our faith is that the basic guides of human action derive from the love of fellow man, the self-control and self-restraint imposed by the moral law. Therefore we must oppose the extension throughout the world of an iron rule that would enslave the minds and bodies of men and seek to break their spirits.

"There are some who seem to feel that, because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it. Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

"Communism is stubborn for the wrong; let us be steadfast for the right. A capacity to change is indispensable. Equally indispensable is the capacity to hold fast to what is good."

These are courageous words. They express high principles that should ever be our guides when we deal with the Communist world. In expressing our unyielding opposition to communism and to its evil principles, we are not being merely negative. Much less are we indifferent to the need for firm and enduring peace in the world.

The peace we seek must be real, and it must be based upon justice. We seek not the peace of the tomb, which we can readily obtain by passivity before the threat of world communism. Nor do we seek the peace of appeasement and betrayal. Our peace is the peace of Christ. It means the law of love in place of the law of force. If we work for, and insist upon such a peace, then the world can again experience the fruits of right living under the moral law.

In such a peace, the home and the family will be safe from war and destruction. The energies of science will be channeled to bring economic abundance, physical and mental health, and a high level of culture for all peoples. Peoples then will kneel, not in submission to the conqueror, but in thanks to the Almighty giver of all good gifts. Our only wars will be wars against poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Surely the prospect of such a peace is worth our prayers and our struggles. Indeed, we may trust that, if the Communist world once realizes what true peace can bring, it too may turn from the insane path that could lead to war and world destruction. If such a hope is to be real, then we must convince the Communists that there is but one choice: we offer them true peace, or unrelenting opposition. Apathy, indifference, and lack of moral principles will only spur the aggressor. Blackmail begets blackmail and compromise begets compromise. To have real peace, we must be resolute in our principles, courageous in their application. Let us all pray to God that we may live up to the text announced at the beginning of this sermon: "Be on the watch, stand fast in the faith, be the man, be full of courage. And let everything you do, be done in the spirit of charity." (1 Cor. 16, 13, 14)

In conclusion, may I address in your name these words to those suffering peoples:

"Dearly beloved brothers and sisters, it is our hearts' desire that you believe and know that we of the free Catholic world are daily praying for your deliverance from savage slavery, and that once again you may know the blessings of liberty and peace. We pledge to you our continued, constant prayers and efforts to save you—a pledge of devotion as changeless as our changeless faith. Far greater and more precious even than our professed prayers and strivings to help you, more precious still, we say, than all our earthly efforts, is the glorious truth that Mary, Queen of Martyrs, is your constant companion in suffering and grief, your devoted intercessor with Christ, her Saviour Son, who died to redeem all men, black and white, yellow and brown, and with God our Father, looks into the soul of man."

The Plight of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my voice has been heard in this Chamber on many occasions concerning the plight of American agriculture. It has long been my contention that the problem has extended, and will further extend itself, into sociological as well as economical facets of our society. Many approaches have been made to the problem, none of them with any marked degree of success. I have recently heard from my good friend and constituent, Mr. John H. Harnly, a farmer near Miami in Roberts County, Tex., with several suggestions relative to the situation. I request unanimous consent to insert herein Mr. Harnly's communication that all Members may have the benefit of his excellent viewpoint, as follows:

MIAMI, TEX., December 18, 1958.

Congressman WALTER ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been giving considerable thought to the position of us farmers in the present day economy and what I see has no future to it. I take pencil and paper and set down my costs of operation on one side, which comes out an average cost per acre of \$12, then on the other side

I set down my average expected income based on average yields per acre and present prices, and I find myself losing money without any compensation for my time. I find the average income per acre to be \$17 of which one-third goes to pay rent. This is today's picture and tomorrow's looks even darker, as they are already posting 5 percent increases on farm machinery, and our local taxes are to take another jump next year. The present plan seems to be that of lowering still more the support prices under our products. The picture is indeed gloomy from where I sit.

Let us then look at the other side of the picture—that of the taxpayer. He is supporting an agricultural budget of \$5 billion a year plus an investment of \$7 to \$8 billion in surplus commodities trying to help us farmers achieve equality of income. Since the Department of Agriculture's budget is creeping upward year by year, as is the mounting surpluses, it is no wonder that the general public is becoming disgusted with the farm program.

We would conclude then that the present efforts on the part of the Government are a failure since the farmers income is still inadequate, and the taxpayers' costs are mounting. What then can be done? We think that we have a plan whereby the farmer can obtain parity of income and the cost to the Government can be reduced.

Approximately five-sevenths of the cultivated lands of this country are devoted to raising small grains, soybeans, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco. This accounts for about one-third the annual income to farmers. Part of this income of course comes from the livestock, dairy, and poultry industries, as considerable of the small grains are fed on the farm and thus never reach the cash markets in their own form. For example: One summary shows corn sold for cash to be only 2½ percent of the gross farm income instead of the 14½ percent when you figure the total corn crop harvested for grain times the average price. The difference, of course, is reflected in the income from livestock, dairy, and poultry.

You, WALTER, are well aware of what I am going to explain next, but your colleagues from the cities are not. We read and have impressed upon us daily that the farm population is shrinking, thus the problem of equality of income becomes less of a political issue since it represents a shrinking portion of our population. Due to mechanization we no longer employ as many people directly on our farms, but when you think of the invisible man who produces our machines for the farm, the invisible man who produces the fuel and oil for these machines, the invisible man who produces the repairs to keep this equipment rolling, the invisible man that finances through loans much of these operations, the invisible man that insures these operations, the invisible man that services these farm operations from local communities you have increased this population to a rather important percentage of the total. Many of our small communities exist solely on income derived from agricultural activities. These small communities in turn help support the economy of the large cities.

When the general economy is booming along this income of the farmers is not felt or recognized, but let me point out to you what it did this year to our economy. Due to exceptionally good weather conditions the farmer produced the biggest crop on record from the fewest acres and this at a time when our general economy was lagging. Because of this many manufactures of farm equipment that had been idle or on restricted production started producing full time. This gave a shot in the arm so to speak to the general economy and help start us on the way to recovery. Had the farmer been receiving parity for his products as well as the increase in production

it would have helped the economy that much more. We are trying to point out that the welfare of our city cousin is still dependent upon our farm prosperity.

Sure, we farmers made some money this year due the large per-acre yields but when you average this year's crops into that of the past 10 years you find that we are still operating at a loss.

You ask me then what I would do about the farm problem? First I would put it on an equitable basis for all involved. The present and past programs have not given the same treatment to all producers alike. For example, anyone planting less than the 15 acres of wheat does not have to have an allotment, and yet this type of farmer, so I am told, produces nearly one-fourth of our total wheat supply. True, he is not eligible for support loans but he does benefit from the price set by these loans. Next the acreage allotted to the growing of wheat varies from State to State and county to county. When you operate farms in two counties and have a 40-percent wheat allotment in one and a 60-percent in the other you wonder at the fairness of the program. In order to insure fairness to all I would first throw out the present historical method of determining acreage controls and would substitute the following plan: I would have each farmer go to his or her farm office and designate how many acres of each crop he would like to grow on his farm. The total of these crops could not exceed the total cultivated acres of this farm. The acreages of the various crops would then be compiled and sent to Washington where they would be totaled thus giving us the acres to be produced by each of these crops. This acreage would be binding for a period of years. We would suggest 5 as a proper period at the close of which the acreage would be redetermined in the same manner as above. Any person wishing to place additional land in these crops would have to wait the expiration of this 5-year period, then he could place his acreage in the program and receive the same treatment as the rest.

The Department of Agriculture would then figure the expected yields from the acreages of the various crops using past averages with possible improved yields from new seed, fertilization, weather cycles, etc., to determine the production of the various crops. Next the Department would determine the probable market totals for each crop, taking into consideration domestic as well as export demand. Taking the ratio between this demand and the total expected production would give us the number of acres needed to maintain our present needs. Since we have large surpluses of these crops on hand it would be well to reduce this allotment of acres to where this surplus could be worked off during the next 5 to 10 years. We would decline surplus only that quantity above the needed carryover to protect the country in case of emergency.

The acreage taken out of production would be retired for the entire base period of 5 years in the same manner as now applied to soil bank land. This would prevent its rotation in the farming operation with the resultant increase of per-acre yields. We have never had a total crop control program but rather a diverted acreage program that only added to our problems. We certainly cannot solve our problem by continuing to produce more than we can use. Anyone that farmed in the late twenties and early thirties knows the fallacy of continued surplus production.

This plan of acreage control would be equitable to all concerned. It would not be hard to administer for the machinery is present from our current program. It would assure a reduction of present surpluses. It would not be as arbitrary a program as the present because the farmer could make his own plans every 5 years instead of being

forced to take the past history of the farm as the base. It is also flexible in that as the needs of the country change this program will change.

Now we have reduced production to an equitable basis within the needs of the country. We must next figure out a way to bring the farmers' income up to parity with the rest of the economy. In order to do this we would classify all small grains that can be used for livestock feed into one price class. This would include corn, wheat, barley, oats, grain sorghum, etc. Since corn is the basic feed crop we would use it as a basis for our price-support program. We would price each crop on the relative feed value that it has to corn by the pound. The following is compiled from figures given by the Doane's Agricultural Service.

Corn at \$1.80 per bushel at 100 percent parity equals \$3.22 per 100 pounds.

Wheat at 105 percent of feed value of corn, \$3.38 per 100 pounds.

Barley at 92 percent of feed value of corn, \$2.96 per 100 pounds.

Grain sorghums at 90 percent of feed value of corn, \$2.90 per 100 pounds.

Oats at 85 percent of feed value of corn, \$2.74 per 100 pounds.

These figures would then be used to insure the farmer 100 percent of parity if he were producing all his acres. Since part of the acres would be taken out of production he would have to receive more to get his full share. In order to do this we would add to this price the percentage of acreage reduction. If we reduced the acres by 20 percent we would add 20 percent to the parity price. Corn would then be supported at \$3.86 per hundred. It is obvious from this that wheat would still not receive its full share of parity as the figures show it to have a parity value of \$2.50 per bushel compared to that of corn. About 500 million bushels of wheat goes into foodstuff for human consumption. If total acres of wheat asked to be planted indicated a total crop of 1,500,000,000 bushels then the domestic human consumption price of the wheat should figure out \$4.12 per bushel. We used the following formula to arrive at this price: $XY \text{ plus } (100 - Y - Z) \text{ C equals A}$.

X equals price of wheat for human consumption.

Y equals percentage of total production of wheat for human use.

Z equals percentage of acres taken out of production.

C equals parity price of feed wheat after allowing for reduction.

A equals parity price for full production.

Wheat would then receive \$2.40 per bushel for that part used as livestock feed and export and \$4.12 per bushel for that wheat used at home for human consumption. Any wheat exported under this price of \$2.40 per bushel would be subsidized by the Government.

We would have to apply a two-price system to wheat in order to make it work. Each farmer of wheat would receive certificates of interest equal to the difference between support price for wheat as feed and the price for human consumption on his share of the crop raised for human consumption. This share would be figured on a bushel allotment basis and would be fixed for the 5-year base period.

Let us see how this would work applied to my own farm. Say I have 1,150 acres in cultivation and I put it all into wheat production. The average yield per acre is 10 bushels. I expect to raise 11,500 bushels of wheat at parity of \$2.50 per bushel, the gross income should be \$28,750. I leave out 20 percent or do not produce 2,300 bushels of wheat. I have a bushel allotment of 3,833 bushels at \$4.12 or \$15,790.

The balance of 5,367 bushels would bring \$2.40 per bushel or \$12,880. Thus I would have a total income of \$28,671 or very near my parity income. Figured on a cost basis of \$12 per acre to produce and one-third

rent to the landowner that would leave me with a margin of \$4.67 per acre for my labor and risk. This would give me an income of \$5,370 per year which is not high at all for these times. Land here is valued at \$80,000 per section and this farm operation includes two sections so that the gross return on the land is less than 6 percent.

Cotton has a problem all its own. It has competition from synthetics which will not allow an increase in price to compensate for reduction in acres. It would need a lower support price to meet competition and a direct subsidy to bring the income up to parity. This is justifiable in that cotton is a war material and we need a healthy production system to insure ample supply in case of war.

Rice can use the same plan as that used for feed grains and wheat only using a support floor equal to the world price of rice and a domestic price high enough to bring the total income up to parity levels.

It might be well to add here that the certificates of interests would be bought from the Government by the processors as they processed the wheat or rice. The producer would cash his certificates at the bank.

This program would add about 20 percent to the prices of the processed food items. This is justifiable in that when labor gets an increase in wages it is passed along in the price of the product that he produces.

We would go further and eliminate all Government payments that are capital improvements such as terracing, tank building, brush eradication, seeding, etc. We would do away with all soil-bank payments. We would not furnish any more drought-relief payments. The above program would insure adequate income to the farmer based on average production figures that take into account drought.

Whether we like it or not a program as outlined above is the only type of farm relief that will actually accomplish the purpose of any such program and that is parity of income.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. HARNLY.

Vice President Nixon's Trip to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of Vice President NIXON on the occasion of his speaking before the English-speaking Union of the Commonwealth on November 26, 1958, in London.

The results of the Vice President's trip to England were most gratifying and some of the editorial comments following that visit are appended hereto. The value which we place upon the friendship between us and Great Britain is readily attested to by the following editorials from newspapers in both countries. It is good to know that people in England are seriously interested in our viewpoint as I know we are in theirs, especially in the field of international affairs where all of our resources and ingenuity have time and again been put to a test. These editorials are appended herewith in full:

[From the Daily Telegraph (London, England), Nov. 26, 1958]

American money helped to revive the free nations, and American strength is now their shield. Yesterday, Vice President Nixon, making his first speech in London, gracefully turned the coin to show inscribed on its reverse the record of America's debt to ourselves: the free democratic institutions that are the foundation of her strength were a heritage from Britain, and—as Mr. Nixon might have added—the United States owes other debts of energy and enterprise to streams that have fed her from other countries, now also her allies. In the public relations of the alliance, sometimes ill-managed, nothing is more important than to emphasize this interdependence of tradition and ideals no less than of armed strength. This between friends. Lest others should draw false conclusions from some external similarities, Mr. Nixon did well to warn them that the recent setback of the Administration party denoted no wavering of Americans in their determination to resist aggression.

[From the Financial Times (London, England), Dec. 1, 1958]

Although the Vice President disagreed, with characteristic vigor, with the Labor Party on disengagement and with the majority of his hosts on China, one had the impression that his view on these topics had none of the principled rigidity of some other American leaders, and that he would be prepared to reconsider his position should the changing situation alter the balance of the argument. Even though the visit may not have set all doubts at rest, it has confirmed the impression that at a time when President Eisenhower is showing a growing obsession with the single issue of a balanced budget, Mr. Nixon represents the main influence inside the administration for a broader approach to both domestic and international problems.

[From the Daily Telegraph (London, England), Nov. 29, 1958]

He has treated us as friends and partners, entitled to understand the difficulties experienced by the United States as well as to realize that our own difficulties are not discounted by his countrymen. Britons and Americans share the same interests, much of the same outlook, most of the same policies. The fact that they share the same language may, in spite of Mr. Nixon's eulogies, tend rather to misunderstanding than to perfect accord. It is always disconcerting to find that someone who uses the same words as you do possesses different categories of thought. But every sensible person in the United States realizes that they need us, and every sensible person here realizes that we need them.

The Daily Mail (London, England), Nov. 29, 1958, heads its comment "Helpful Visit." The paper emphasizes the need to maintain a firm and constant Anglo-American unity. It says that there has been a big improvement in the past year or two with London and Washington showing themselves more ready to listen to each other's points of view. Mr. Nixon's visit should have helped in that direction. The Daily Mail writes:

"In recent months, he has rivaled Mr. Dulles in his determination to see for himself what is going on in the world. He has shown in London that these travels have broadened his mind and opened his eyes. He has in the course of the next 2 years an opportunity to influence American thinking. He can strengthen the Anglo-American Alliance and do something to strengthen his own reputation as well."

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald and Review, Nov. 27, 1958]

BRITISH EDITORS ON MR. NIXON

English newspapers discuss editorially the visit of Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

The News Chronicle (Liberal) feels that Mr. Nixon's visit should be useful to himself and to Britain. The truth about Mr. Nixon, says the paper, is that he is an unknown quantity under a cloud. Unknown because he is still developing politically, and under a cloud because the mid-term election success of his fellow Republican, Nelson Rockefeller, has spoiled what looked like a near certainty for the presidency.

The Manchester Guardian (Liberal) writes:

"Vice President Nixon is welcome to Britain. We are happy to receive him not merely because he represents an ally to whom we are bound by warm friendship and respect as much as by gratitude and political necessity, not merely because of the greater understanding and confidence between our governments that may result from his visit, but also because we want to get to know him. At present he is a puzzle to us."

"At any minute he may become the leader of the non-Communist world—one of the two or three people on whom the destinies of all of us seem to depend.

"Few people in Britain would pretend that this prospect allures them. Many, indeed, have the same sinking of the heart as the idea of Mr. Bevan as British Foreign Secretary is said to bring about among many Americans; but our misgivings are certainly due in part to ignorance. In fact, most of America's allies, as well as the uncommitted nations, have reason to be grateful to Mr. Nixon. In recent years, his ideas on foreign policy are what we—actuated by self-interest—would call enlightenment."

The Daily Express (Conservative) comments on the visit of the United States Vice President, Mr. Nixon, to Britain. It says that he is a vigorous politician—intelligent as well as ambitious. He was the first member of Eisenhower's administration to recover from the American hysteria over Suez. In his own country, adds the Express, Mr. Nixon—a strong partisan—inspires mixed feelings; here he will have a warm reception from all sides.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 2, 1958]

MR. NIXON'S CONQUEST

From all accounts Vice President and Mrs. Nixon were extremely effective ambassadors on their visit to England. Mr. Nixon is at his best when talking responsibly about national policy and foreign affairs, and he seems to have won the admiration of British officials and a considerable section of the previously distant British press. The fact that Mr. Nixon can be charming, candid, and courageous on such occasions does not, of course, mean that there is no basis for the misgivings about the other side of his personality that sometimes emerges during election campaigns. But these misgivings ought not to becloud the Vice President's exemplary conduct in Britain and his well-chosen efforts on behalf of the Anglo-American alliance. Although formal visits seldom afford an opportunity for really balanced appraisals, it is well that the British public has had this chance to see a possible future President at first hand. Despite the Republican reverses, he remains a formidable practical politician whose potential is by no means eclipsed by the difficult decisions he faces on just where to chart his course.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 1, 1958]

GETTING TO KNOW HIM

Returning from his trip to England, Vice President Nixon told reporters he thinks NATO's position has been strengthened by the Berlin crisis. Whatever the fact as to this, it seems clear that Mr. Nixon definitely strengthened his own standing with the British, some of whom have been among his severe critics.

Thus, as Mr. and Mrs. Nixon took their leave after a 4-day visit, the Daily Telegraph pronounced him a "frank and engaging character." According to this journal, the Vice President "has done a good deal to cement the Anglo-American alliance." Another British paper, the Daily Mail, concluded from Mr. Nixon's conversations in London that the Washington administration "has learned a lot about the international facts of life."

This favorable impression was not registered on the press alone, however. The Associated Press reports from London that "politicians—both Conservative and Socialist—seemed impressed with Mr. Nixon's air of sincerity." And, again according to the AP, Labor Party Leader Hugh Gaitskell came away from two exposures to Mr. Nixon "praising him extravagantly."

None of this, we suppose, will make the slightest impression on Mr. Nixon's dedicated and relentless critics in our own country. They will continue to portray him as a kind of subhuman embodiment of all that is evil in public life. But, for those who prefer to appraise this controversial man objectively rather than subjectively, the British reaction will confirm an already strong impression—that RICHARD M. NIXON is one of the ablest if not the ablest spokesman for the Republican Party.

C. Melvin Sharpe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

MR. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive the permission of the House to insert in the RECORD a few thoughts about the late C. Melvin Sharpe, a lifetime resident of Washington who died on Christmas Day last. The people of the District of Columbia have lost a great and useful citizen in his death. While it was not my privilege to know him well, his devotion to the Capital City and his pride in doing what he could for its welfare was evident to all who met him. Everyone, whether they knew him or not, had the most profound respect for his sincerity and his character. Those who were in disagreement with his views frequently revised their thinking because of the aggressive and logical arguments he would put forth in support of them. He was a good fighter who made few enemies and a loyal and warm friend. His influence for good will long be felt in this city and his devotion to its welfare will never be forgotten.

He well deserved the eulogies expressed in the following editorials:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

Many Washingtonians came to know C. Melvin Sharpe best during the 18 years of his service as a member, and for half that time as president, of the Board of Education. His death on Thursday, at the age of 77, followed his retirement from the board by about a year and a half.

But an older generation of Washingtonians will remember that Mr. Sharpe's service on the Board of Education was a mere postscript to a busy and active life in Washington, first as a Federal employee, using his persuasive abilities in behalf of civil service retirement legislation, and later as an executive and public relations adviser for the old Washington Railway and Electric Co., and the Potomac Electric Power Co. In the latter capacity he became involved in numerous community organizations and undertakings, and was a man-about-town known for his delightful gift of anecdote and his shrewd judgment of human nature.

He was appointed to the Board of Education a few years before he reached retirement age at Pepco, and in 1949, when he became president of the board, he promised to bring to an end the small bickering and misunderstandings which hampered the school system. Whatever small bickering he may have had in mind, it must have seemed small indeed compared with what followed within a few years. For in his term as president the school system, quickly conforming to the Supreme Court's edict against segregation, underwent the most profound and spectacular changes in its history. That "Mel" Sharpe survived them with grace, and that retirement found him still in possession of the good will of the people of this city, are no mean tributes to his capabilities. He lived a full and useful life.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

C. Melvin Sharpe, who died Thursday at the age of 77, spent most of his years in Washington with the Potomac Electric Power Co., but he will be remembered for his conscientious civic service on the board of education and the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City. Unlike most men who jealously guard their retirement years for themselves, Mr. Sharpe used his to serve his adopted community. He was both president of the board of education and chairman of the Committee of One Hundred after he retired from Pepco. As head of the board of education when District schools were desegregated in 1954 he helped to plan for this difficult transition. His devotion to Washington ought to set an example for other men.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 27, 1958]

C. MELVIN SHARPE

It is a tribute to C. Melvin Sharpe that District public schools, which he labored so long and so hard to improve, were able to forge ahead on their own, without his leadership, when he retired as president of the school board last year.

His death Thursday, at the age of 77, is a great loss to the city he loved, but there is every indication that public education in the District will continue to advance along the trail he blazed in 16 years of active service on the board.

He was one of the world's kindest men, true to himself and his convictions, and a tireless and selfless worker. He did not favor desegregating the schools, but he accepted the Supreme Court's decision as law and did nothing to impede the orderly process of carrying it out.

He was greatly respected by Congressmen, business leaders, teachers (he was never too busy to hear their problems) and parents—particularly those with handicapped children, which became his special concern. He was largely responsible for obtaining the new health school, which now bears his name.

He will be sorely missed.

Why United States Will Not Recognize Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article taken from a recent address by Secretary Dulles which appeared in the December 12 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The Secretary clearly restates the administration's position with regard to the recognition of Red China and the reasons behind this policy. I strongly agree with the Secretary's statements and believe that to give political recognition to the Chinese Communist regime would be truly a disheartening and almost fatal blow to the non-Communist governments in the Far East as well as a danger to the political, economic, and security interests of the United States:

WHY UNITED STATES WILL NOT RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

(Pressure is on once more for U.S. recognition of Red China. But it isn't going to happen. Secretary of State Dulles tells why in a restatement of U.S. policy.)

Developments make it ever more clear that, if we were to grant political recognition to the Chinese Communist regime, it would be a well-nigh mortal blow to the survival of the non-Communist governments in the Far East. Such recognition, and the seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations, would so increase their prestige and influence in the Far East, and so dishearten the free nations, that the Communist subversive efforts would almost surely succeed.

Contrary arguments come largely from two sources. There are those who argue that, since the Chinese Communist regime exists and has power in mainland China, we ought to accord it political recognition.

There is, however, no principle of international law to this effect. Recognition is a privilege which can be accorded or withheld. There are several de facto regimes in the world that we do not recognize. We act in this respect, as our national interest dictates.

The Chinese Communist regime is bitterly hostile to the United States. It is dedicated to expelling us from the Western Pacific. It is determined to take over the free peoples and resources of the area. It violates all established principles of international law and of civilized conduct.

Why should we give aid and comfort to such a regime and to such policies? Some think we should recognize the Chinese Communist regime in the hope that large and profitable trade would follow. That is an illusion. The mainland of China has never been a large customer of the United States,

and its trade is even more closely regimented under Communist rule.

The United States today is exporting to the non-Communist countries of the Far East at the rate of over \$2.5 billion a year. This excludes the value of military items exported under our mutual-security programs.

We may be sure that, if the Communists should take over these free nations of the Far East, our trade with them would drastically shrink, as has been the case with our trade with the Soviet Union and its European satellites. We must also recall that, because Communist nations look on trade primarily as a political instrument, it has rarely been possible for citizens of free nations profitably or safely to engage in such trade.

Should we, then, in the quest of a few millions of dollars of unreliable trade with Communist China, jeopardize exports of \$2.5 billion?

We deal with the Chinese Communist regime whenever that is expedient. We do not pretend that it does not exist. We have been in almost constant negotiations with it for particular purposes, at Panmunjom, at the Geneva Conference on Indochina, in bilateral negotiations at Geneva, and now at Warsaw.

But it is certain that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist regime would gravely jeopardize the political, the economic and the security interests of the United States. The Pacific, instead of being a friendly body of water, would in great part be dominated by hostile forces and our own defenses driven back to or about our continental frontiers.

There is currently a specific threat to free-world trade in the Far East. That is the "dumping" practice of Communist China. The Chinese-mainland people desperately need for themselves all that they are capable of producing. But they are denied, so that the rulers may prosecute their expansionist designs.

When millions of Chinese are dying of starvation, rice is exported for political purposes.

Goods manufactured in China are being dumped in Southeast Asia at prices that disrupt normal trade. These include textiles, bicycles, sewing machines, fountain pens, and the like. This is particularly a threat to the trade of Japan in South and Southeast Asia. This problem as it arises in the Far East is one phase of the economic offensive now being initiated by the Sino-Soviet bloc. Your Government is intensively studying this problem. We have asked business people to study it. There is no doubt in my mind but what concrete measures will be needed to assure that, in the face of this unfair competition, free enterprise will continue to play its full role as a dynamic and expanding force in developing the economies of the free-world nations.

If the non-Communist nations hold fast to policies which deter armed aggression; if they prevent subversion through economic and revolutionary processes; and, above all, if they demonstrate the good fruits of freedom, then we can know that freedom will prevail.

A Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us on both sides of the aisle have en-

joyed the Sunday weekly column of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, in the Washington Star.

It can always be said that Dr. Harris is never afraid to take a stand on an issue on which he feels strongly. I attach, in full, his very thoughtful article of Sunday, December 14, 1958.

A TROJAN HORSE

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

From the time of the Greek siege at Troy, a Trojan horse has been the symbol of conquest from within by smuggled foes. The Communist conspiracy has used the Trojan horse technique as its most potent method of aggression. Now, from an unexpected direction—a church conference on world order, whose members belong to 33 denominations—a Trojan horse is trotted out in the name of world understanding. Of course, the architects of concord who built it did not construct it for that purpose—just the opposite—but a Trojan horse it is, planted within the lines of the free world.

No wonder the recommendation of these churchmen has been received with pained incredulity at home and abroad. No wonder anguished cables are coming from officials and missionaries in free China and free Korea asking the meaning of such an unbelievable attitude to the mounting Red peril. Of course, it ought to be made clear that these religious leaders speak only for themselves, and have no mandate to commit the various churches to their point of view. It already is evident that multitudes—especially laymen—belonging to these same churches are violently opposed to any such betrayal of the solemn trust committed to America's hands in this day of destiny. Those who know the grim facts of the international situation listen to this "message to the churches" with the feeling Paul expressed when he asked fellow Christians, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?"

One is reminded that in spite of Churchill's warning, "Arm! Arm!" it was because equally sincere church leaders mobilized the pacifist forces of England that Britain was unprepared when the mad dictator struck. In her finest hour she paid an awful price, largely because of church leaders who had zeal without knowledge.

Now, those in the forefront of the Cleveland conference group express the hope that our Government will listen to this message and change its firm and "inflexible" policy in dealing with the Red menace. The mood of these leaders through all their discussions seemed to be critical of America's defenses rather than of the offenses of the Red terror. It is because this "message to the churches," with all its pious verbiage, betrays the very principles which by black paganism are being denied and derided that this column joins the outraged voices of religious leaders in all parts of the country in crying out against any serious consideration of what is proposed. Spires are perpendicular—never bending—and are symbols of divine sovereignty, human dignity, and spiritual verities, of justice and morality.

From the standpoint of Spires of the Spirit, the Cleveland proposition is a Trojan horse because, first, it would make the U.N. a travesty and a mockery. The U.N. Charter defines its objective as the "furtherance of fundamental human rights." It supports the "dignity and worth of the human person." It gives a guarantee of "equal rights for all nations, large and small." In this very year, 1958, Red China, in an official publication, declared that "such bourgeois ideas must be made to thoroughly stink and must be thoroughly burnt." The very year when the most diabolical device of all, the communes, are turning continental China into

one vast concentration camp, a Christian church group recommends that it be admitted to the U.N. The fact is that any person in Red China today who dared profess belief in the Charter of the U.N. would be either brainwashed or executed. Second, it is a Trojan horse because it refers to the present regime as an "effective" government. Effective. Do they not know that in response to Mao's "hundred flower" invitation, people in all walks of life by the hundred fervently berated the Communists?

Has anyone who voted for this pronouncement read the report of the chief of Red security, dated January 4 of this year, in which he admits that during the past 2 years 370,000 counterrevolutionaries surrendered, and 100,000 new ones were discovered, and that 18 million workers were undergoing investigation for anticommunism, 5,000 of these inside the Communist Party, some in "highest, inmost organs"? In a number of places excited mobs have plastered the walls with pro-Taiwan posters. The significance of all this is stupendous. Third, the Cleveland message to the churches is a Trojan horse because in addition to being a boon to Red China and a blow to the U.N., if carried out it would be a devastating breach of faith with Taiwan, whose sacred task it is to guard, preserve and perpetuate the ancient China culture which, on the mainland, is now being ruthlessly ground into the dust.

What will this message to the churches do to the growing assurance in Formosa that the hour will strike when the economic miracle under freedom that is happening there will be welcomed by millions on the enslaved mainland? Then what of Korea, one of the most promising missionary fields in all the world, half of whose sacred territory Red China still holds as an invader? An apostolic American missionary writes: "To ignore Korea and sit in the council of nations with its bitterest enemy would be an insult to all that Korea has fought and bled for since 1950." It seems to be forgotten that Red China, still unrepentant, is under condemnation for aggression by the very organization now urged to accept it as a defiant, yet equal, member. And what of the Philippines, who would regard such action as treachery? And what of the 12 million Chinese, mostly anti-Communist, scattered across Asia? If such a betrayal should take place and Red China made respectable, these valiant millions would be tempted to bow the knee to the Red Baal. All this and much more is concealed inside this Trojan horse. Out of it could come a resounding victory for the powers of darkness which plot the destruction of our liberties.

But we are grateful that already there is an American Committee of a Million Against the Admission of Red China. Its roster contains the names of thousands of churchmen in all public and private walks of life—perhaps as great a galaxy of eminent names as ever graced an organization. They also have a message to the Christian churches. We prophesy that by leaps and bounds that committee will now swell to 10 million plus, declaring in no uncertain tones, "We are set as a flint against this great denial." From all over the Nation last week men in high positions were hastening to Valley Forge for the annual meeting of Freedom's Foundation.

One of the Cleveland delegates, a layman, apparently with trembling knees, was heard to say, "The Chinese will soon number a thousand million. We'd better make peace with them." Shame. When did the Christian church ever quail before mere bulk?

There is a message to the churches in this crisis, mirrored in a recent scene in a crowded Washington church, when, at the close of the morning worship, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, and scores of others high in the Government councils joined the multitude in singing heartily:

Ye that are men now serve Him against un-numbered foes;
Let courage rise with danger, and strength to strength oppose.
Stand up, stand up for Jesus, ye soldiers of the Cross;
Lift high His royal banner,
It must not, it must not suffer loss.

Silent Weapon of the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Silent Weapon of the Cold War." The author, Mr. Demaree Bess, presents an interesting and arresting account of how Russia has used economic warfare in the past to gain control of certain countries such as China and Hungary, and how it is now relentlessly waging this same type of warfare against the United States. The author feels it is vital at this time to use all possible measures to stem the tide of inflation and keep this country on a sound economic and financial basis:

SILENT WEAPON OF THE COLD WAR—A POST EDITOR'S GRIM WARNING OF A DEADLY VIRUS WHICH THE REDS USE AS A TOOL: RUNAWAY INFLATION, WHICH CAN DEVASTATE A NATION

(By Demaree Bess)

Inflation can be one of the most tiresome subjects in the public domain, as a swarm of economists have demonstrated in Washington during recent months. The disputes of these specialists about inflation have shown why economics is sometimes called the dismal science. Economists have managed to make their controversy seem dull and dreary, despite the fact that it directly concerns every American, for good or evil.

For a long time inflation has fascinated me because I have seen so much of it, not as an economist, but as a foreign correspondent. During several decades of reporting abroad I had closeup views of the whole range of inflation—from the creeping type to the runaway variety—in many countries of Europe and Asia. The two aspects of inflation which have impressed me most have been largely ignored in current Washington debates. The first is inflation's shattering effects upon individual human beings. The second is the use of inflation as a frightful weapon in economic warfare—in some ways as frightful as any of the new military weapons which are getting so much publicity.

This article will undertake to show how inflation has become a major factor in the Soviet-American cold war, and how it can break the human spirit as completely as famines, earthquakes, wars or revolutions. In France I have watched creeping inflation inexorably undermine a great people's confidence in themselves and in democratic government, thus weakening their will to resist external and internal foes. In eastern Europe, after World War II, I saw runaway inflation cause a sort of universal paralysis, when Moscow deliberately permitted it to get out of control. Runaway inflation wipes out almost overnight every kind of security for

the individual: insurance, pensions, annuities, savings bonds, bank accounts, even cash. What we call "solid citizens" are hardest hit. It was runaway inflation which cleared the way for Communist rule in China after World War II, just as it had previously done in Russia, after World War I.

Up to now, Americans have been lucky about inflation because we have had so little recent experience with it. Only twice in its history has the United States known runaway inflation: Once during revolutionary days for the whole country, and later for the people of the Confederacy after their currency became worthless. While inflation has ravaged many countries since World War II, our creeping inflation has been held within comparatively narrow bounds. But Soviet strategists have given notice that they expect our luck to change, partly because of our own indifference to economic matters in general and to inflation in particular; partly because of the Kremlin's planned economic warfare against us.

Two recent developments have dramatized the fact that the cold war has reached a major turning point. First of these was the Russian sputniks and second was the recession. For several months after the original sputniks roared into space, the American press concentrated its attention almost exclusively upon military innovations, notably earth satellites and guided missiles. Washington was the chief source of this verbal outpouring, as it is of most news and comments nowadays. The administration and congressional committees consulted hundreds of scientists and other specialists working on the arms race. Nuclear physicists and spacemen got more public attention than ever before. Because the arms race also affects many kinds of vested interests, platoons of press agents and lobbyists helped Washington correspondents to keep the news flood flowing.

But then, after months of this, the uproar over sputniks and space weapons subsided almost as abruptly as it started. Now the recession dominated every news channel, as it brought to Washington a prolonged parade of economists and financial experts to advise the President and Congress about means for dealing with it. These experts sharply disagreed about almost everything connected with the recession. Some predicted that it would last for years. Others insisted that it was almost over before most people had noticed it. Some argued that big tax cuts would cure it. Others prescribed massive additional taxes. Some urged the Government to spend its way out of the recession by piling up ever-growing deficits. Others recommended wholesale Government economies. With the November elections coming, both political parties naturally were looking for vote-catching projects.

But it was inflation which most sharply divided the economists. The only unanimous agreement was that inflation has cut away more than half the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, and whittles off more of the dollar's real value every year. That could not be disputed, although almost everything else about inflation was left in doubt. Some economists detected danger of further inflation in almost every one of the projects proposed to tide over the recession. They even warned that more inflation already is inevitable, because of the mounting demands of the arms race. But other economists pooh-poohed these warnings, and insisted that budget deficits could safely be multiplied, and should be.

The man caught in the middle of this crossfire among disputing economists was President Eisenhower, who does not pretend to be a financial expert. Disagreement among his advisers may have confused him as much as it did the rest of us, but no President of the United States can afford to admit being confused. He must keep on

making the big decisions which nobody else can make for him. Moreover, under the American form of government the President's decisions do not necessarily settle issues, especially in financial controversies. Congress holds the power of the purse, and can upset plans made in the White House.

So Mr. Eisenhower has done what any President could be expected to do in this situation. He has tried to give equal attention to the controversies about inflation and about the arms race. He has stopped, looked, and listened. While he has been compelled to recognize that, under existing conditions, there is no immediate hope of balanced Federal budgets, he has vigorously opposed proposals to speed up the arms race recklessly without regard to inflationary effects. He has heeded the warnings of some of his most respected advisers that inflation could become one of the greatest threats to the security and well-being of our country.

But when Washington's news spotlight shifted so abruptly from weapons scientists to economists not one of the controversies about the arms race had been definitely settled. They only got shoved into the news background by the recession. On the surface it looked as if the recession had compelled the American Government to concentrate upon domestic affairs rather than world affairs. Some commentators even detected a return to isolationism. It was already apparent, even before the Middle East exploded again, that the men in Moscow were not going to let us off that easy.

Almost unnoticed by the American press and public, the nature of the Soviet-American conflict had been undergoing a profound change. The cold war, which had featured the arms race ever since Russia exploded her first atom bomb in 1949, has taken on a new aspect in 1958, or more accurately, revived an old one. While American eyes were still fixed on the arms race, Soviet leaders quietly stepped up economic warfare. The sputniks dramatized the fact that the arms race was more or less stalemated, at least temporarily, because both superpowers possess the means to destroy each other. But not until the recession monopolized American attention did anybody in Washington publicly recognize that Moscow's main attention had shifted from the arms race to economic warfare.

This shift has been no surprise to Americans familiar with Bolshevik policy. Even before the Russian revolution the father of Soviet communism, V. I. Lenin, predicted that economic warfare would do much more than armed force to promote Communist worldwide revolution. Ever since they seized power in 1917, Russia's Bolshevik leaders have been carefully studying economic weapons, among which inflation ranks tops. Having utilized runaway inflation to achieve their original victory in Russia, the Bolsheviks have found it equally useful in all subsequent conquests. In fact, Communists never have succeeded in entrenching themselves anywhere without the help of large doses of inflation.

As a reporter in Russia, I first learned what great importance Soviet leaders attach to economic warfare. Almost every morning, for years, it was my painful duty to read Soviet newspapers, which rarely let a day pass without boasts of the superiority of their economic system. Even the Russian grammar I used in Moscow based its lessons upon the great American depression of the 1930's. In my efforts to learn the Russian language I had to read over and over again about how life was becoming more joyous every day for Soviet citizens while millions of Americans were allegedly living on the verge of starvation in slum cities they had built of tar paper and packing cases. That grammar was prepared for Soviet citizens studying English, not for Americans living in Russia. Its propaganda became a sad joke for us, as we

watched our Soviet acquaintances frantically scrambling to supply themselves with the barest necessities.

Nevertheless, during those prewar years in Russia I decided that the Kremlin's professed faith in economic warfare was not just propaganda or wishful thinking. The Soviet creed is fashioned upon the basic belief that communism will sooner or later stand triumphant upon the ruins of rival economic systems which have been bankrupted by a combination of their own financial irresponsibility and unreeling Soviet pressures against them. Time and again during the 40-odd years of Soviet rule in Russia, Moscow has reasserted its faith in economic warfare. As long ago as May 1921, Lenin told an assembly of foreign Communists: "Today we Russians exercise our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy. . . . It is to this arena that the struggle has been shifted on a world scale. If we solve this problem of economics, we shall win on an international scale, decisively and permanently." Two years later, in a speech entitled "The Prospects of World Revolution," Lenin declared: "Our best forces are working on the stabilization of the ruble (Russian money), and we attach decisive importance to it. If we succeed in stabilizing the ruble for a long period, and then permanently, we shall have won."

Just before Lenin died the Soviet Government did stabilize its currency by redeeming outstanding paper rubles at the rate of 50 billion for 1 gold ruble. Those paper rubles once had been equal to gold rubles, and the appalling rate of conversion, revealed dramatically how completely the savings of thrifty Russians had been wiped out by inflation. The Czarist Government, by adopting wildly inflationary measures to pay for World War I, had started the ruble on its road to ruin before the Bolsheviks seized power. The Bolsheviks merely continued to print worthless paper money until they had won their civil war and established themselves in power. But then Bolshevik economists, having watched the effects of runaway inflation in its most virulent forms, were determined to stabilize their own currency.

The most thorough study of the Soviet financial system with which I am familiar was made by an English economist, L. E. Hubbard. In his book, *Soviet Money and Finance*, which has attracted much less attention than it deserves, Mr. Hubbard wrote: "The path traveled by the ruble since 1935 has shown a remarkable convergence toward orthodox capitalist principles. . . . Soviet economic theory may soon be considered reactionary by the advanced advocates of social credit schemes and the manipulation of currency in western countries." By an interesting coincidence the Hubbard book was published in the same year, 1936, as a book by a far more famous English economist, John Maynard Keynes. Soon after the First World War, in 1919, Mr. Keynes had attracted worldwide attention by a book entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace." In that 1919 book Mr. Keynes wrote:

"Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. By this method they not only confiscate, but they confiscate arbitrarily. . . . Lenin certainly was right. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million can diagnose."

That is what Mr. Keynes wrote in 1919, but by 1936 he had changed many of his

ideas about currency manipulation. He had decided that under certain conditions capitalist governments were obligated to debase their currency in a controlled manner. But Soviet economists, who had written with respectful admiration of the 1919 Keynes book, still preferred its ideas to the comparatively radical Keynes ideas of 1936. And ever since 1936, so far as their own system is concerned, Soviet economists have stubbornly clung to such old-fashioned notions as balanced budgets and sound money.

Even in today's topsy-turvy world, it is hard to believe that orthodox capitalist principles could command more respectful attention in Moscow than in a number of western countries. But there is evidence to prove it. In overcoming the tremendous destruction of the German invasion and the enormous costs of World War II, the Soviet Government has labored persistently toward a stable currency and reactionary notions of a sound economy. Almost every economic measure employed by the Kremlin since the war has been anti-inflationary inside Russia and throughout the closed Soviet economic system. At the same time Moscow has hailed inflation in non-Communist countries as evidence of the superiority of the Soviet economic system, and its eventual triumph through economic warfare.

Although the Kremlin's faith in economic warfare thus goes back to the earliest days of the Soviet regime, this subject has seldom interested Americans. Economic subjects are played up in our popular press only when something happens to make them look like news. What brought economic warfare back into the news recently was a speech by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles. In one of his rare public statements C.I.A. chief pointed out that the Soviet Government had stepped up economic pressures throughout the world even before the sputniks signalized what looked like a military stalemate. So from here on out, Mr. Dulles predicted, the cold war would probably be fought mainly with economic weapons. The American press reported Mr. Dulles' remarks as fresh and exciting news, although he probably did not consider his idea new. The C.I.A. Director is supposed to have several thousand secret agents working under him all around the globe, but he didn't get material for that speech from secret agents. He got it from stoop-shouldered analysts sitting in libraries reading and studying Soviet publications, just as we correspondents in Moscow did a quarter of a century ago. As the Dulles speech revealed, Soviet publications are expressing precisely the same confidence in economic warfare today as they did in the 1930's.

Meanwhile, however, the Bolsheviks have extended their economic experiments to several additional countries, thanks to opportunities provided for them by World War II. They have learned a lot about how to control inflation inside their own system and how to turn it loose on their enemies. And Moscow's enemies often have played directly into Bolshevik hands. It is generally agreed that the conquest of China has been Soviet communism's major victory since the war. But it has not been widely understood that runaway inflation probably contributed more than anything else to the overthrow of Gen. Chiang Kaishek's Nationalist Government.

After Japan's defeat in 1945, General Chiang returned in triumph to his capital, Nanking, hopeful for the future. But Chiang and his associates apparently had little or no understanding of economic principles, and ignored the necessity of currency reforms to end the economic chaos caused by a generation of warfare. The ensuing runaway inflation wiped out all sound money values, and sapped the will of China's most substantial men and women to resist communism. It demoralized even American business communities in China. When Red armies entered Shanghai they were openly greeted by

the Shanghai American Chamber of Commerce in the belief that they could not possibly be more dangerous to business interests than Chiang's inflation had been. Those Americans, like their Chinese counterparts, soon discovered how wrong they were. But then it was too late.

Japan's postwar history presents such a remarkable contrast to China's that it has inspired the sardonic comment that Japan was lucky enough to lose the war, but China was unlucky enough to win it. In 1945, defeated Japan was as completely bankrupt as China was. Economic chaos would have resulted if the Japanese Government, backed by the military occupation, had not fought inflation vigorously. The Japanese thus never were even threatened with such economic anarchy as existed in China for several years before the 1949 Communist takeover. And one reason why the Chinese Communists were given so much time to entrench themselves was that they promptly terminated the shattering effects of runaway inflation. Years passed before the Chinese people fully realized the terrible price they had paid for this temporary relief.

In Europe, Russia and the West have waged economic warfare in many different forms since 1945. West Germany provided the most humiliating defeat for the Soviets. For 3 years after the war Moscow got just what it wanted in Germany—economic paralysis—by vetoing all proposed anti-inflationary measures. But in 1948 Washington, London, and Paris decided to override Soviet vetoes and to create an economically unified West Germany with a sound new currency. In an effort to checkmate this move Moscow clamped down the Berlin blockade, but the airlift broke the blockade. As a result, West Germany made one of the most spectacular economic comebacks on record. The Berlin blockade usually has been pictured as a political and propaganda contest, but its primary importance was economic. It was perhaps the most decisive postwar battle in economic warfare.

Another striking example of what economic warfare can accomplish was shown by postwar developments in Austria and Hungary. These two nations, once twin seats of a mighty empire, emerged from World War II in a terrible mess. Both served as battlegrounds for some of the war's most savage fighting, which wrecked, among other things, both capital cities, Vienna and Budapest. When I revisited these two countries shortly after Germany's surrender, they were a sorry sight. Neither had been very prosperous even before World Wars, and now both were bankrupt, having been bled white by occupying armies.

In those dark days of 1945 it seemed to me that the Hungarians were facing the future much more cheerfully than their Austrian neighbors. I couldn't decide whether they were more gallant or just more ignorant of what they were up against. The Hungarians apparently also mystified the Russians, so much so that in 1945 Moscow permitted the only genuinely free election ever held in a country controlled by the Red army. That election proved to be a humiliating defeat for Hungarian Communists, with moderate non-Communists winning an overwhelming majority of the votes. Soviet strategists apparently accepted this defeat placidly, but actually they resorted immediately to economic warfare in Hungary.

When I went back to Budapest in 1946, the Russians had unleashed the wildest currency inflation on record. That this could easily have been prevented was proved in Austria, which has experienced no runaway inflation since World War II. By wartime agreements Allied Control Councils were set up in both Austria and Hungary in which the Western Powers were supposed to have equal rights with Russia. But there was one big difference. In Hungary the Red army was the only effective military force, whereas Allied troops in Austria were at least equal to the

Russians. So in Hungary the Russians contemptuously ignored American and British efforts to establish the same anti-inflationary measures which were being imposed at that time in Austria.

The Hungarian inflation was deliberately manipulated so as to demoralize the middle-class Hungarians who had dared to vote against communism. This was done by keeping the printing presses running at full speed day and night turning out more worthless paper money. The Hungarian unit of currency, the pengo, which had been worth about 20 cents before the war, suddenly took off into the stratosphere. The day I arrived in Budapest in 1946 a friend in the American mission advised me, "Don't change more than a dollar at a time. Today the dollar brings 10 billion pengo, a billion more than it did yesterday, and nobody knows what it will bring tomorrow." The next day the exchange rate was 14 billion, and a week later 33 billion. So I was getting 33 billion pengo for the same dollar which would have bought only 5 pengo a few years before.

That wild inflation was aimed at certain groups of Hungarians as deliberately as guns aimed in battles. It wiped out the savings of the country's most solid citizens, the thrifty and hard-working middle class. Then the Russian-dominated government distinguished between white-collar and manual workers.

For example, at Budapest University I found that the professors and clerical staff—mostly Catholics and anti-Communists—were being paid only in paper money while janitors and other manual workers were paid in food and clothing which no amount of paper money would then buy. Two distinguished scientists told me they were keeping their families alive only by bartering their last possessions. One of them had just exchanged his last bed sheet for food, the other said he was "eating" his wedding ring. While I was in Budapest the American mission advertised for a few English-speaking jeep drivers, offering a dollar a day. That amounted to a colossal fortune in pengo, and the hundreds of applicants included prominent lawyers, doctors, and businessmen, a composer of light opera and two formerly wealthy landowners.

After this runaway inflation had served the Russian purpose, the Russians finally agreed to introduce the same anti-inflationary measures which had prevented runaway inflation in Austria. Meanwhile, however, the Soviets had so demoralized Hungarian non-Communists that Communists had easily taken over. So the West lost its Hungarian battle in economic warfare, but at the same time it won the battle in Austria. The contrast is striking, for today Austria is one of the most stable countries in Europe, despite having fewer natural resources than Hungary. Austrian non-Communists never were submitted to the demoralizing effects of runaway inflation.

It has taken some time for most Americans to appreciate how important economic warfare has been and will continue to be in the worldwide conflict with the Soviets. How well are we prepared to wage this kind of warfare? That question reminds me of a conversation which took place a quarter of a century ago when Dictator Joseph Stalin had his first meeting with an American diplomat, Ambassador William C. Bullitt. Shortly after the United States resumed diplomatic relations with Russia, the Soviet dictator invited the American Ambassador to the Kremlin. This was a most unusual gesture, because Stalin at that time almost never received foreign diplomats. Mr. Bullitt told the small group of American correspondents working in Moscow about Stalin's invitation, and said if we would wait for him at the Embassy he would give us an immediate off-the-record report of what happened. We had to wait a long time, because Stalin kept Mr. Bullitt talking for several hours. That conversation really

was an interview, with Stalin asking most of the questions.

Stalin's chief interest was President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and he became increasingly fascinated by Mr. Bullitt's description of how the American Presidency works. The Ambassador spent a good part of the afternoon explaining the American system of checks and balances. He told how the President not only must devise a program acceptable to Congress and the Supreme Court, but also must face vigorous and continuous opposition of a rival political party, and bear in mind the political fortunes of his own party's members. It was apparent from Stalin's questions that he had never before fully understood basic American governmental principles. Finally he shook his head and commented, "You have greatly increased my respect for President Roosevelt. Speaking frankly, it seems to me that your form of government imposes almost impossible demands upon the President." After a moment's thought he added, "But it seems to work for you."

Although President Roosevelt's problems in 1934 were big enough to astonish Stalin, they seem very simple compared with President Eisenhower's today. During the intervening quarter of a century the American Government has almost incredibly expanded its activities, at home and abroad. Decisions made in Washington today have immediate and far-reaching reactions in every corner of the globe. These multiplied responsibilities have imposed tremendous new stresses and strains upon our Government, and particularly upon our economy.

Meanwhile, however, the Soviet Government also has added enormously to its own stresses and strains. It has assumed responsibility for hundreds of millions of people outside its borders, just as the United States has done. It has challenged Washington to an all-out arms race with the most costly weapons in history, and at the same time has proclaimed economic warfare against the non-Soviet world. Moscow has done all this during a period when 200 million Soviet Russian citizens, better educated, are demanding more than the bare necessities.

Today Russia and the United States are much more openly in conflict than they were in 1934, but so long as the arms race remains stalemated the outcome obviously depends upon other factors. The Soviet Government's faith in economic warfare is clearly stronger than ever. How can Moscow's self-confidence be explained? One explanation is that Soviet strategists rely upon their enemies to fall into an economic trap. Financial irresponsibility in the United States would be just what would suit Moscow best. If the Russians can force the pace of American spending to the point where inflation gets out of control, they can forget about such weapons as intercontinental missiles. For the ability of Americans to wage economic warfare on even terms will depend upon whether the American Government and people can guard against further serious inflation in our own economy. The entire non-Communist world depends, as never before upon the solidity of the American economic and financial structure.

H.R. 446

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the provisions of the bill

H.R. 446, which I introduced on the first day of this session. The purpose of the proposal is simply to treat all patrons or married savers in savings and loan associations alike throughout the United States.

The present palpable inequality of treatment arises in this way. We all remember the bank and savings and loan association closures in the early 1930's. The deposits and savings of millions of our fellow citizens were snatched away from them overnight. To its everlasting glory, Congress moved forward immediately and passed two laws to prevent a recurrence of a similar financial catastrophe in the future. It first created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with authority "to insure the deposits of all banks"—12 U.S.C. 1811. And then Congress created the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation, with authority "to insure the accounts of all institutions eligible for insurance"—12 U.S.C. 1725.

In order to support the bank deposit insurance program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act provided for a uniform assessment on all member banks of one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum—12 U.S.C. 1817. And from the beginning of the program all bank depositors throughout the United States have in fact been treated alike, whether they come from common law States or community property States.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act likewise provided for "a premium charge for such insurance equal to one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total of all accounts"—12 U.S.C. 1727. But unlike bank depositors, savers in savings and loan associations are not in fact being treated alike. Although savings and loan associations located in community property States pay the same and identical premiums as those located in common law States, married savers in community property States do not enjoy the same insurance protection as those coming from common law States. Under the regulations issued pursuant to the statute, married couples living in common law States enjoy insurance of the account of a husband in the sum of \$10,000, insurance of the account of a wife in the sum of \$10,000, and insurance of a joint account of husband and wife in the sum of \$10,000; while a married couple living in a community property State receive an insurance coverage of the account of a husband in the sum of \$10,000 and insurance coverage of the account of a wife in the sum of \$10,000, but no insurance benefit whatever of a joint account of both husband and wife. In other words, a married couple living in a common law State enjoy an aggregate coverage of \$30,000, but a married couple living in a community property State receive an aggregate coverage of only \$20,000. And yet the savings and loan associations throughout the United States, in both community property and common law States, pay the same and identical insurance premiums to support the national program. This is not only inequality of treatment but rank injustice; it is as wrong as a 2-foot yardstick and as phony as a \$9 bill.

This matter has received the particular

attention of the executives and attorneys of savings and loan associations in community property States, of which there are eight as follows: Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, and Wyoming; but the savings and loan associations throughout the United States also recognize that this situation must be corrected.

A serious attempt was made to correct this inequity by having the regulations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation amended to provide the same amount of coverage to married savers in both common law States and community property States. The opinion of the General Counsel of the Home Loan Bank was that the desired objective could not be accomplished through amendment to the regulations, and that this would require further legislation. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is a part of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The proposed change in the law was submitted by the United States Savings and Loan League and was included in the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, known as Senate bill 1541 of the second session of the 85th Congress. The proposed change in legislation, in substance, was adopted by the Senate last year, but the bill failed of passage in the House.

The United States Savings and Loan League at its annual convention held in Philadelphia during the month of November 1956, through its legislative committee, endorsed this amendment to the law in the following language:

This recommendation would amend title 4 of the National Housing Act to clarify and make certain that married savers in certain community property States are provided insurance coverage on an equal basis with savers in other States.

Subsequently, Henry Bubb, chairman of the Legislative Committee of the United States Savings and Loan League, testified favorably before the Senate committee on January 30, 1957, in connection with the Financial Institutions Act of 1957, Senate bill 1451 of the second session of the 85th Congress, in submitting a recommendation that the needed change be made in the law, with the comment that the whole purpose of the proposed change was to make it clear that in community property States the husband can have \$10,000 of insurance coverage, the wife \$10,000 of insurance coverage, and the two of them \$10,000 of insurance coverage as such persons may have in common law States.

At the 1958 convention of the United States Savings and Loan League held in San Francisco during the month of November, the legislative committee of the league adopted the following:

The league recommends amendment to the law governing insurance of accounts to make it clear that married savers in community property States are entitled to the identical protection of married savers in other States.

The United States Savings and Loan League has a membership of some 44,000 savings and loan associations located in every State of the Union.

The community property States, eight in number, and the State leagues of the associations in each have endorsed the enactment of this amendment. The associations located in the community property States are as follows: Arizona, 17 associations; California, 235 associations; Idaho, 11 associations; Louisiana, 72 associations; New Mexico, 23 associations; Nevada, 4 associations; Texas, 203 associations; and Wyoming, 10 associations.

We do not have a breakdown of savers on a State level; however, 2 associations in my district at Lafayette, La., have savings accounts as follows: Lafayette Building Association, 7,400; Home Building and Loan Association, 5,600. This gives you a good illustration of the number of people interested in this legislation.

When we consider the hundreds of thousands of savers in savings and loan associations in community property States, it is easy to understand their eagerness to have the law amended to put them on a par with savers in common law States.

For many years citizens in community property States enjoyed a very distinct advantage in income tax matters over citizens in common law States. By being permitted to file separate income tax returns for the husband and the wife covering funds owned by the community, they were enabled to remain in lower brackets and thereby pay much less income tax. After many years of continuous persistent effort, the law was amended to put persons residing in common law States on the same level as persons residing in community property States. Community property States are being differentiated against purely on account of their State laws. Since the insurance of shares in savings and loan associations is on a national basis, we desire by this bill to make the same apply equally in all of the States of the Union, just as has been done in connection with income tax matters.

A copy of bill H.R. 446 follows:

H.R. 446

A bill to amend the National Housing Act with regard to insurance of accounts so as to provide uniform protection to all married savers in savings and loan associations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401(b) of title IV, National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724(b)), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any law which would constitute an account community property), two persons who are husband and wife shall each be insured under this title with respect to accounts in his or her sole name in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$10,000 and, in addition to any insurance under the foregoing provisions of this sentence, they shall be insured with respect to accounts in the sole names of both of them in an amount (not to exceed \$20,000) such that the total of the insurance under this sentence with respect to accounts in his or her sole name and accounts in the sole names of both of them shall not exceed \$30,000; and neither of them may be additionally insured under this title with respect to any account in such institution unless such insurance is authorized by this title otherwise than by this sentence."

Introduction of Bill To Remove Dual Employment Limitation in Employment of Retired Officers of the Uniformed Services in Civilian Positions in the Federal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 701, the result of which will, if enacted, make available to our Government highly trained and loyal citizens to serve our country in civilian positions under our Federal system. I refer to the opportunity we shall then have of employing some retired officers of the uniformed services in civilian positions in our Federal services who are presently barred from such employment.

Under present laws, most career retired officers of our uniformed services are entirely barred from employment by the Federal Government in civilian positions, while many others, when employable, are so severely restricted in accepting such positions as to render it impossible for them to accept such employment. Reference is made to the so-called Dual Employment Act of 1894 (act of July 31, 1894; 5 U.S.C. 62) and the restrictions contained in the Economy Act of 1932 (sec. 212 of the act of June 30, 1932; 5 U.S.C. 59(a)).

Under the Dual Employment Act of 1894, commissioned officers of the regular services are not employable by the Federal Government in civilian positions if their retired pay exceeds \$2,500 per annum, unless retired for physical disability or elected to office or appointed thereto by the President with Senate confirmation. Thus, almost all retired officers of the regular military services are barred from employment by our Government, if they have not been retired for physical disability. Under this law, they may not even waive their retired pay to thus serve their country since the statute simply bars them from any civilian employment by our Government. Recently, General Quesada found it necessary to resign his earned retired status in order to serve the President of the United States in an appointment which did not require Senate confirmation.

When retired officers are employable in civilian positions under the Federal Government, unless they have been retired for physical disability as the result of combat wounds or the explosion of an instrumentality of war, they may not, under the provisions of section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932, receive a total compensation of more than \$10,000 per annum. If they are employable and the compensation of the civilian position exceeds \$10,000 per annum, they may waive their retired pay during their incumbency in the civilian position. Those retired for combat wounds or the explosion of an instrumentality of war may keep both their retired pay and

the pay of the Federal civilian position. Prior to 1932 all retired officers who were employable by the Federal Government received both their earned retired pay and the pay of the civilian office.

It should also be noted that these restrictive provisions do not apply to retired members of the Reserve components of our armed services. For many years, under appropriate legislation, it was established that members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces would not be in any way restricted in their civilian pursuits, including employment by our Government. That provision has been reenacted and made to apply, generally, to all members of the Reserve components in the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, which became effective on January 1, 1953. Nowadays, we have career retirement for reservists as well as for regulars. In addition, reserve officers now serve on long periods of active duty. It is entirely appropriate that they should be entirely free from restrictions in their employment opportunities like other citizens. We should have comparable legislation excluding retired officers of the Regular services from such restrictions, thus making all retired officers of the uniformed services available to the Government for civilian employment where the best interests of the country require such employment. Furthermore, such officers should be entitled to receive both their retired pay, which they have earned in active service in the Armed Forces of their country, and whatever civilian compensation may attach to any position under the Federal Government in which they may be employed.

The present situation has a twofold detrimental effect. It renders impossible employment of competent and available retired officers, highly trained and experienced in important fields of Government activity, at a time when their service would be greatly beneficial in the defense effort. It also deprives these officers of the opportunity of employment by their Government in civilian positions to which other citizens of the United States are eligible. It relegates these loyal military servants of the Government to a position of second-class citizenship.

Retirement laws, applicable to the armed services, properly provide that some officers be retired from the top of each rank each year and for enforced retirement upon the attainment of certain maximum allowable ages in each rank. This has been found essential to maintain the officer personnel of the services at the highest possible state of proficiency, both professionally and in physical health. It does, however, result in the loss of service to the Government of substantial numbers of highly trained, loyal and efficient officers whose services could and should be used in other governmental agencies. Yet far from planning for such use, especially in these times when we should be utilizing our available manpower to the best advantage in the defense effort in which we are now engaged for our very survival, there exist these outmoded and restrictive dual employment and dual compensation laws, which should be amended to make this potential source of manpower avail-

able to our national use. In this respect, it should be asked, Do our international competitors similarly bar themselves from the use of their trained military officers? The question suggests its own answer.

There is a mounting opinion, among those who are aware of this situation, that our present policy is wasteful in manpower and wrong. I am sure that Members of the House will wish to see the existing restrictions against the employment of retired career commissioned officers removed. That is what my bill, if enacted, will accomplish.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter to constituents for January 10, 1959.

The newsletter follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, January 10, 1959)

"I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." (The oath.)

Thus, for 436 Representatives (including 17 women) began the 2-year 86th Congress. There were many new faces. Republicans totaled 153 (down from 200), Democrats 283 (up from 235). The opening prayer of House Chaplain Braskamp fittingly ended with a united Lord's Prayer. Meanwhile, in the other body (Senate), Chaplain Harris included "Grant us the art of disagreeing without being disagreeable."

No. 206, Old House Office Building, is the Texas Fifth District, Dallas County, headquarters. The staff is the same—Frank Crowley, Mary Hornbeck, Dorothy Chrest, Kay Wharton—an able and unique group—unique in two ways—representing one of the Nation's largest districts and in being the original staff.

The 44th Congressman in history to be House Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, Texas, was again elected by the Democratic majority in a straight party line vote; while Republicans replaced JOE MARTIN, Massachusetts, with CHARLES HALLECK, Indiana, as minority leader. The determining factor in this contest was leadership, not political philosophy since both are conservatives.

The state of the Union message was well presented by the President (he looks fine) to the joint Houses, Supreme Court, Cabinet, Chiefs of Staff, and diplomats. Worldwide in scope, it was too general for detailed programs. These will follow. The theme was "security plus liberty."

Some of the references made are most important and thought-provoking, including: liberty and the God-given rights of man; world suspicion and tension; mass destruc-

tion possible; keeping the peace requires unrelenting effort; Communist agreements and treaties are worthless unless containing self-enforcing mechanisms; defense cost exemplified by bombers worth their weight in gold; heavy military expense requires elimination of waste and duplication; strong economy is foundation for national safety; competitive enterprise and freedom describe America; public understanding is needed; basic causes of inflation are wage-price spiral and deficit financing by Government; self-discipline and restraint are necessary; meet current costs (of government) from current revenue; balanced budget; ours is the noblest of causes—human freedom.

Some of Government's present conflicts and dilemmas can be detected in this message, including: Too often we make decisions based on trusting the Russians; security can jeopardize liberty when overzealous government overexpands its jurisdiction (abroad, foreign aid; at home, welfare programs); we don't balance the budget or pay-as-we-go; waste and duplication in Government is not sufficiently being sought out and stopped by Congress; politicians sponsor more Government spending with its crushing tax load, forgetful of the need for a strong free economy; competitive enterprise and freedom can be killed by Government regulations; self-discipline and restraint are frequently forgotten by self-seeking citizens and politicians; human freedom can perish from well-meaning but misguided Government "help" and taxation.

My forecasts include: Much bitter partisan politics with "criticism for criticism's sake" for political advantage; liberals proposing spending schemes without regard for a balanced budget; conservatives of both parties realizing their ideological kinship, their combined lack of strength, and the frustration of partisan politics between parties themselves split.

Questions the future will answer: Is this a labor-socialist Congress? Can the President save the day by the veto? Will the veto be sustained or over-ridden? Will the public understand the respective jurisdiction of the Administration and Congress and help direct the course of legislation? On the answers to these, as I see it, rest the "security and liberty" of this Nation and her people.

Finally, to Dallas County people at this Congress' outset, I pledge again to support consistently all earlier stated principles made during campaigns or in Congress and live up to the congressional oath stated above, so help me God.

Introduction of Bill To Equalize the Pay of Retired Members of the Uniformed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, I introduced a bill H.R. 703, which has for its purpose the re-establishment of the relationship between retired pay and the active duty pay of members of our uniformed services.

It will be remembered by Members of the House that, when the Military Pay Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-422) was en-

acted last year, it departed from the long-established policy that retired pay of previously retired personnel of the uniformed services be computed on the same basis as that of personnel thereafter retired.

The failure of the new pay law thus to keep faith with those who have served our country so well in war and peace has resulted in disillusionment among both active and retired personnel of the services. It has dealt a blow to what, in the past, has been the greatest single incentive to tenure in military service. If this mistake is left uncorrected, it alone may nullify the very purpose of the law itself, namely, to improve the stability of career military service and to stem the exodus from such service of our best qualified personnel.

As pointed out by the Cordiner Committee report, military retirement is a unique form of retirement, possessing characteristics not found in any other form of retirement. Career retired personnel of our uniformed services continue to "hold office" after retirement. They may be, and frequently are, involuntarily recalled to active service. They are, thus, not free agents, as are those who retire under other systems. Further, there is always a definite ceiling over their potential in reward for their service—a ceiling which we here in Congress place over them in a succession of pay laws for all to read. Until the enactment of the Military Pay Act of 1958, they could, at least, have faith that their Government would adhere to well-established standards governing their retirement rights.

Among other things, in recognition of these principles, the Cordiner committee reported as follows:

The committee has therefore concluded that the incentive value of its existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people. It is this unique characteristic which serves to counterbalance many of the limited aspects of the military retirement pay and has made it one of the most influential selling points in the recruitment efforts of the services.

Editorials have appeared in leading newspapers and periodicals throughout the Nation, urging a correction of the error which has been made. Among them are the New York Times, the Washington Star, and the authoritative spokesman of the military services, the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal. One quotation from the New York Times should be looked upon as prophetic:

Young officers who might make the services a career will not be blind to this discrimination; if officers already retired can thus be discriminated against in the interests of false economy, this can happen again.

The legislature of my own State of California petitioned Congress to maintain the time-honored policy in regard to the retired pay computation of previously retired personnel of the services—

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1958, page 5248.

The relatively modest cost of retired pay maintenance, as compared to the high costs of the newly created incentive features, provided in the Military Pay Act of 1958, is small, indeed, to the replacement costs which will inevitably result from the defections from career military service of those who, unless we restore their confidence, will leave the services. Faced with the assurance that their retired compensation will be progressively reduced, the best and most alert officers may seek other careers, unless we act now. Even worse, necessary replacements for those who thus leave the services might well result in the substitution of less qualified personnel for the best qualified of our fighting men.

In the face of this dire threat to our national safety, I am sure that Members of the House will wish speedily to correct the mistake we have made by reestablishing equality of treatment in retired pay compensation among members of the uniformed services. That is what my bill, if enacted, will accomplish.

Startling Facts About Florida's Population Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received the following copy of a very comprehensive report from Harold Colee, executive vice president of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce in Jacksonville:

STARTLING FACTS ABOUT FLORIDA'S POPULATION GROWTH

(Compiled by the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville)

1. Florida has a permanent population of 4,442,000, as calculated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in mid-1958.

2. Florida is the fastest growing large State in the Nation:

Since 1950 it has gained 1,671,000 new permanent residents; only California added more.

This Florida gain is about the size of the State in 1940; also;

This Florida gain is about the same as today's size of Arkansas or Arizona or Oregon.

3. Florida gained 60 percent during the 8 years, 1950-1958.

Only little Nevada (267,000 population) with 67 percent topped this.

4. Florida's weekly gain in population averaged 5,032 persons each week during the past 3 years.

This is a net figure and was made up of 3,885 persons who moved here from other States and countries and 1,177 persons from natural increase.

This weekly gain was greatest in the year which ended June 30, 1956, and has slightly lessened since that time.

5. Florida's 3-year population gain:

Year	Number gained (in thousands)			Persons gained weekly		
	Total	Natural	Migration	Total	Natural	Migration
1955-56.....	289	58	222	5,385	1,122	4,263
1956-57.....	272	63	209	5,231	1,204	4,027
1957-58.....	233	63	170	4,481	1,207	3,274
3 year.....	785	184	601	15,032	1,177	13,855

1 Average.

6. Florida stepped up one more rung on the population ladder last year, passing Missouri, to a rank of 12th in mid-1958. (Incidentally, Florida ranks 13th in beef cattle.)

Florida ranked 20th in population in 1950; and Census Bureau estimators affirm that Florida will take 9th place between 1965 and 1970.

7. Florida's population is approaching that of Indiana (with 4,581,000) and Massachusetts (with 4,862,000).

8. Florida's population is made up of 37 percent under 21 years of age (United States, 38 percent); 53 percent from 21 to 64 years of age (same as United States); 10 percent 65 and over (United States, 9 percent). Breakdown based on 1956 census estimates, the latest available.)

White persons account for 81 percent of Florida's population. This proportion has been increasing steadily for many years.

9. Floridians numbered 2,771,305 on April 1, 1950, the date of the last regular census. The U.S. Bureau of the Census has made the following estimates of Florida's population as of July 1 of each year:

Year	Total population		Increase from previous year		Percent increase from 1950
	Number	Rank	Number	Percent	
1950.....	2,830	156	—	—	20
1951.....	2,992	156	6.5	5.5	19
1952.....	3,152	150	5.3	11.1	17
1953.....	3,303	151	4.7	16.4	17
1954.....	3,404	161	4.8	22.1	15
1955.....	3,657	193	5.5	28.9	14
1956.....	3,937	280	7.6	38.8	13
1957.....	4,209	272	6.9	48.4	13
1958.....	4,442	233	6.5	56.6	12

NOTE.—Gain from Apr. 1, 1950, 60 percent; from July 1, 1950, 56.6 percent.

THE PEOPLE/THE LAND

10. Floridians numbered 51 for every square mile of land in the State in 1950 and 82 in 1958. (U.S. average, 58 persons per square mile in 1958.)

Twenty-six States had more people per square mile than Florida in 1950; 16 States were more densely populated in 1958.

There are 54,262 square miles of land area in Florida; 24 States are larger.

11. Florida's growth means more markets, more opportunities. It also creates an urgent need for more highways, more schools, more public facilities of all types. And it brings with it changes in land use and the readjustments which attend change.

Because of Florida's superior climate, the land is desired for homes. And because of this same climate, and the adaptability of the soil, the land is desired for agriculture. In recent years the rivalry between population growth and expanding agricultural pursuits has been accentuated. The 1958 Yearbook of Agriculture, titled Land, published by the United States Department of Agriculture, points up Florida's land situation in the following quotation:

"L. A. Reuss, of the Agricultural Research Service, reported that recent trends in Flor-

ida included a rapidly rising urban population, a moderately increasing rural nonfarm population, and a declining farm population. Projections to 1970 indicated a possible slight increase in the number of farms, a moderate increase in urban areas, and a market growth in the rural nonfarm population.

"Spreading urban and suburban areas intensify problems of providing roads, electricity, sewerage, police and fire protection, schools, and shopping facilities. Tax and zoning problems are multiplied. Premature subdivisions often do not provide for services.

"Urbanization has a strong impact on the attitudes and goals of farm people as they are brought into closer contact with non-farm or part-time farm people, urban employment, and ways of life. This impact is greater in northern and western Florida, where the culture of the rural population is more homogeneous than in the rest of the State. Increased opportunities for non-farm employment increases interest among rural people in education and training.

"The number of noncommercial—part-time and residential—farms has dropped in northern and western Florida and increased in central and southern Florida. In some counties there were decreases or only slight increases in the number of farm operators working off their farms 100 days or more; largest decreases in this group were reported in Duval and Nassau Counties in the Jacksonville area.

"A study in Duval County by Daniel Al-leger, an economist at the Florida Agricultural Experiment Station (Gainesville), showed that two-thirds of part-time and retirement farmers were gainfully employed, one-fourth were retired, and the others were self-employed.

"Two-thirds of the home-farm units had fewer than 6 acres. More than half had fewer than 4 acres. About half of the operators planted one-half acre or less in crops. Nearly 90 percent of the enterprises were gardening types of agriculture. About 80 percent of the operators kept poultry or meat animals. The economic advantages of part-time farming came more from savings than from increased earnings.

"As population and economic activity have grown in Florida, there have been tendencies toward a gradual upgrading in the use of land: Subdivisions replace citrus groves, citrus groves replace improved pastures, and pastures replace native rangelands.

"The acreage of bearing citrus groves increased about 25 percent (an estimated 567,000 acres in 1958) and the nonbearing acreage doubled (94,500 in 1957-58) from 1949 to 1958, according to Mr. Reuss. Some established citrus groves were being cleared for subdivisions, highways, and industrial parks. Some estimates indicate that only 50,000 to 100,000 acres suitable for citrus have not been planted, and of these 25,000 to 50,000 acres would be taken up for homes. All rangelands in some places are occupied, and new groves are being set out on flatwoods land after ditching and bedding. Demand for land for citrus in central Florida affects the supply and the cost of land available to producers of other farm products.

"The area of improved pasture in Florida was estimated at more than 1.6 million acres. Continued expansion is expected. Florida has perhaps 10 million acres that could be converted from native rangeland into improved pastures. Some loss of acreage of improved pastures occurred when new citrus groves are set out and when residential and commercial subcenters are established in open country."

The acreage of truck crops increased by 116,000 acres between 1950 and 1958 (471,000 acres planted in 1957-58 according to the Florida State Marketing Bureau).

"The demand for land for truck crops in 1958 was not in serious conflict with other uses of land. Urbanization encouraged increases in the acreages in truck crops in rural areas such as the Everglades, some expansion in acreage around urban markets, and some outward movement of production areas at the perimeter of expanding urban centers."

"The acreage in general field crops has declined slightly. Demand for land by pulp and timber companies affects the economy of general farming in northern and western Florida."

"Several examples are at hand of some of the effects of a high demand for land. Dairy farmers near Miami have sold land for subdivisions for \$1,000 or more an acre and moved their operations to cheaper land north of Palm Beach or near Lake Okeechobee. The same type of movement is taking place near towns like Tallahassee. (St. Petersburg is typical of this movement.) In the process, the dairymen may increase greatly the size of their farms and boost land values at their new locations. Cattlemen are refraining from investing funds to improve pasturelands that may be in demand as sites for citrus groves or subdivisions. In areas where the land market is highly active, especially the coastal and metropolitan areas, investors are permitting much land to remain idle, pending resale or the anticipated change to a higher use. Dwellings in rural areas are in demand as housing for part-time farmers and for nonfarmworkers. Market values of tracts that have dwellings seemed in 1953 to exceed current or prospective values for agricultural purposes."

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Florida Bureau of Vital Statistics, and U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Compiled and distributed by Florida State Chamber of Commerce, P.O. Box 8046, Jacksonville, Fla., January 1, 1959.

Further, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the results of a survey that was recently made on the district that I represent, Florida's Fourth District, which is comprised of Dade and Monroe Counties.

The 1950 census showed only 495,000 Dade County residents. The 1955 Dade census, 703,777; a 5-year increase of approximately 84 percent. A 1958 survey by the University of Miami concludes Dade now has a population of 852,000.

Monroe County, with an official 29,957 in 1950, is growing similarly and is now thought to have 65,000. It is authoritatively estimated that 1,200,000 residents will have permanently settled in Dade and Monroe by 1960.

The 1,200,000 Dade and Monroe County figure compares to a congressional district national population average of about 345,000. The district with the least people has only 159,000.

The Bureau of Census figures, recently released, confirm Florida's fabulous growth and estimate that Florida will be entitled to three additional seats in the Congress following the 1960 census.

The present permanent population of Florida's huge Fourth Congressional District—Dade and Monroe Counties—now far exceeds the entire population of each of 15 States—Arizona, 749,587; Alaska, 128,643; Delaware, 318,085; Maine, 913,774; Idaho, 588,637; Montana, 591,024; Nevada, 160,083; New Hampshire, 533,242; New Mexico, 681,187; North Dakota, 619,636; Rhode Island, 791,896; South Dakota, 652,740; Vermont, 377,747; Utah, 688,862; and Wyoming, 290,529.)

Further, the present population of the district I represent is larger than the combined population of four States.

During the year many of you will have occasion to visit and/or pass through Florida, and through my congressional district. On behalf of our chambers of commerce, our many business interests, and each and every member of our community, I take this opportunity to extend to you an invitation to visit with us and to take advantage of our salubrious climate, and any of the multitude of business and recreational facilities that are abundantly available.

John R. Reidl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my district was saddened by the recent untimely death of John R. Reidl, vice president and general manager of the Appleton Post-Crescent.

I was privileged to know John Reidl, not only as one of the Nation's outstanding newspapermen, but as a close friend and adviser. It was in this latter capacity that John Reidl will be most sorely missed. He unselfishly devoted himself to assisting people in all walks of life, in the same modest and quiet manner in which he contributed to the civic leadership of his community and State.

John Reidl was a newspaperman's newspaperman, one of the most skillful and respected practitioners of his art. He worked his way to the top, from reporter to city editor, to managing editor, to executive vice president, and general manager. On his way up, he contributed greatly to the success of the Post-Crescent, helping to make it one of the truly great newspapers of Wisconsin.

His life was aptly summed up in an editorial which appeared in the Post-Crescent after his death:

John Reidl was a real Christian, and a man who truly accomplished the objective of living the good life, and leaving the world a better place for his having lived in it.

I include the complete editorial as part of my remarks, as well as an editorial which appeared in the Green Bay Press-Gazette:

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent, Jan. 3, 1959]

JOHN R. REIDL

John Reidl wouldn't have wanted an editorial published about him. He would have

snorted that it was a waste of good newspaper space. One of the best judges of news values we have known, he could never understand that he could be news. Several years ago he wrote his own obituary for the Post-Crescent's files; it was four paragraphs long and said, in essence, that he had been born, had lived, and died.

But John Reidl did a lot more than that. A complete list of the things he did for his newspaper, his community, and its people will never be drawn, for he never told anyone about many of them. Newspapermen knew him as a highly skillful practitioner of his craft, businessmen knew him as a topnotch executive, civic leaders knew him as a man to whom they could turn with their knottiest problems, politicians went to him to share his astute evaluation of political trends and events. But perhaps his least known side was his compassion for his fellow human beings; a deeply religious man—he went to mass daily for many years—he truly lived a Christian life. Reporters, for instance, sometimes would notice one or two rather infirm looking individuals in Reidl's office, deep in conversation with him; later they learned that Alcoholics Anonymous sent their most difficult cases to him for personal counsel. He and his wife supported a number of needy older people for many years; exactly how many will never be known. A stickler for publishing the news despite the persuasive importuning of people who didn't want some story in the paper—especially if the importuner were prominent or wealthy—he sometimes would break his own rule for, as he put it, "some poor fellow who didn't have any influential friends." To his closest associates he would occasionally relate, quietly but proudly, how some of those poor fellows had come back in later years to thank him for giving them a break when they needed it.

Over the years journalism schools sent their most promising graduates to the Post-Crescent so they could be trained under Reidl. A tough taskmaster who insisted on good writing and absolute accuracy—he was known, sometimes affectionately and sometimes fearfully, as the Bull of the Woods in his earlier days as managing editor—he would spend hours with a young reporter or editor, patiently going over copy and explaining how a story should be written or edited. One of his outstanding qualities in his later years was an unaffected sympathy with the problems of young people; unlike many older men he could really understand their ambitions and dreams, and often cautioned his department heads against discouraging their younger employees. Often he would permit his subordinates to go ahead with projects the quality of which he was personally doubtful; he would say it was better to let young men try out their ideas than to stifle their creativeness.

Reidl became irritated when someone referred to journalism as a profession; he insisted on using the term "newspaper business" and sometimes would shock more idealistic practitioners by asserting that news is a commodity—"we buy it and sell it, just like any other business." Or, he would point downstairs and comment, "The important thing is what's in the kitty (company treasury) down there." Despite this ultrapractical approach he was early a strong advocate of publishing more news columns—the kind that bring no direct revenue—buying the best news, picture and feature services, running more columnists than almost any other newspaper, and building up one of the biggest news staffs of any newspaper this size. He also pushed hard for building up the Post-Crescent's circulation in as large an area as possible, on the theory that it would bring more business to Appleton "and what's good for Appleton (later he would say the Fox Cities) is good for the Post-Crescent."

Riedl was a self-educated man. His formal education went only through high school, yet his knowledge of many subjects would put holders of doctors' degrees to shame. He read widely and learned naturally—he spent one winter, for example, reading nothing but books on constitutional law. He numbered among his close friends college and university presidents and professors and—although he was a devout Catholic—Protestant ministers. He loved to sit for hours with the latter, discussing theology and doctrine, about which his knowledge was formidable. He knew much about the history of Appleton, and was a fount of information for writers and researchers about the city's families, its industries and its early leaders.

Riedl's civic activities were many, although again he was wont to deprecate the role he played. Late in World War II when, under doctor's orders, he sat down to write letters of resignations from all the committees and commissions of which he was a member, he found he had to write more than 20 letters. He was a strong, sometimes impatient, advocate of civic progress on all fronts, taking the lead in such programs as the establishment of the Apostolate and the Visiting Nurse Association, a community fund, the county airport, an industrial development program, and the like.

A political conservative, Riedl nevertheless numbered among his friends Democrats, liberals, and labor leaders. They all came to him for advice—on one occasion three men running for the same office called on him within the space of 2 hours—and he gave it freely, even when the receiver knew that Riedl himself thoroughly opposed his policies and principles. Among his close friends were men with such varying ideologies as former Gov. Philip La Follette, the late Senator McCarthy, and former Lawrence (now Harvard) President Nathan Pusey.

It is difficult to write about a man with whom one has had such close business and personal ties. Words will not express adequately our feelings. Suffice it to say that John Riedl was a real Christian, and a man who truly accomplished the objective of living the good life, and leaving the world a better place for his having lived in it.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Jan. 5, 1959]

JOHN R. RIEDL, OF APPLETON

The death of John R. Riedl, vice president and general manager of the Appleton Post-Crescent, represents a real loss to the newspaper business in Wisconsin. To the Press-Gazette it means the loss of a good friend.

During the years since 1920 when Mr. Riedl became city editor of the Appleton Post-Crescent, there has been a close relationship between the Post-Crescent and the Press-Gazette. Throughout this long period, Mr. Riedl was active successively as city editor, managing editor, as executive vice president, and as vice president and general manager. Always and regardless of the title he held, he was a firm rock of commonsense and a man ready to go halfway in any cooperative move.

He was a good newspaperman and as such was familiar with or active in almost everything of importance going on in Appleton. He preferred a quiet, behind-the-scenes support for most activities to that of the public leader but he supplied the energy and drive for a great many good things that happened in his community and in the newspaper field about him. He will be missed as a friend and a counselor by many who knew him well and worked with him during his very active years as a civic leader and a newspaperman.

Statement of Policy by League of Wisconsin Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead we shall be faced with serious decisions on a wide variety of issues affecting local, national, and international interests.

In considering programs for domestic progress, a major challenge will be to determine the appropriate role of the local, State, and Federal governments in the development and maintenance of these programs. Too, we must consider social, economic, population, and other factors in the overall economy.

We recognize, of course, that today there is a trend toward population concentration in urban areas.

For example, in 1850, only about 15 percent of the people lived in our cities, villages, and towns; in 1950, only 100 years later, the percentage had risen to about 65 percent.

With this tremendous growth and expansion, there arise, of course, numerous problems. These cover a wide variety of fields, including the need for more adequate highways, airports, urban renewal, adequate water and sewer systems, and other programs.

Today, I have received from Mr. Ed Johnson, executive director of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, a statement of municipal policy by that splendid organization.

The statement outlines the views of the league on a wide variety of important programs, including intergovernmental relations, the need for an improved civil defense program, the necessity of effective Federal control over natural gas, problems of urban renewal, and other challenges of deep concern, not only to local municipalities, but also to us, in Congress.

We realize, of course, that there are different approaches to resolving these problems.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the constructive thinking of the league outlined in the statement of municipal policy, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MUNICIPAL POLICY OF THE LEAGUE OF WISCONSIN MUNICIPALITIES

This statement of municipal policy of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities is the vehicle through which the cities and villages of Wisconsin make known their aims and purposes. It sets forth broad areas of responsibility for municipal, State, and Federal governments on matters affecting local governments. It is primarily a restatement

and summary of many long-standing league policies.

This policy represents the foundation upon which the league builds its legislative action program at both the State and Federal levels. It does not attempt to state the league's position on the hundreds of individual bills which will be presented to the Congress and the State legislature during the coming sessions; rather it attempts to set forth guideposts for league officials and committees to use in establishing the league's position on individual bills which may come under consideration in future years.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPALITIES

Each year it becomes more and more apparent to the officials of Wisconsin cities and villages that the impact of Federal Government policies on local governments is becoming greater. The effects of national legislation and administrative programs are felt in every city and village in Wisconsin. League members therefore feel that their thinking on the major Federal municipal issues of the day should be made known to Members of Congress and other Federal officers. It is for this reason that the following statements of national municipal policy are set forth:

Intergovernmental relations

The relations between the Federal, State, and local governments determine the limits of the ability of municipalities to solve their own problems and to serve their citizens. Therefore, continued progress in municipal government is dependent on a proper relationship between and understanding among the various governmental levels and units.

The league endorses the guiding philosophy of government as set forth by the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report to the Congress in 1955. The report states the following:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle, utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

To continue the necessary constant study of Federal-local relationships, the league recommends the creation of a permanent national commission by Congress. The members should be representatives of all levels of Government, and they should have as their primary aim the clarification and definition of the policies of the Federal Government with respect to local units.

Municipal credit

The improvement of municipal credit and the municipal bond market is a matter of much concern to local governmental officials in these days of high costs and the need for tremendous capital improvements. Because of the effect of national tax policy on municipal bonds, the league recommends to Congress that: (1) The present Federal income tax exemption of income from municipal bonds be continued; and (2) that legislation be adopted which would further broaden the market for municipal bonds by authorizing all banking institutions to participate in the municipal bond market, and the income tax exemption be clarified so as to authorize the "pass-through" principle for investment companies.

Payments in lieu of taxes

The league urges the Congress to enact legislation which will broaden the present Federal policy regarding payments to local governments in lieu of property taxes on Federal property and payment of special assessments on Federal property benefited by local improvements.

Highways

Since the greatest need for improvement in highway facilities exists in and around municipalities, the league urges the Congress to continue to expand the Federal highway program and to give even greater recognition to the needs of cities and villages. The impact of the new Interstate Highway System is yet to be felt, and the Congress should pass all legislation necessary to implement the role that cities and villages must necessarily play in the provision of adequate highway facilities to the millions of motorists in the Nation.

Airports

Airports do not serve only the residents of the municipalities in or near which they are located; they serve the traveling public of the Nation. For this reason the Federal Government has a responsibility for participating in any program to provide adequate terminal facilities for air travelers. The league urges that the existing Federal airport program not only be continued but be expanded in order to adequately provide facilities for the ever-increasing number of air travelers. Local units of government are financially incapable, in many instances, of financing the construction and improvement of airport terminal facilities which are and will be needed to provide an adequate network of air terminal installations.

Civil defense

Because of its very nature civil defense is a matter of national concern. Wisconsin municipal officials stand ever ready to cooperate in civil defense activities. In spite of the readiness of local officials to aid and assist in the civil defense program, they are not in a position to know the over-all needs of such a program and feel that an adequate civil defense program requires greater participation and leadership at the national level.

Natural gas

Since an adequate supply of natural gas, reasonably priced to the consumer, is essential to the citizens and industries of Wisconsin, and since natural gas consumers would be left without adequate protection if there were no Federal control over the price of natural gas as sold by the producer and supplier, the league urges Congress to reject any legislative proposals which would leave the price of natural gas unregulated by Federal authority.

Water pollution control

The pollution of rivers and streams which flow through many municipalities and States is a problem of national concern. The current Federal program for sewage plant construction has been successful in enabling local governmental units to expedite their pollution control activities. Although there may be questions in the minds of some Wisconsin municipal officials as to whether such a program was originally justified, there now remains no question that it should be continued for municipalities with limited financial ability. Discontinuance of the program would cause new sewage plant construction activities to be curtailed and be detrimental to the pollution control program. For this reason the league urges that the Congress continue to appropriate funds for sewage plant construction and research in the field of pollution control.

Urban renewal

The decay of our municipalities through blight and deterioration is a matter of concern to all residents of our Nation. The

league urges that the Federal urban renewal program be continued and that funds be made available to local units of government to assist them in preserving our urban centers. Slum clearance and urban renewal are of such a nature and of such great expense that local financing of the needed programs is impossible.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN AND ITS CITIES AND VILLAGES

The actions of the State legislature and State officers, departments and agencies have had and will have an increasingly greater impact on the residents of Wisconsin cities and villages and their local governments. Municipal governments are no longer mere creatures of the State but are active, working partners in the performance of public services and in the administration of Wisconsin government. Wisconsin has long had a reputation for good government at both the State and local levels. This reputation can be maintained only as long as the working relationship among all levels of government within the State is maintained according to sound principles and policies. It is for this reason that the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, representing the State's cities and villages, sets forth the following broad principles as a statement of municipal policy in regard to State and local relationship.

Home rule

Actions of the State legislature and State officers, departments and agencies should always conform to the spirit of the home rule amendment of the State constitution overwhelmingly ratified by the people of Wisconsin in 1924. Government close to home is a Wisconsin tradition and should be preserved. The League, representing those units of Government which have been granted broad home rule authority by vote of the Wisconsin electorate, must necessarily oppose all measures involving attempts to have the State interfere in the local affairs of Wisconsin cities and villages.

Finances

The limited taxing powers of Wisconsin municipalities, together with the Wisconsin practice of having a substantial portion of total public services performed by local governments, demands an extensive program of intergovernmental financing and a necessarily complex State-local financial relationship. It is essential that in this State-local financial relationship the integrity, home rule authority and financial stability of municipalities be preserved. The State government has the responsibility for providing the means whereby Wisconsin local governments can adequately finance necessary local governmental activities without causing undue burden on the local property taxpayer.

The league, therefore, in representing its membership must oppose all proposals which (a) impose additional costs and mandatory duties upon cities and villages, directly or indirectly, without providing new revenues to pay such costs from sources other than the general property tax; (b) take away revenue now received by cities and villages unless replaced by some source other than the general property tax; (c) exempt property from general property taxes or cause exemption from State taxes shared by municipalities without providing an equivalent new replacement revenue; or (d) create excessive restrictions in the allocation of State aids and shared taxes.

Urban growth

Cities and villages must be given the opportunity for normal expansion. The complexities of urban growth are increasing each year. Responsibility for the solution of problems caused by the urbanization of Wisconsin's population rests equally with the State and local units of government. Continuing study of urban problems at all levels of government must be encouraged

and local units must be given adequate means to solve problems of urbanization through cooperative effort. In all matters relating to urban expansion the home rule authority of cities and villages must be given full consideration and what appear to be simple solutions through mandatory State legislation must be discouraged.

Highways

The members of the league anxiously await the findings of the present study of highway needs being made by the highway advisory committee of the legislative council. It is firmly believed that the results of this study will statistically prove that the greatest needs in the field of highway development are found in Wisconsin cities and villages. No major changes in the formulas for the distribution of highway aids should be made until the complete results of the study are known.

Cities and villages are now expending for street purposes several times the amount received from highway user taxes. It is now necessary to finance much of the highway costs to cities and villages from the general property tax. Certainly no consideration should be given to proposals to reduce the amount of income which cities and villages presently receive. Serious consideration should be given to proposals whereby the highway user pays a greater and more equitable share of highway costs.

Employee relations

The league does not oppose unionization of municipal employees but it does oppose State legislation interfering in matters of local governmental employment. Members of city and village governing bodies are in a far better position to understand the problems of their employees than are members of the State legislature. If home rule means anything in Wisconsin, it means that local employee relationships should be dealt with by the duly elected, local governmental officials. Therefore, the league will continue to oppose any attempt to have the legislature enact laws interfering with local government-employee relations.

Water resources

An adequate supply of water is essential to the development of any urban community. No water use should be given a higher priority than municipal public water supply. No private use should interfere with the availability of water for public purposes. For these reasons the league will oppose any attempt to enact legislation which would curtail the authority of municipalities to obtain an adequate supply of water for public use.

Education

The rapid increase in school population has caused tremendous pressures on the general property tax which provides approximately four-fifths of the funds necessary to support elementary and secondary education in Wisconsin. It is doubtful that the property tax can continue to bear such a high percentage of school costs in years to come when school enrollments are expected to increase at an even more rapid rate. If the property tax is either directly or indirectly further burdened for the financing of education, this source of local governmental revenue will make home ownership prohibitive, especially by individuals on fixed incomes.

The league believes that all children should have an opportunity for adequate education in the public schools of Wisconsin. However, educational opportunity must not be considered in a vacuum. In Wisconsin cities where education is one of many governmental services, it must be considered in relationship to all other municipal services rendered. The fragmentation of governmental services through mandatory attachment of districts outside corporate limits to school systems in cities operating under

the city school plan frequently results in curtailment of municipal expansion. For these reasons the league will oppose any attempts to enact legislation for the compulsory attachment of districts which will jeopardize the opportunity for normal growth and expansion of the municipalities for all governmental purposes if those responsible for local municipal government are denied an opportunity to participate in such decisions.

Dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, St. Lawrence Seaway, Massena, N.Y., September 13, 1958

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the address made by the Honorable George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, Mich., former Member of the House of Representatives, at the dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, being a part of the St. Lawrence Seaway project named in honor of Senator WILEY and himself, September 13, 1958.

The address follows:

DEDICATION OF THE WILEY-DONDERO SHIP CHANNEL, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(Remarks of Hon. George A. Dondero, dedication of the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel on September 13, 1958, Massena, N.Y.)

An occasion of this kind occurs only once in a lifetime. This is the greatest red letter day of my life. We are filled with emotions of gratitude and appreciation to our fellow countrymen for the signal honor bestowed upon Senator WILEY and myself by determining that this ship channel shall bear our names.

We dedicate today an important link in one of the world's most impressive monuments to international cooperation and good will.

We are witnesses not only to the construction but the near completion of the greatest engineering project of our time. The dream of two friendly nations who speak the same language and read the same Bible will soon become a reality.

Perhaps if North America has a lesson for the world it is the lesson of the border delineated by the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes; the lesson that it is possible to divide, and yet to share; that it is possible to be independent and at the same time interdependent; and that sovereign peoples can work together to bring fulfillment to a great common dream of industry and commerce. Let the world take note of what can be accomplished when mutual trust, friendship, and understanding chart the course of nations in building a great work for the benefit of all mankind.

To have had a part in guiding through Congress the legislation that made it possible for the United States and Canada in mutual trust, friendship, and understanding to undertake the building of this colossal project is an achievement and satisfaction for Senator WILEY and myself which cannot be measured in words.

On the walls of the House of Representatives in Washington, immediately above the Speaker's chair is inscribed the only quotation in that historic chamber. It is from Daniel Webster, a legislative giant of 100

years ago. Said he, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power; build its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

To Lew Castle, Administrator, his staff and advisory board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Corps of Army Engineers of the U.S. Army and all who had a part in the planning and construction of this gigantic undertaking for the development of navigation and hydroelectric power on both sides of the river, the thanks of both nations are generously tendered for its benefits to commerce, prosperity and peace, and to the national defense of North America.

After many years of hesitation, consideration, negotiation, and of planning, the mighty St. Lawrence seaway will soon become a reality. Man's dream of two centuries will have come true. Here it stands an unparalleled example to the world of international understanding and good will. Because of this I believe that in the years to come the people of the United States and Canada will, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in prosperity, in majesty, and in peace.

Item Veto

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution to implement the recommendation of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 9, 1959, for giving the Chief Executive item veto power in connection with appropriation and authorization bills.

As the President said, the responsibility either to approve or to veto specific items is one of the most important corrections that could be made in our annual expenditure program because of the savings of tax dollars that would result.

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to the joint rules of the House and Senate not only providing veto power of individual items in appropriation bills but also veto power of authorizations for borrowing funds direct from the Federal Treasury. This is the only answer I see for eliminating nonessential spending and unnecessary projects.

I know that when this item veto power was requested by former Presidents, the argument was advanced by some Members of Congress that in the President's hands we would place the power to use pressure on or punish individual Members of Congress who did not vote the way a President wanted them to on his administration's measures.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there have been times when Members have been subject to pressure, and we all have legislation which could be used against us. But our first responsibility is to the Nation and any vindictive veto would

boomerang under the light of publicity; or it could be overridden by Congress. Certainly Members know in their hearts that the passage of this concurrent resolution is one necessary and important way of restoring fiscal responsibility and Federal economy to our Nation.

I hope the Judiciary Committee will consider this matter.

Why Is Anyone Surprised at Soviet Maneuvers?

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the Communists turn on smiles and appeals for us to trust them one month, and switch to threats and brazen lies about us the next month, one always hears some Americans ask, What are they up to now? This is always a cause for astonishment. How long are we to refuse to read the Communist rule books? These rule books spell out in detail the pattern of deception, lullaby songs, and so on, which they follow faithfully.

There never is any mystery about the ultimate objective behind any Communist actions. The objective is to confuse, divide, soften up, and weaken us preparatory for the final kill. Whenever they urge us to follow a given course, it is because that will be good for them, not for us. How can we hope to survive, unless we wake up to the nature of this conspiracy and refuse to fall for its devious tricks, and turns?

One of the best short analyses I have seen of this consistent Communist behavior is in the enclosed column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in the New York Herald Tribune several weeks ago. The headlines of today, the current hotspots of Communist agitation, are different now than they were then, but the pattern never changes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

REDS MAINTAINING POLICY OF TENSION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Everybody agrees that the Soviet and Chinese Communists are well embarked on a tough, tension-laden, let's-keep-everything-in-turmoil policy. What surprises me is not that the Communists are acting to lacerate every sensitive spot in the free world but that so many people in the West should in any way be startled or surprised or in any way find it unexpected.

Of course, there will be stops and goes in Soviet-Chinese tactics; there will be some pauses to catch breath, to reappraise and get ready to apply the pressure somewhere else. But the fact is that creating tension and turmoil is the norm of Communist policy—it is the built-in requirement of Communist dogma. The only time to be moderately surprised is when they let up. Let us never forget that absence of pressure from Moscow and Peking is the interruption of the normal.

The Communist concept is not national, it is international. The Communist revolution

has neither spent itself nor come to an end after establishing its control over millions of Russians and Chinese.

What we need to realize is that the Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders are dedicated Leninists and that in the words of Lenin they are committed to carrying on a "permanent revolution" against every non-Communist society everywhere in the world until one or the other prevails.

This is not the West's cold war challenge to the Communists. We have never said that the whole world must be one thing or the other. This is communism's challenge to all who do not want communism. This is why it is well to appreciate that a tough, let's-keep-everything-in-turmoil policy from Moscow and Peiping is not a departure from the normal, is not startling, surprising, or unexpected, but is standard, by-the-book, authentic Leninist routine.

No one has more lucidly set out the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of the "permanent revolution" than Harry and Bonaro Overstreet in their new book, "What We Must Know About Communism," which is the most mature, perceptive, clear-headed, radiantly illuminating work on this subject I can imagine. On the one point I am seeking to make, let me quote from the Overstreets who, in turn, quote pertinently from Lenin:

"Peace, as Lenin saw it, was 'a respite for another war'—while the 'permanent revolution' went on; '... there is no other alternative: Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs, the most savage imperialism * * * Anglo-American imperialism, which has perfectly mastered the art of using the form of a democratic republic.

"One or the other."
"There is no middle course." (Lenin, "Selected Works," vol. VIII, pp. 146-149.)

So let us not be surprised when the Communists take a tough turmoil-laden line as they are now—toward Hungary, toward Yugoslavia, in Berlin, in Iran, at Geneva over ending nuclear tests, creating frontier incidents in the air (as downing the U.S. plane off-course over Armenia) and in the continued alternate-day shelling of Quemoy and Matsu.

And the revolution goes on inside the Communist strongholds. Mao Tse-tung has decapitated the flowers of criticism he urged to lift their heads into view. Khrushchev is no longer talking about "socialist legality" and has called a halt on the "rehabilitation" of past victims of socialist illegality. Premier Imre Nagy and his closest associates have been shot. Moscow's "literary thaw," which lasted about a year after Stalin's death, has ended with the attacks on Pasternak.

Moscow and Peiping are not engaged in "peaceful coexistence." They are engaged in "permanent revolution" against every non-Communist society by every measure they think has any chance of succeeding.

None is worse, however, than that loophole which I now wish to call to the attention of the House. I deplore any gimmick which permits one group to escape its just share of Federal tax obligations by shifting that tax burden to others. Our tax system, largely one of self-assessment, can survive only when justice is preserved as between taxpayers of the entire country.

The loophole to which I wish to direct attention today is that which permits giant, wealthy oil and gas companies to avoid hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes which should be paid to the Federal Government. I refer to that device in the Internal Revenue Code known as oil and natural gas depletion allowance. Under the present law, income for tax purposes may be reduced by 27.5 percent of the gross income from each oil and gas property, but not to exceed 50 percent of net income. For 32 years, oil and gas companies have benefited from this device at the expense of other taxpayers of the Nation. I think the time has come when Congress should no longer pamper this giant industry. Tax favoritism and discrimination are always undesirable even when rates are low. Under present high levels, they are intolerable.

How did the oil and gas interests obtain favored tax treatment? It all started back in the days of World War I when income tax rates were greatly increased. Because of the skyrocketing cost of drilling as compared with prewar costs, Congress was persuaded to introduce a new concept into the tax law. This new concept was called "discovery value depletion," and was based upon the theory that it was unfair to limit the discoverer of an oil deposit to the recovery of his costs which were largely incurred prior to the war, when the purchaser of a proven field could recover the amount paid at war prices. Under the then existing law, oil and gas companies were allowed to recover tax-free only their actual investment in depletable property. In this respect they were treated just like other industry is today. If private industry in Massachusetts, or any of the other States builds a factory to provide jobs for workers, they can recover only what is invested through depreciation allowances. Even though the property should subsequently increase in value, only what has been invested may be recovered. But this did not, and still does not, satisfy oilmen. They argued then that Congress should allow them to recover the value of the property after the discovery of oil, rather than their actual outlay. Congress went along with this in 1918. But soon great difficulty and much litigation ensued over methods of determining "discovery value." So, as a substitute, in 1926, Congress enacted the new concept of percentage depletion, which, as I have said, allows a deduction from income of 27.5 percent of the gross income from each oil or gas property limited by 50 percent of net income. The total investment may be recovered time after time, tax free. An investment of \$1 million may be recovered many times over, as has been done often, with no taxes being paid on

this 27.5 percent of gross income. I contend that it would make just as much sense to exempt 27.5 percent of the gross income of every actor, writer, athlete, movie star, doctor, or any other individual for that matter, who are daily depleting their creative and physical resources. Why should this special treatment be given to the largest and most wealthy corporations in our land today?

Let me emphasize this point. In classifying corporations for purposes of income statistics, the Internal Revenue Service has set up 14 categories of corporations according to the size of total assets. The highest, or 14th group includes corporations with assets of \$250 million or over. In 1955, this group claimed two-thirds of all the depletion allowances taken by corporations.

I point out that, in addition to the billion dollar oil companies which benefit from percentage depletion, there are others who receive an allocable share of the deduction. I refer to lessors and royalty owners, often wealthy investors engaged in buying oil royalties from proven fields. Risks involved in oil exploration and production are sometimes cited in support of continuation of percentage depletion but certainly the buying of oil royalties from proven fields has very little risk indeed. The lessor of land on which oil is discovered usually exerts little effort or makes little contribution to a discovery; yet, he also is entitled to an allocable share of the deduction.

I may say in passing that those individuals and corporations who benefit from percentage depletion are, in effect, being subsidized by the other taxpayers of the Nation. It is a government subsidy over which Congress exercises no control. One result may well be overexploitation and waste, or exhaustion of our resources. It is my belief that normal profit incentives and the free price system are adequate to insure necessary supplies, especially where the demand for the product has nearly tripled in the last 25 years and certainly will continue to increase as more and more producing fields have been discovered.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the legislative process develops when preferred treatment is once given to a favored group. Then others, reasoning by analogy, argue that they too should have similar preferred treatment. And Congress, instead of withdrawing it from the first, is caught in the illogic of its initial action, and extends it to a second group. Third, fourth, and succeeding groups likewise get a favorable hearing. This has been the history of percentage depletion. The oil interests have for years urged upon Congress this theory that incentives for exploration were necessary because of the risks involved and that oil was vital to our national security. In turn, the coal people argued that tax favoritism was being given to their principal competitor. Therefore, they needed relief. Now, no one will seriously contend that we are in need of additional coal fields. Estimates of available supply predict that we have enough coal for at least another 1,000 years. There is no immediate need for further exploration,

Amending Federal Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to close one of the largest and most inequitable loopholes that exist in our tax laws. Our Federal income tax law admittedly has many devices which have caused a serious erosion of the tax base.

nor is there current exploration. Even so, the allowance for coal is only 10 percent as compared with 27.5 percent for oil and gas. Actually, the oil industry productivity is far in excess of current demand and the exploration argument is shopworn and unconvincing.

It is my personal belief that a much fairer tax law would result if percentage depletion were entirely eliminated. Because now, not only oil and gas are legally entitled to it, but all mineral industries receive it in varying degrees. The amounts vary from 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, 23 percent, to 27.5 percent, the percentage allowed being determined to a degree by the amount of political pressure competing groups have been able to bring to bear on this body. If we could eliminate it altogether, we could add about three-quarters of a billion dollars annually to Treasury receipts.

I appreciate the fact that any proposal for the repeal of the entire idea would run into a wall of well-entrenched special interests with no possibility of passage. So, today I point out only the worst injustice and hope to appeal to those in this House who will work to correct this. I do not propose to eliminate the subsidy entirely, but seek rather to reduce the present amount from 27.5 to 15 percent.

On January 23, 1950, President Truman in his message to Congress stated:

I know of no loophole in the tax law so inequitable as the excessive depletion exemption enjoyed by the oil and mining industries.

I want to point out that this charge was not altogether new to President Truman. President Roosevelt and his Secretaries of the Treasury long fought for the very proposal that I urge today. I must say, too, that the present administration has been less impressed with the necessity for action.

A study made by a recent Presidential Commission showed that the percentage depletion allowances taken by oil companies were 19 times as great as those which would have been allowed under cost depletion. A reduction from 27.5 to 15 percent, which I propose, would still allow these companies to write off 10 times the cost of their investment, so you can see that I can hardly be charged with being unfair to the oil and gas industry. I wish to repeat. It is not my purpose to deny oil and gas companies the opportunity to recover their investment, tax free, just as do investors in plant and machinery. But I do wish to hold that recovery to 10 times the investment instead of 19 times as can currently be done. Again, to repeat, an investor in my State who builds a factory to give jobs to workers, may recover in depreciation no more than his actual investment. Why should billion dollar oil companies be preferred, especially when small independent wildcaters do most of the exploring? The usual contribution of the major companies is the so-called pocketbook explorations where the major companies taking no exploratory risk, merely buy up the independent, together with his earned depletion allowance.

I would like to point out that in my opinion we cannot permit this kind of tax favoritism to continue. The result of large percentage depletion allowances of course greatly reduces the tax bill of the oil companies. However, oil companies can point to the tax law and say that they pay the same rates as all other corporations, namely 30 percent on the first \$25,000 of taxable income and 52 percent on all over \$25,000. That is true, but the effective rate is greatly reduced by the exclusion of large blocks of exempt income. Actually, most oil companies pay only one-third to one-half the rates that other corporations pay. For example, between 1947 and 1956, five big oil producers paid Uncle Sam only 5 percent of their total cash earnings. Five comparable industrial corporations paid 38 percent, or an additional 33 percent. A large number of producers pay not one dime in Federal income taxes, yet they report large net incomes and pay dividends to their stockholders. Obviously, there is a wrong here that needs correcting. I think that it is no coincidence that *Fortune* magazine found that more than a third of the Nation's wealthiest individuals had made their fortunes in oil. This, at the tax expense of all other industries.

The President stated that he will submit a balanced budget to the Congress. There have been grave doubts expressed that revenues are likely to be as large as estimated by the President or that expenditures will be as small. It is my thought that the goal of a balanced budget is one greatly to be desired at this time. It would generally be favorable for the economy of the Nation. Since inflation is a specter that is to continue to haunt us, we should certainly do what we can to stop it. The reduction of the percentage depletion allowance to 15 percent will yield a substantial sum of tax revenue estimated by the Treasury Department to be about \$420 million annually. This is obviously a large sum of money. In fact, it almost exactly equals the total 1958 tax collections from all sources within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I wish to be as accurate as possible in my estimate of revenues to be obtained, and for that reason offer this brief explanation. The \$420 million estimate given assumes a continuance of present prices and production, and no change in foreign tax credits. It appears likely that oil and gas companies may make some changes in prices if percentage depletion is eliminated. But these changes are not capable of statistical projection. If oil prices are raised, then the yield will be greater than I have estimated. If they are lowered, the yield will decline. Included in my estimate is some \$95 million of additional revenue from foreign production. The Treasury fears that this increase will be largely dissipated through an increase in foreign tax credits. If this be true, then the net yield may be more in the neighborhood of \$325 million. But I say to the Members of this House, that even in days of \$80 billion budgets, we must not overlook the

possibility of obtaining an additional third of a billion dollars, especially when the result includes greater equity in the tax laws for all our industries. This additional revenue could be used for tax relief for the small taxpayer. It could also be used to eliminate some of the excise taxes that are helping to strangle small business. The money might also be used for national health research programs; hospital construction or educational scholarship grants which are so needed.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, enactment of my proposal will have the following desirable effects:

First. Help to close one of the largest loopholes that exist in our tax laws.

Second. Remove an inequity which is shocking both in its philosophy and its results.

Third. Add greatly needed revenue to contribute substantially toward a balanced budget.

Fourth. Reduce the probability of overexploitation and waste or exhaustion of a valuable natural resource.

Fifth. Make the availability of supplies dependent upon normal profit incentives and the free price system rather than uncontrolled subsidies.

The Drama of John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following appreciative article regarding the prodigious labors for peace by our distinguished Secretary of State. The article is by Mr. William S. White of the New York Times:

THE DRAMA OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES—SECRETARY'S PRODIGIOUS LABOR FOR PEACE BRINGS APPRAISAL OF APPRECIATION

(By William S. White)

One of the most arresting personal dramas of Washington is that of John Foster Dulles, whose permanent residence is in the eye of the hurricane.

Various observers may rationally dislike Mr. Dulles or some of his policies as Secretary of State. But nobody in possession of the facts—which, by the way, is just the kind of large, dustily legalistic phrase Mr. Dulles himself would use—could reasonably deny two things:

1. This Secretary of State has what are inelegantly called guts to a degree that few men in recent public life have surpassed. True, it may seem at times a rather tiresome, quibbling sort of courage; Mr. Dulles is not one to read from the large print when the fine print is available.

2. This Secretary of State, whose endless travels about the world would long ago have left limp and exhausted the average man of 30, has a physical industry so great as to be fatiguing even to watch.

Two years ago this month Mr. Dulles all but crawled on hands and knees from the hospital, where he had undergone an unpleasant thing—surgery for intestinal cancer. He returned to his manifold duties

stolidly silent about what most men find it impossible not to comment on—"my operation."

Never once since has he gone about holding his pulse in public. Never once has he asked quarter, on grounds of health, from the very hard world that surrounds him.

He is the oldest member of the cabinet—now in his 71st year—and yet he makes far more demands upon himself in every way than do any two of the others.

Just now, these demands are piling high about him. The Russians are glowering at the Western position in Germany, and crisis in its nastiest meaning may be in the air.

Mr. Dulles is making our policy in this infinitely tricky business, and in a sense making the policy of the whole Allied West, since we are the biggest of its partners. He is walking a high and swaying wire. His problem is not to give up any of our vital interests, but not, on the other hand, to do anything that would make it impossible for the Russians to draw back without losing face.

In all this he is carrying three buckets of water on his soberly tailored shoulders. One of these buckets represents the Allies, one the Russians themselves, and one the Congress—to which, with its huge new Democratic majorities, Mr. Dulles must pay far more heed than ever before.

How adroitly he is swaying with these buckets was well illustrated by a recent Dulles press conference. This the Secretary held on the day usually reserved for the President's own press conference, while Mr. Eisenhower himself was on holiday in Georgia.

Here Mr. Dulles grappled with explosive questions like an old Army sapper removing land mines. He spoke of the Russians without animosity or threats. His manner toward them, rather, was that of a corporation lawyer dealing with a rude and irresponsible but dangerous witness in an antitrust suit—firm, but careful and coolly detached.

The Secretary often has been—and sometimes fairly—accused of "brinkmanship," of an unduly threatening line. Whatever the past, this is in no sense now his line. It is now hardly possible, even for an observer never exactly enchanted with Mr. Dulles, not to feel some sense of security that our latest crisis, given all present circumstances, is in the hands of this possibly uncomfortably righteous but undoubtedly tough and supple man.

Amendment of the Senate Rules—The Three-Fifths Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Three-Fifths," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of January 5, 1959. The editorial comments on the proposal I made before the commencement of the present rules debate, namely, that rule XXII be amended to enable cloture to be invoked by a vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THREE-FIFTHS

The present rule in the Senate is that only two-thirds of all Senators can force cloture and bring a filibuster to an end. And by two-thirds of all Senators is meant two-thirds of the 98 Members of the Senate, not just two-thirds of those present and voting.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democratic leader, has proposed that the rule be amended so that two-thirds of those present can bring about cloture, but Senator COOPER, the candidate of the more progressive wing of the Republican Party for floor leader, says that there is not much difference between the present rule and what Mr. JOHNSON offers, since on important issues nearly all Senators are present. Mr. COOPER wants to change the rule so that three-fifths of the Senators present can stop a filibuster and bring a bill to a vote.

The Cooper plan goes further toward relaxing the present rigid rule than the Johnson plan, which is good. At the same time it does not let down the barriers completely, as the so-called liberals in the Senate suggest, and this too is good. It would be a serious mistake to change the rules of a legislative body as loosely organized as the Senate in such a way as to give a mere majority control over procedure. Such a system would not promote majority rule in anything except name. In reality it would give those highly organized minorities known as pressure groups the whip hand in many crucial Senate votes.

For when Senators vote on the record, as they nearly always do, the votes often reflect their subservience to the particular pressure groups to which they owe their offices and not their own thoughtful convictions or the wishes of the great silent majorities of their constituents. And since the pressure groups are nearly always in favor of extreme measures—witness the labor group, the racial groups, and the like—the record votes often do not represent majority rule but just the opposite. This isn't always the case, but politics being what it is it often happens. And the filibuster can serve a good end in preventing the distortions of justice and reason which so often occur when extreme measures are put over.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the filibuster is a device for allowing Senators to escape public commitments, and that public commitments can serve majority ends as well as pressure group ends. Hence it is important not to keep the rules favoring filibusters too rigid. Without endorsing the Cooper proposal it may be said that it splits the difference between the two extremes.

Big Brother Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared relating to the Big Brother Week movement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This is Big Brother Week in Tennessee and elsewhere. I would like to emphasize

the importance of adult cooperation with youngsters who need kind and constructive guidance.

The principle of the Big Brother movement is the application of the one-man-one boy relationship to the treatment of boys who have problems which may be solved through adult direction.

Adult members of Big Brother organizations deserve our most sincere thanks for their efforts.

In my State of Tennessee, many Big Brothers associations have helped rehabilitate boys who are fatherless or who lack the guidance which a father should provide.

All Big Brothers are volunteers under the supervision of trained, professional staffs of Big Brother agencies.

The events which disturb the minds of young men are seldom public events. Most boys live in their own small world. It is a particular human relationship which sets their inner stresses and directs their actions.

During the years when I was chairman and a member of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, we had an opportunity of studying in detail the Big Brother program and we found it to be one of the most helpful programs to young people that is offered in our country. Many young people who would have become juvenile delinquents have been saved from this plight in this personal interest of a Big Brother. It is the human touch and personal interest that boys need more than anything else.

Let us join in supporting Big Brother organizations.

Lincoln-Douglas Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EVERETT M. KINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the year 1958 marked the 100th anniversary of the series of seven debates in Illinois between the Honorable Stephen Arnold Douglas, the then incumbent Senator, and Abraham Lincoln, a candidate for the Senate in that year. These debates provoked national interest, and every one of the seven communities where they were held fittingly commemorated this great event. It was my privilege to participate actively in three of these celebrations, and I submit for printing in the Record the address which I delivered at Freeport, Ill., on August 22, 1958, and at Galesburg, Ill., on October 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MAGNIFICENT MISSIONARY

(Address by the Honorable EVERETT M. KINLEY DIRKSEN at the Lincoln-Douglas ceremonies, Freeport, Ill., August 27, 1958)

I. INTRODUCTION

Today in this inspiring communion, let me salute the magnificent missionary—Abraham Lincoln.

A missionary is one with a mission.

It is customary to think of a missionary as one who goes forth to propagate a religious faith.

Very naturally we think of Jesus Christ, of Buddha, of the Apostle Paul, of Mo-

hammered, of Moses, of Francis Xavier, of Father Marquette, or others.

But a missionary can be more than this. A missionary could be a dedicated group like the Crusaders. Or it could be an entire nation under a spirited leader.

The mission might be in any field of human activity.

The Roman emperors leading the legions of ancient Rome were missionaries bent on conquest.

The French under Napoleon were missionaries bent on world domination.

The Moors inspired by Mohammed were missionaries intent on the destruction of all infidels, and that included all who did not embrace the doctrines of the Koran.

The first English in India were missionaries seeking an expanding trade.

Every generation has had its individuals, its groups, its institutions, with a sense of mission in some field of human activity.

II. CIVIL MISSIONARIES

Among the missionaries of mankind in the field of civil endeavor there is one who stands out above all others—that magnificent missionary—Abraham Lincoln.

He sought to propagate no religious faith. He sought no conquest, like Caesar or Napoleon.

He neither sought nor exercised autocratic power.

He sought no material advantage.

He was a humble, common man, whose only weapons were an incandescent conviction, an unflinching zeal, an invincible logic and an unfailing sense of right and wrong.

III. THE MISSIONARY EMERGES

Not far from where we meet today, in the city of Bloomington, on May 29, 1856, the spirit of this great missionary emerged.

Two years before that date the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and also the new and hateful doctrine of popular sovereignty was breeding a strong revulsion in the land. Heretofore the issue of slavery was essentially a policy problem.

In some quarters it was probably little more than an intellectual exercise.

When the meeting in Bloomington drew to a close, Abraham Lincoln was summoned to speak.

This was the occasion when he uttered the celebrated "Lost Speech."

The form and text may have been lost, but the spirit and the effect were imperishable.

This was the utterance which his partner, Herndon, referred to as the greatest of his life.

Until then, according to Herndon, the slavery issue had been argued on grounds of policy and not from the standpoint of eternal right.

But on this day Abraham Lincoln seemed newly baptized.

"From that day," wrote Herndon, "to the day of his death he stood firm in the right."

The smothered flame had broken forth. A new sense of justice fired his energy.

His soul was now seasoned. Abraham Lincoln had found his cross.

A new sense of mission was lighted. The magnificent missionary had emerged here on the rolling prairies of Illinois destined to become one of mankind's greatest crusaders in a human cause.

IV. THE INTERIM YEARS

In that interim period between the emergence of the magnificent missionary and the time when the formal debates in this series began, not only the great moral issue of that day but also the zeal of Lincoln was being fueled.

In the presidential election of 1856 James Buchanan was elected.

In the territory called Kansas the clashes over the slavery issue were being referred to as war.

The unrestrained spirit of John Brown burst into murderous action like that of some "apocalyptic horseman of vengeance."

In that period came the amazing decision of the Supreme Court of the United States under the leadership of Chief Justice Taney in the celebrated Dred Scott case.

There came in that period a most extraordinary document called the Lecompton Constitution, under which one group expected that Kansas might enter the Union.

There was the fact of an election campaign for the United States Senate between Lincoln and Douglas and the development of sharp personalities between them as each sought a victory.

There was the fact of a growing interest beyond the boundaries of Illinois to give national significance to the contest between Lincoln and Douglas.

Thus in that period between the emergence of Abraham Lincoln's sense of mission at Bloomington 2 years before and the first of these debates at Ottawa on a hot Saturday afternoon in August of 1858, the spirit of the moral baptism was working steadily in the soul and mind of Abraham Lincoln.

V. THE MORAL LIGHT SHINES BRIGHTLY

In this great continuing discussion beginning at Ottawa and ending in Alton, few things were left undiscussed.

The debate embraced the Missouri Compromise of 1850, which sought to limit the extension of slavery.

It included the effort to repeal that compromise through the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which was piloted through a Senate committee by Judge Douglas.

It involved the Dred Scott decision in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It covered the personal life of the candidates.

But the moral issue was the overriding light.

It came in the very first discussion at Ottawa.

"I hold," said Lincoln, "there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . in the right to eat the bread without the leaviness of anybody else which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Here was the beginning of the moral thunder which was to roll down through conflict, emancipation and victory.

On they went—these gladiators—from Ottawa to Freeport, from Freeport to Jonesboro, from Jonesboro to Charleston, from Charleston to Galesburg, from Galesburg to Quincy, from Quincy to Alton.

It was then mid-October. Here then came the final discussion.

Slavery is wrong. It is wrong. It is wrong. The very word came tumbling from Lincoln's lips over and over.

"That is the real issue," said Lincoln in the final discussion. "That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world."

VI. THE CONTAGION

Then as now editors and politicians, scholars and historians could interpret the debates as they saw and felt them against the backdrop of their own day.

It may be difficult to evaluate this great event by orienting oneself into that period and then looking backward into the past and forward into the future.

Two years before the debates the missionary had emerged.

Character and conviction had emerged.

A notion of the ultimate course which the country was to take and the moral concepts which must be asserted had emerged.

The missionary had found himself. And so on and on he went.

The issue of principle was drawn. It was the age old struggle of right and wrong.

At first it had to be tempered to reality. Abraham Lincoln knew that he was dealing with an entrenched institution.

He knew he was dealing with a Supreme Court, with a Congress, and with a Constitution.

He knew that he was dealing with a divided land, with a people who were sharply divided.

He was dealing with friends and party associates interested in a political victory.

He was dealing with his own senatorial candidacy.

All these were realities.

And he knew that the people must be conditioned for this whole dose of basic moral principle and the struggle between right and wrong.

This was not a case for a thimbleful of gospel.

And as the conditioning process went on, so the conditioning of the spirit of Abraham Lincoln went on.

With it all there was the slow but inevitable contagion which developed.

The thousands upon thousands of people who attended or who read the accounts were caught up in the fervor of the occasion.

They were given a sustained chance to think, to meditate on the moral issue, and to separate the superficial from the genuine.

They had a chance to get a sharpened sense of the real issue and to reflect week after week upon the basic principle of human equality.

VII. THE ULTIMATE IMPACT

The ultimate impact of this series of debates can best be found in the utterances which came later.

On a cool November afternoon at Gettysburg in the year 1863, 5 years after the debate series came to an end there came those deathless words from the lips of Lincoln, when he spoke of a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

After 5 years the eternal truths rolled on and on.

Again, on a misty morning in the month of March 1865, in the Nation's Capital, as he stood to receive the oath for the second time, with all the agonies of carnage and death written on his rugged face and his furrowed heart, he could yet say, "It may seem strange that any man should ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not that we be not judged."

Thus did a sense of mission which slowly incubated on these rolling prairies of Illinois become fashioned and shaped in these debates to carry on and on not only in the hearts of his countrymen but in the heart of a great, humble man, who to the very end dedicated himself to the spirit of what Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence so many years before, when he said, where all could behold, "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal."

The magnificent missionary had executed the mission to which he was ordained.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(Address by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN at the 100th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas debate at Galesburg, Ill., October 7, 1958)

Ecclesiastes, so long ago remarked that "The thing which hath been, it is that which shall be and that which is done is that

which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." The past is prologue. And the past is tradition.

To the Thessalonians, Paul wrote, "Hold fast to the traditions ye have been taught." And what is tradition? It is the whole body of culture and beliefs, of usages and practices, of achievements and accomplishments, of personalities which come down to us from the past.

In the American tradition, shining majestically, there are the Pilgrims and pioneers, Valley Forge and Gettysburg, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. In it loom large are William Penn and Daniel Boone, Washington and Paine, Zenger and Marshall, Jefferson and Jackson. In it are faith and hope, tears and laughter.

And high in our tradition stands Abraham Lincoln. Can he be explained in any other way than that he was an instrument of divine destiny?

History is but the unfoldment of a divine pattern. This may be amusing in highly liberal quarters. If not this, it can only be materialistic drift. If there be a creative hand behind this universe, there must be a creative hand in its unfoldment and direction. Everything in it, sun, moon, stars, planets—their distances—the calibration so that people will neither freeze nor scorch to death—the procession of the seasons—man's subsistence—all rise to testify to the amazing adjustments in the universe to preserve life. And surely the creative force would not provide it all in such meticulous detail and then ignore its ultimate destiny.

But destiny does not unfold in a vacuum. It cannot be manifested without a vehicle, without an instrument. The light falling upon Saul enroute to Damascus to convert him into the world's great salesman was a divine hand reaching for an instrument. The voice from the heavens said to Ezekiel, "Son of man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak unto thee." Destiny was seeking an instrument. The servant of the Lord commanding Joshua to be strong and of good courage and giving him assurance and instruction was but finding an instrument for the unfoldment of history.

Abraham Lincoln standing before 15,000 people on a cold, raw, windy day in Galesburg 100 years ago today may not have seemed an instrument of an all-pervading conscience to carry on in a struggle which still besets our land a century later. How could a story teller be regarded as an instrument of destiny unless it be remembered that in a day when the vagaries of the mind were not too well understood, it is easy enough to perceive that the brooding mystic introvert can so easily conceal his introvert attributes in this understandable manner?

But consider this whole moral common man moving always godward, never too fast and never too slow, walking ever slowly but never backward.

In May of 1856 in Bloomington he delivered what came to be known as the Lost Speech. The form and text may have been lost, but not the spirit and the impact. For it was here that he received a new baptism. It was here that the moral, rather than the political or intellectual aspects of the slavery issue fired his soul and his cross was found.

Two years later, at Ottawa, it became the overriding issue for on that occasion he said, "I hold there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . in the right to eat the bread without leave of anybody else which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas and the equal of every living man."

Here at Galesburg he said of his opponent that, "he is blowing out the moral lights around us when he contends that whoever wants slaves has a right to hold them." He continued, "I confess myself as belonging

to that class in the country who contemplate slavery as a moral, social, and political evil having due regard for its existence among us and the difficulties of getting rid of it in a satisfactory way and to all constitutional obligations which have been thrown about it; but, nevertheless, desire a policy that looks to the prevention of it as a wrong, and looks hopefully to the time when as a wrong it may come to an end."

On they went in the discussion until at last, this far-reaching discussion carried them to the concluding debate at Alton. Over and over a word kept tumbling from Lincoln's lips. It was the word "wrong." And as they concluded, Lincoln said, "That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles of right and wrong through the world."

The moral contagion which Lincoln had created was spreading. At first, the moral issue had to be tempered to reality. He was dealing with an entrenched institution, with a Supreme Court, with a Congress, and with a certain concept of the Constitution. He was dealing with a divided land. He was dealing with people sharply divided. He was dealing with friends and party associates who were vitally interested in a political victory. He was dealing with his own candidacy. These were realities. Little by little, people must be conditioned for the whole dose of moral principle—wrong versus right. As the conditioning process went on, so the conditioning of his own spirit went on. The contagion was slow but inexorable.

Came that day in March 1861, when he took the oath as President of the United States. How careful he was with respect to the Constitution and the rights of the States. How earnest were his entreaties to preserve the Union. Yet he never lost sight of the moral issue. "If the Almighty Ruler of Nations," he asked, "with his eternal truth and justice be on your side of the North or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal, the American people." And he continued, "Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty." There was no word about slavery. He knew as none other knew what the ultimate solution would be.

On the first day of January in 1863 it is said that he first regaled the Cabinet by reading from one of the quaint and whimsical lectures of the current humorist, Artemus Ward. Then in a complete change of mood, he took from a drawer what turned out to be the Emancipation Proclamation. What a spectacular way to begin a new year. Having disposed of the details, he came to the final paragraph. "And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of the Almighty God." That day there must have been unbounded joy in God's Heaven.

On a cool afternoon at Gettysburg in November of 1863, after the words of the orator of the day had faded into obscurity on the afternoon breezes, he came forth with only a few hundred words, but they were deathless. How easily and clearly he stated the issue—whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality, can endure. There followed his appeal for a new dedication of the spirit and for a new birth of freedom. Justice and morality were marching and he was in the forefront, moving ever forward—not too fast to leave public confidence behind and not too slow to invite defeatism or to frustrate the unfoldment of a divine pattern.

Came that day in March 1864 when he stood before his countrymen again to take the oath as Chief Executive. Gettysburg

was behind him now. The progress of the Union forces was more encouraging.

He might have become stern and less humble. He might have fulfilled the politicians' hopes and stated what he expected to do with the sister States still in rebellion. He might have threatened. But not so. There was no passion, no spleen, no politics. It was the instrument speaking. "If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which in the providence of God must need come, but which having continued through his appointed time, He now wills to remove and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him?" What humility he concluded. "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right," There was that word again. Firmness in the right, the antithesis of wrong.

Consider finally Abraham Lincoln's last speech. It came in the evening of April 11, 1865, at the White House in response to a serenade. Lee had surrendered. There was jubilation in the land. Lincoln took the occasion to speak of the action of 12,000 voters in the State of Louisiana who had taken the necessary steps to return to the Union. Before discussing the details of the action taken by Louisiana and his obvious inclination to accept the action, even though defective in some particulars, he said to the serenaders, "In the midst of this, however, He, from whom all blessings flow, must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared and will be duly promulgated."

Four days later, the assassin's bullet ended all that was mortal. The ages embraced him. The Lord's instrument had consummated his mission. How else shall one adjudicate this exalted common man?

National Printing Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention to the fact that the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, has designated the 7-day period beginning January 11 as Printing Week in our great city.

We of Chicago are not only grateful but indeed proud that our city is the printing center of the Nation and the printing industry constitutes one of our largest industries in Chicago.

While this Nation from time to time frequently pays tribute to the various industries of America, it is my opinion that the development of printing has been one of the most effective contributing factors in the development of our democratic process and, we, as Americans, should be grateful to the men and women occupied in this highly skilled trade and to the foresight of those great Americans who have helped develop this industry. We, as a nation, proudly proclaim that our democratic processes have survived because our people are the best informed people in the world. I doubt there will be any dissenters to the statement that, without the phenomenal de-

velopment of the printing industry in this country, we, too, would suffer the intellectual darkness that still plagues so much of the world.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in my city, the Chicago Allied Printing Trades Council, with its executive secretary, Mr. Henry Coco, has done much to raise the standards of the printing industry, and it is through the dedicated work of organizations such as the council that this Nation has been able to make extraordinary progress in improving the printing industry.

In tribute to the thousands of Chicagoans who loyally serve the printing industry daily and because this industry is so important to all Americans, I have introduced the following resolution which I hope will receive speedy approval:

H.J. Res. 25

Joint resolution designating the seven-day period beginning January 11, 1959, as National Printing Week

Whereas the printing industry has a large measure of responsibility for the advancement and dissemination of science and culture in our Nation and throughout the world; and

Whereas the printing industry in Chicago ranks highest among all printing centers in production volume; and

Whereas the printing industry in Chicago surpasses all other industries in the number of separate manufacturing establishments, number of employees, and amount of wages paid; and

Whereas, through the printed word and the growth of America's printing industry, the population of the United States of America is composed of the best informed people of the world; and

Whereas January 17, 1959, will be the two hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the father of American printing, and the week of January 11 through January 17, 1959, will be marked by appropriate commemorative ceremonies throughout this continent in public, private, and commercial institutions, with particular emphasis upon the progress of printing and allied crafts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning January 11, 1959, and ending at the close of January 17, 1959, is hereby designated as National Printing Week in honor of the printing industry and its contributions to progress. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation urging the people of the United States to be mindful of the industrial, educational, cultural, and spiritual contributions which the art of printing has made and is making to the life and progress of mankind.

United States Trading Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation in order to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world

markets. This bill is not designed as a final and complete bill, but is mainly for the purpose of having it referred to the Congress so that the proper congressional committees and their staffs will get to work on this problem which the United States and the free world have to face at the present time. If this bill will be but a start toward a program which will enable the capitalist free world to properly compete with the Soviet economy, our purpose in introducing this bill at the present time will be achieved.

It is estimated that the economy of the Soviet Union, although not comparable to ours in total capacity or total production at the present time, is growing at a rate roughly twice that of ours. Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has described the Kremlin's progress in that respect as "the most serious challenge ever faced by the United States in times of peace"—a challenge making it "most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be fought in the economic and subversive arenas." Certainly, this is but another indication to prove that we should be well on our way toward making battle plans for the economic war.

There was a recent State Department report which labeled the Russian communistic tactics of economic aid and economic policy as being even more dangerous to the free world than the threat of war. We all know, in studying Marxism and communism, that it was the feeling of the founders of the philosophy of communism that ultimately capitalism would fail, and this would make it easy for socialism and communism to take over. However, we must not fall into the trap of adopting the Communist policies. We must be in a position to aid and help individual business enterprises and the capitalist system, so there will be no encroachment by government on free business; but, because of the economic war against the Communists, it makes it necessary that private enterprise and Government march together in this warfare rather than apart.

In recent months, we are getting a new insight into this trade warfare policy and we can cite the example shown us in the aluminum industry. Until recently, North American exports of aluminum to European countries provided practically all of the imports of this metal to the free European countries. Just a short time ago, Russian Communist sources announced to various European aluminum purchasers that they would supply aluminum for approximately 1.7 cents per pound cheaper than it could be bought from American and Canadian sources. In other words, the Communists were not worrying about costs, knowing they have slave labor and a Socialist economy where material costs are not measured in monetary value, enabling them to sell raw material or finished products at any price they arbitrarily choose. Our American and Canadian firms cannot meet that type of competition. Are we to idly stand by while we lose those markets and our own continent has to suffer from such com-

petition? Some methods must be found to combat this type of competition in aluminum, and surely in many other products, and the operating procedures of meeting this problem must immediately be given a great deal of study.

In setting up the United States Trading Corporation, there will be losses entailed. If we are to compete with the Russian Communist bloc, the Government might have to purchase raw materials and finished products from our concerns and sell at a loss in order to vie with their slave economy. We can possibly see a time when the original capital of the Corporation might be used up, at which time the Corporation would again have to come back to Congress to receive further monetary support. At that time, the Congress would be in a position to evaluate the work and accomplishments of the Corporation, and then could decide whether the program was worth continuing or should be changed.

In the long run, the economic facts of life are bound to catch up with the inhuman and unprogressive economic system of communism. However, in the interim, such a system can badly damage, indeed like the parasite plant can destroy, the healthy and sound economic system of a free society. Just as in our own internal economy we have found that unrestrained monopolistic practices can damage the healthy growth of our own economy so must we recognize that these same practices engaged in world trade can badly damage healthy foreign trade.

In other words, Russia through its state trading can pick and choose specific areas for attack, undersell the market for whatever period of time is necessary to destroy competition and then once competition has been destroyed revert, in true monopolistic form, to increased prices to recoup the economic loss suffered in gaining the market and then go on to exploit the market and, worse still, enslave small nations dependent upon a narrow economic base.

Strong as our private businesses are, they are not strong enough to cope with this kind of operation. Accordingly, the United States Trading Corporation would be set up to respond when this kind of economic warfare becomes apparent.

In putting meat on the bones of the bill I have proposed, it will be necessary to spell out in definite terms the economic circumstances which will permit the Corporation to function. As I have stated, it would be only in answer to a clear threat by Soviet Russia resorting to state trading and monopolistic practices designed to destroy competition or enslave small nations.

If Soviet Russia does not engage in this kind of activity, the Corporation would not have to act. If Russia does, the Corporation would be there to insure the fact that through temporary underselling, though it lasts for several years, Russia could not take over any market and destroy healthy competition, or enslave the economy of some small and weak nation.

There is no question in our minds that affirmative action and positive planning

must take place now. We can compete against the Russian declaration of economic war only by intelligence and cooperation. The bill which we are introducing and which would create the United States Trading Corporation is but a step to get a workable program started.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that we do not want our Government to take over business. We want a program in which the Government will assist private business, and only take over such functions as would be necessary in order that private enterprise and free government can march down the road of economic warfare together, and ultimately foil the aim of communism to dominate the world.

The bill I am introducing is as follows:

A bill to establish a United States Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Trading Corporation Act."

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes that one of the most dangerous weapons currently being employed by the Soviet bloc in its struggle for world domination is the use of international trade to achieve that objective through economic means. If the United States is to continue to be the leader of the nations of the free world in their effort to resist and retard such domination by the Soviet bloc, it must prepare to utilize international trade as an instrument of our national policy. So that this may be done in the most effective manner with the greatest possible benefit to the United States and its citizens and the other free nations and their citizens there is hereby established a body corporate to be known as the "United States Trading Corporation" (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Corporation") which shall assist and supplement the efforts of private business in the United States in fostering trade between the United States and the other nations of the world.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia and may establish offices in such other places as it may deem appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. The objects and purposes of the Corporation shall be to undertake such measures, and engage in such activities, with respect to the foreign trade of the United States as will effectively meet the threat to the free world of long-range economic penetration of world markets by the Soviet bloc. In connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes and the policy of the Congress set forth in section 2, the Corporation is empowered—

(1) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its business and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed on it by law;

(3) to sue and be sued in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(4) to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws specifically applicable to Government corporations;

(5) to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), to hold, maintain, use and operate the same, to pledge, hypothecate,

sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the same, whenever any of the foregoing transactions are deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of activities authorized by this Act or to achieve the objectives set forth in section 2, and on such terms as may be prescribed by the Corporation;

(6) to execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its functions;

(7) to use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government;

(8) to assist citizens of the United States or any corporation at least 60 per centum of the stock of which is owned by citizens of the United States which is engaged in foreign trade and is determined by the Corporation to be achieving the objectives set forth in section 2 by loan, subsidy, or otherwise;

(9) to appoint such agents, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation; and to delegate to them such powers and to prescribe for them such duties as may be deemed appropriate by the Corporation; and

(10) to take such actions as may be necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 2, and to carry out the powers and duties granted to or imposed on it.

SEC. 5. The Corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property (or buildings which are considered by the laws of any State to be personal property for taxation purposes) of the Corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, Commonwealth, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 6. (a) There shall be a President of the Corporation, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve as the chief executive officer of the Corporation. There shall be a Vice President of the Corporation, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as President of the Corporation during the absence or disability of or in the event of a vacancy in the office of President of the Corporation, and who shall at other times perform such functions as the President of the Corporation may from time to time prescribe.

(b) The annual rate of compensation of the President of the Corporation shall be \$21,000, and the annual rate of compensation of the Vice President of the Corporation shall be \$20,500.

SEC. 7. (a) The Corporation shall be managed by a Board of Directors of the Corporation. The Board of Directors of the Corporation shall consist of the President of the Corporation who shall serve as Chairman, the Vice President of the Corporation who shall serve as Vice Chairman, and fifteen additional persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the seventeen members of the Board of Directors not more than nine shall be members of the same political party. Before entering upon his duties, each of the directors shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. Terms of the directors shall be at the pleasure of the President of the United States, and the directors, in addition to their duties as members of the Board of Directors, shall perform such additional duties and may hold such other offices in the administration of the Corporation as the Pres-

ident of the Corporation may from time to time prescribe. A majority of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum. The Board of Directors shall adopt, and may from time to time amend, such bylaws as are necessary for the proper management and functioning of the Corporation, and shall, in such bylaws, designate other officers of the Corporation and prescribe their duties.

(b) Members of the Board of Directors (other than the Chairman and Vice Chairman) shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum.

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be an Advisory Committee of the Corporation consisting of 9 members, appointed by the Board of Directors of the Corporation on the recommendation of the President of the Corporation, who shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, agriculture, and labor. The Advisory Committee shall meet one or more times per year on the call of the President of the Corporation, to advise the Board of Directors on the program of the Corporation.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee, while attending meetings of the Advisory Committee called by the President of the Corporation, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President of the Corporation, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the service of the Federal Government who are employed intermittently.

SEC. 9. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock of \$1,000,000,000 subscribed by the United States. Payments under this subsection of the subscription of the United States to the Corporation and the repayments thereof shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Certificates evidencing stock ownership of the United States in the Corporation shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to issue from time to time notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which shall be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury; but the aggregate amount of such obligations outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$4,000,000,000. Such obligations shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be provided for in such obligations and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of the Corporation.

(c) For the purpose of purchasing capital stock and obligations of the Corporation issued under this section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchase of capital stock or obligations of the Corporation issued under this section.

SEC. 10. No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

SEC. 11. The President of the Corporation in carrying out his functions shall consult from time to time with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Tax Deduction of Expenses for Transportation To and From Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work.

My bill would allow a disabled individual to deduct from gross income in arriving at adjusted gross income expenses up to \$600 a year for transportation to and from work. For purposes of this provision, the term "disabled individual" is defined to mean an individual who has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, public transportation as a means of traveling to and from work.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the deduction proposed by my bill would be a real boon to those disabled citizens who need a boost to help themselves to be useful and productive citizens.

The bill follows:

A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. Transportation of disabled individual to and from work.

"(a) General rule: In the case of a disabled individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction, expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work to the extent that such expenses do not exceed \$600.

"(b) Disabled individual defined: For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 217. Transportation of disabled individual to and from work.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

(c) Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of ad-

justed gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(7) Transportation of disabled individuals: The deduction allowed by section 217."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

Analysis of the Foreign Investment Incentive Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following section by section analysis of the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1959—H.R. 5— which I introduced January 7, 1959:

SECTION 1. EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 1 provides that the bill will be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

SECTION 2. FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

The efforts of American firms to expand their foreign investments have been seriously impeded by the adverse impact of United States tax laws. Despite the avowed policies of our Government to encourage private investment to supplement and ultimately replace foreign economic aid, the capital available for investment abroad by American corporations is unduly restricted by present tax policies. Moreover, our corporations are placed at a competitive disadvantage in their efforts to expand abroad because the tax policies of other countries do not hamper their own foreign investors.

For example, it is possible for corporations of the United Kingdom and Canada to reinvest foreign profits without payment of tax to the home country. No tax liability is imposed by either the United Kingdom or Canada until foreign earnings are repatriated. This is possible under legislation expressly enacted to achieve this result.

Because of these pressures, American corporations have been forced to organize their international operations in foreign corporations in those countries of the world whose laws permit profits earned in one foreign country to be invested in other foreign countries without an intervening tax. This unfortunate trend has developed in part because of the burden U.S. taxation imposes on the expansion of the foreign business activities of American corporations. There are frequent instances in which the management and control of American-owned foreign business have been transferred abroad to have an equal opportunity in foreign markets.

In order to eliminate the necessity for American firms to utilize these foreign corporate vehicles and to promote an expansion of foreign investment by American firms, it is proposed by section 2 of

the bill to create a special category of U.S. corporations known as foreign business corporations. Section 2 would offer to American firms substantially the same tax treatment now obtained by the use of foreign corporations and would enable American firms to manage and control their international business in the United States where they belong.

Section 2 would also facilitate tax administration because the Treasury would have information received through the returns filed by these corporations. Any concern by the Treasury for an asserted loss of revenue is illusory. If the present trend to organize foreign business activities through foreign corporations continues, there will be in 5 years little U.S. revenue from taxes on foreign source income. Moreover, to the extent that private foreign investment can supplant foreign aid, there will be a net saving.

A foreign business corporation, under section 2 of the bill, is a domestic corporation which derives substantially all of its income from sources outside the United States and from the active conduct of trade or business, directly or indirectly through subsidiaries in which it has at least a 10-percent common stock interest. Income from the latter source, however, will qualify only if the subsidiary corporation derives substantially all of its income from business done outside the United States. A foreign business corporation may also license the use of patents abroad and render abroad technical, engineering, scientific, construction or like services.

Section 2 of the bill permits foreign business corporations to defer the payment of U.S. taxes on their income earned from sources outside the United States until that income is distributed. Thus, income earned in one foreign country may be reinvested in a new enterprise, in the same or another foreign country, without reduction by U.S. taxes. Similarly, income derived from licensing of patents and rendering of technical services may be accumulated and used to finance further foreign investments. It is just this tax treatment which has led so many American corporations to form foreign subsidiaries to operate their international business. The income accumulated by a foreign business corporation which is not distributed is described as reinvested foreign business income. When a distribution is made out of reinvested foreign business income U.S. tax becomes payable. Against the tax imposed, credit is allowed for taxes paid to foreign countries, just as the foreign tax credit is now allowed to prevent double taxation.

A broad definition of the term distribution is adopted in order to prevent possible misuse of foreign business corporations for tax avoidance. Since the purpose of the provision is to defer the payment of U.S. taxes only so long as the income is reinvested abroad, a distribution is defined to include any withdrawal of funds from foreign business operations. This includes the distribution of a dividend or the liquidation of a foreign business corporation. To carry out this purpose, any payment made for the acquisition of property sit-

uated in the United States, other than property that is necessary for the conduct of the foreign business, is similarly treated as a distribution, and results in the imposition of U.S. tax. The continued ownership of property that is initially acquired in connection with the foreign business activities, but which is later used in the United States for other purposes, is also treated as a distribution.

The advantages of the foreign business corporation provisions are meaningful only to American firms interested in the expansion of their foreign business. Moreover, these provisions will prevent tax avoidance which has sometimes arisen in the use of foreign corporations. A foreign business corporation cannot qualify if it holds stock in subsidiary corporations which derive any substantial amount of income from investments in the United States. Money cannot be accumulated abroad and then loaned, for example, to the parent organization. Nor can such money be used to purchase plants and equipment in the United States for lease to the parent corporation.

It cannot fairly be contended that section 2 of the bill would make the United States a tax haven. A corporation organized in a foreign country need never pay U.S. taxes on earnings from non-U.S. sources. On the other hand, a foreign business corporation organized in the United States will pay U.S. taxes on foreign income when distributed. Furthermore, ordinary income taxes will be imposed even if the foreign business corporation is liquidated, whereas a corporation organized in a foreign country can be liquidated subject only to capital gains taxes.

SECTION 3. TRANSFER AND REORGANIZATIONS TO FACILITATE PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

As presently administered by the Treasury Department, section 367 constitutes a deterrent to increased private foreign investment because of a strict interpretation of the term "avoidance of taxation" in situations involving the transfer of property from a U.S. corporation to a foreign corporation to be used in the active conduct of a trade or business abroad.

Where such a transaction involves the transfer or exchange of assets which may have appreciated in value, the taxpayer must, before completing the transaction, obtain a ruling from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that such exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Since tax rates in some foreign countries are presently lower than rates prevailing in the United States, the commissioner frequently finds an ominous purpose in a contemplated transaction, and rules that the transaction would be an avoidance of Federal income tax. Indeed, the Treasury Department views any deferral of tax as avoidance of tax.

Section 3 of the bill would facilitate private foreign investment by making expressly applicable to transfers of business property for foreign investment the usual rules for nonrecognition of gain otherwise provided in the code for corporate reorganizations. To accomplish

this result, the bill provides that transfers of foreign business property are not for the purposes of tax avoidance and, hence, eliminates the necessity for an advance ruling from the Internal Revenue Service. The term foreign business property is strictly defined to include only property actually used in a trade or business, or stock of another corporation actively engaged in a trade or business. The trade or business must be one 90 percent or more of the gross income of which is derived from sources outside the United States.

To conform related provisions of the code, section 1492 is also amended to provide that the excise tax imposed by section 1491 shall not apply where stock or securities transferred to a foreign corporation are foreign business property as defined in section 367(c).

SECTION 4. EXTENSION OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE CORPORATION STATUS TO INTERNATIONAL TRADE CORPORATIONS

Since 1942 a class of corporations known as Western Hemisphere trade corporations has been taxable at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the normal tax and surtax rates applicable to other corporations. This has been accomplished by allowing a deduction to such Western Hemisphere trade corporations under section 922 of the 1954 code. Western Hemisphere trade corporation status, under existing law, is limited to a corporation which does all of its business—except for incidental purchases—in any country or countries of North, Central, or South America, or the West Indies, provided its income meets two conditions:

First. At least 95 percent of gross income for a 3-year period must be derived from sources without the United States; and second, at least 90 percent of gross income for a 3-year period must be from the active conduct of a trade or business.

The principal purpose of section 4 is to extend the tax status now enjoyed by Western Hemisphere trade corporations to domestic corporations doing business in any foreign country, if the conditions respecting kind and source of income—as somewhat modified—are met.

The justification for enactment of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions in 1942 was that American corporations trading in foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere are placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with foreign corporations. See Senate Report No. 1631, 77th Congress, 2d session, page 32. Since the same competitive inequity now exists throughout the free world, it is only fair that all U.S. corporations engaged in foreign trade should be treated alike.

The rate differential for the new International Trade Corporation provided by section 4 is fully as justifiable for corporations doing business in Pakistan as in Peru, in Burma as in Brazil, and in the East Indies as in the West Indies. Under section 4, only 90 percent—instead of 95 percent as under existing law—or more of the gross income must be derived from sources without the United States. The reason for this change is the fortuitous

possibility that nonrecurring income from within the United States (for example, interest on a tax refund) may result in disqualification for as many as 5 years.

In computing the 90 percent or more of gross income derived from the active conduct of a trade or business, there would be taken into account compensation for technical, managerial, engineering, construction, scientific or like services, royalties from patents, trademarks, and copyrights, and dividends when received from a corporation which, itself, meets the conditions as to kind and source of income, if the stock ownership by the corporation receiving such income is at least 10 percent. The justification for broadening the latter definition is the recognition that foreign countries often require local incorporation and that frequently the risk to American capital is so great as to make essential the sharing of the stockownership.

Under section 4 of the bill, Western Hemisphere trade corporations will cease to exist for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958, and for all subsequent taxable years such corporations will qualify as international trade corporations. No corporation which meets the present requirements of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions will fail to qualify as an international trade corporation. International trade corporations will be permitted to file consolidated returns in the same manner and on the same basis as consolidated returns may be filed by Western Hemisphere trade corporations under existing law.

SECTION 5. ALTERNATIVE LIMITATION ON FOREIGN TAX CREDIT

Under existing law, domestic corporations, and citizens and residents of the United States, are subject to U.S. tax on total income from sources within and sources without the United States. Since income from without the United States is generally also subject to income tax in a foreign country or possession, a credit is allowed against the U.S. tax for these taxes in order to avoid double taxation of such income.

The foreign tax credit, however, is restricted by the so-called country-by-country limitation, so that the credit for foreign taxes paid to a foreign country cannot exceed the same proportion of the taxpayer's total U.S. tax liability before credit which the taxable income from that country bears to taxable income from all sources. The net effect of this limitation is that the credit for foreign taxes paid to a particular country cannot exceed the amount of the U.S. tax on taxable income from that country.

Thus, under existing law, if a taxpayer earns \$100,000 in each of two foreign countries—country A, in which the tax rate is 60 percent, and country B, in which the tax rate is 40 percent, the corporate tax paid, respectively, would be \$60,000 and \$40,000. Since the income from each country is taxable in the United States at the rate of 52 percent, the total U.S. tax prior to the foreign tax credit is \$104,000. Since the \$60,000 paid to country A exceeds the \$52,000 of U.S. tax on income

from country A, the excess of \$8,000 is not allowable as a foreign tax credit, even though the tax paid to country B is \$12,000 less than the ratable part of the U.S. tax on the income from country B. Consequently, a taxpayer in such circumstances would pay an aggregate tax of \$112,000 on a total income of \$200,000, whereas a corporation earning the same income from less hazardous enterprises within the United States would pay a total tax of \$104,000.

Section 5 of the bill would provide for an alternative limitation upon the foreign tax credit to insure that the \$8,000 of credit for tax paid to country A, which would be lost under existing law, could in effect be applied against U.S. tax upon income from other foreign countries. In no event, however, could the total of the credit for taxes paid to all foreign countries exceed the ratable part of the U.S. taxes upon total taxable income from all sources without the United States. In this manner the fundamental purpose of the foreign tax credit—to prevent double taxation of income earned abroad—which has been a basic cornerstone of Federal tax policy since 1918, would be effectuated.

SECTION 6. CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT INCENTIVE WAIVERS OF TAX BY A FOREIGN COUNTRY

This section will make it possible for American firms which do business without the United States to benefit from tax inducements offered by foreign governments to attract new capital, new technical skills, and American management. Today, if a foreign country is willing to give up tax revenues to induce an American firm to risk its capital and to provide the technical skills and know-how for industrial development, such a concession is of no benefit to the American concern. Under U.S. tax laws, income from foreign sources is fully taxable, but a credit against the U.S. tax is allowed for income tax paid to a foreign country. When a foreign country reduces its tax, the U.S. tax is correspondingly increased. Hence, any benefit of such a tax inducement is vitiated under existing tax laws.

It is not justifiable to thwart the efforts of underdeveloped countries to increase their standard of living through industrialization which cannot be provided without capital from the United States. Frequently, these underdeveloped countries are not firmly committed to either the Soviet bloc or the free world. Our national interest lies in assisting these countries in their efforts to industrialize and in impressing them with the advantages of our economic system. It is difficult to explain that tax sparing, their best opportunity for acquaintance with the free-enterprise system, is nullified by U.S. tax law.

While tax sparing is a worthwhile instrument, its scope must be limited. Safeguards are provided in section 6 by requiring that the taxpayer establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that tax waivers were not only extended in good faith by the foreign country, but were also accepted in good faith by the U.S. taxpayer, and that the taxpayer was, thereby, induced to begin, increase or continue the specified activity within

the foreign country. In view of the foreign economic policy aspects of this provision, the Secretary of State is considered best qualified to make the determination under this section, just as the defense agencies have usually been delegated authority to issue certificates of necessity for accelerated amortization.

The period of credit for taxes spared is limited to 10 years.

SECTION 7. NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN ON INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION OF PROPERTY OF FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES

Under existing law, if the property of a domestic corporation is compulsorily or involuntarily converted as a result of its destruction, theft, seizure, requisition, or condemnation, no gain is recognized by such corporation upon the receipt of insurance proceeds, if these proceeds are converted into property within 1 year after the close of the first taxable year in which any part of the insurance proceeds is received. However, this treatment does not extend to the case where a domestic corporation insures the property of its wholly owned foreign subsidiary with the result that, when the property of the foreign subsidiary is destroyed, for example by fire, the domestic parent pays a tax on the insurance proceeds received as a result of the fire at ordinary income rates.

In many foreign countries it is impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage. It is necessary for a domestic corporation to seek insurance from U.S. sources in order to protect the assets of its foreign subsidiary. Thus, such domestic corporations are deprived of the benefit of the insurance protection by the operation of existing law to the extent that the insurance proceeds are reduced by the full corporate income tax when they are received. To prevent this result, section 7 of the bill extends the nonrecognition of gain now provided by section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to cases where property of a foreign subsidiary in which the taxpayer has an insurable interest is compulsorily or involuntarily converted, if the taxpayer, first, contributes the insurance proceeds to the capital of the foreign subsidiary; or, second, purchases property similar or related in service or use to the property involuntarily converted and contributes such property to the capital of the foreign subsidiary. This rule applies whether or not the contribution of insurance proceeds is in exchange for stock. It also applies to cases where a contribution to capital is directly to the subsidiary, or indirectly through another foreign subsidiary. To prevent a double benefit to a domestic corporation as a result of the new treatment provided by the bill, section 7 specifies that the domestic corporation's basis of the foreign subsidiary's stock shall be increased only by the amount of any gain which is recognized. Similar safeguards are provided by section 7 to prevent a distortion in the earnings and profits of the foreign subsidiary. Thus, since the foreign subsidiary would be allowed a deduction in the amount of this loss arising from the involuntary conversion of its property, the bill provides that its earnings and

profits are to be increased by the amount of the gain which is not recognized by the domestic parent corporation as a result of the new treatment provided by the bill.

Do We Need an Overseas Trade Monopoly in Order To Compete With the Soviet State Trading Apparatus in Critical Sectors of the World Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Anastas I. Mikoyan to our country to promote trade between the United States and the U.S.S.R. will have served a useful purpose if it causes us to greatly strengthen our own trading policies.

During the week of December 1, 1953, the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the House Committee on Ways and Means took a look at the Russian trade monopoly when experts from seven Federal departments and agencies testified regarding it. It became clear, after hearing these witnesses, that while our Government recognizes the inherent danger to our way of life from the Russian trade offensive, it has no policy to meet or equal it. The United States is not alone in lacking such a policy. The Finnish Government collapsed recently, a victim of Russian economic pressure. Brave little Finland, which fought the Russian military juggernaut almost to a standstill only 20 years ago, collapsed like a house of cards when Russia refused to trade with the Finns. About the same time the Government of Iceland resigned because of economic difficulties and the Communists were conspicuously active in bringing this about too.

John J. Powers, Jr., president of the international division of Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc., told 500 members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association at a meeting in New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel that:

The enemy has devised new techniques and is launching a major offensive on a worldwide basis, while we are still in the perilous position of preparing only for a shooting war that may never come. Recent Russian international trade disruptions in aluminum, tin, and other commodities are as much a sign of war as the shooting in Quemoy and the political maneuvering in Berlin. The Soviet bloc clearly demonstrated that it will dump, that it will sell under cost for political purposes, that it will use inflation as a political weapon, and that it will extend long-term, low-interest loans.

Mr. Powers and other able observers conclude that Russia is winning over the economically underdeveloped, politically neutral countries by linking their aspirations to Russian goods and technology.

We can only hope that as other countries come face to face with economic

realities similar to those which led to the overthrow of the Governments of Finland and Iceland that they will take a second look at the well-filled Christmas stockings offered by the Russian Santa Claus. Uncle Sam has given away over \$60 billion since the end of World War II. This has not succeeded in endearing him to other nations who prefer trade to aid. With a fraction of what we have spent Russia is being phenomenally successful by a trade offensive in which aid, as we know it, has at best but an insignificant role. Somehow aid has been easier for us and we have chosen the easy way. Our best interest in the long run demands more trade and less aid. This is a task for all of us to get going on, business, President Eisenhower, and the Congress. The National Planning Association, with the aid of a Rockefeller grant, and the Business Advisory Council of the Federal Government's Department of Commerce are each making painstaking studies of how we in the United States and the free world can meet and master the Russian trade offensive. It is not a minute too soon.

According to a press report by James Reston—New York Times, December 2, 1958—the administration has been discussing quietly for the past 6 months the advisability of establishing an overseas trade monopoly to compete with the Soviet state trading apparatus in critical sectors of the world market.

The current groping for some line of action by which to counter the Soviet thrusts in selected markets must be viewed against the broad setting of recent commercial policy of the U.S.S.R. and the aggressive tactics employed by its trade monopoly as both buyer and seller.

I. RECENT TACTICS OF THE SOVIET TRADE MONOPOLY

Within the past 2 or 3 years the Soviet trading apparatus has attracted worldwide attention by a series of acts tending to draw several smaller countries into its own commercial orbit and to undermine the competitive position of a number of other trading nations. Some of the tactics used by the U.S.S.R., through the medium of its trade monopoly, may be summarized as follows:

A. BUYING UP OF PRESSING SURPLUSES

First. During 1956–57 it moved to relieve Burma of its rice surpluses by buying at the rate of 114,000 metric tons a year.

Second. In Iceland, it has made heavy purchases of fish in the past 2 years, at the rate of 45,000 tons per annum.

Third. Large-scale procurement of cotton and rice was ordered in Egypt: 60,000 tons yearly of the former and 70,000 tons of the latter.

Fourth. In Uruguay and Argentina, the U.S.S.R. recently appeared as a new, and reportedly welcome, buyer of wool, taking four to five thousand tons a year from each country.

Note: While the above commodities are of the type usually imported into the U.S.S.R., the significance of the recent pattern of procurement arises from the fact that the Soviet trade monopoly has been able to shift its buying from Western-oriented suppliers—Australia,

Iran, South Africa, Norway—to more promising markets. Such shifts, moreover, can be made by the trade monopoly without regard to the usual commercial terms: price, quality, cost of transport, et cetera. It is known, furthermore, that some of these imported products were later reexported by the U.S.S.R. to other countries within the Soviet bloc.

B. PREEMPTING MARKETS OF TARGET COUNTRIES

In a number of selected markets, the Soviet trade monopoly has been pressing its initial advantage to the point of establishing its commercial dominance.

First. In Afghanistan, for example, it has succeeded in preempting a growing share of that country's total trade—now over 30 percent.

Second. The U.S.S.R. has also extended its political leverage into Finland by way of raising its purchases to about 20 percent of that country's total exports.

Third. In Egypt, Russia has recently stepped up its purchases to a point where they now account for over 20 percent of all Egyptian exports.

Fourth. Similarly, the Soviet trade monopoly now takes 22 percent of Iceland's total export trade.

By way of getting these countries more deeply involved in the Soviet commercial orbit, the trade monopoly is conducting an aggressive export campaign. As a result, the position of the established western exporters to these markets is being seriously undermined by Soviet sales of similar goods at cut-rate prices. A number of such target markets are now supplied by the U.S.S.R., for the first time, with trucks, autos, tractors, bulldozers, scrapers, cranes, machine tools, and oil equipment.

As far as can be ascertained from available trade reports, when the Soviet Government decides to introduce a particular line of machinery into an underdeveloped country, say in the Middle East, the regular western supplier to that market finds it impossible to compete.

It is interesting to note, for example, in this connection, that the Yugoslav Government reported in late November 1958, that it was under severe pressure in the Middle East from the Soviet trade agents who "with uneconomic prices and other means are trying to push us out of the Arab market"—New York Times, November 30, 1958.

C. MAKING INROADS INTO WESTERN COMMODITY MARKETS

Agents of the Soviet trade monopoly have also stepped up their activities on a number of world commodity markets. The pressure to increase Soviet sales has been concentrated especially on petroleum products and nonferrous metals—tin, aluminum, nickel, and zinc. The effect in such cases has been to depress prices and to cut the export earnings of several small producer-nations—for example, Bolivia, Malaya, and Indonesia, in the case of tin.

These practices have been characterized by Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada as "warfare in the market place," designed to undermine the economic strength of the free world. In this type of operation, said the Prime Minister, "the profits are measured not

in the ledgers of commerce, but by the numbers of souls who trade their security and survival as freemen in the future for a temporary material advantage of the present"—New York Times, November 5, 1958.

Specifically, Canada has been affected by Soviet incursions into sensitive markets for several of its export commodities such as, among others, platinum, nickel, aluminum, soybean oil and meal.

D. PROMOTING THE POSITIVE FEATURES OF STATE TRADING

In its approach to the underdeveloped nations, the Soviet trade monopoly plays up a number of features in its state trading system calculated to appeal to the economic interest of these countries. The following features are stressed:

First. The state trading agencies of the U.S.S.R. do not require hard currencies for their exports. The purchase of Soviet goods can always be arranged on a barter basis, with the buying nation paying in goods rather than in currency.

Second. Soviet machinery is made available on the installment basis over periods as long as 5 years.

Third. Trade with the U.S.S.R. is particularly stable, because it is usually conducted on the basis of bilateral trade agreements that are renewed from year to year. Such agreements include specific lists of goods to be supplied by each side in the course of the year. Moreover, in the interest of stability, the U.S.S.R. often suggests 3- and 5-year agreements. Such formal lists have their special appeal to countries where governments are heavily involved in the conduct of foreign trade.

Fourth. The Soviet trade monopoly also recommends itself as a stabilizing influence on the prices of raw materials exported by the underdeveloped nations. As a token of its good intentions, it offers to sign purchase contracts at prices fixed to run over an extended period of time.

II. THE RECORD OF THE SOVIET TRADE MONOPOLY

The conduct of foreign commerce on a monopoly basis has enabled the U.S.S.R., over the years, to utilize trade as a weapon for the attainment of political objectives. Viewed from the other end, however, namely, from the standpoint of the nations trading with the U.S.S.R., the record of the Soviet trading system has been on the whole rather unsatisfactory. Its very utility for political pressure has made the trade monopoly a rather poor medium for the conduct of normal trade relations. More often than not it has prevented the development of a climate of mutual trust and simplified procedures. The experienced trader in the Free World has always known that only the politically motivated deal is closed promptly. By contrast, ordinary commercial transactions are inordinately time-consuming, being accompanied by excessive formalities and long periods of indecision.

While we need not here submit a full list of the liabilities of the Soviet trading monopoly, it may be useful, in the interest of perspective, to recall a few of the basic negative features of the Communist system of state trading as identified in a

recent paper by a distinguished western economist read before an East-West economic conference held in Rome in March 1958:¹

1. The individual state-trading country of the Communist bloc does not usually aim at enlarging its international trade as such, but rather seeks to establish its other objectives and to make use of trade as a temporary convenience that may assist in carrying out some general policy objectives of the state.

2. Supplies placed on the market by a state-dominated economy tend to be marginal rather than the result of a line of continued production intended for the market. In the main, commodity trade is consciously used as a device for counteracting the mistakes of the planning mechanism and for compensating for the failures of the domestic plant to meet the goals set by the planners.

3. Because trade in a state-managed economy serves chiefly as a corrective to the planning mechanism, it tends to be discontinuous. Hence, trade which requires for its most effective operation a substantial specialized investment over a long period of time is discouraged. Trade tends to gravitate to: (a) Bulk commodities where added amounts can be easily absorbed by an already existing market; (b) large units of equipment in which sporadic transactions are normal.

4. One of the greatest obstacles to trade with countries employing a monopoly system is the ever-present risk of interruption in active contact that comes with each shift in the political orientation of the regime. Constant shifts of executive officials and of formal jurisdictions prevents maintaining long-term contact with the same individual or department. The central management of the economy, furthermore, leads to sudden changes of interest, to the launching of campaigns for dealing with an unexpected or unheeded surplus or shortage.

In short, practical experience with state trading over the past 40 years has not evolved the institution into an effective instrument for the normal, profit-motivated, and recurrent exchange of goods. What has attracted the Communist governments to this system, to be sure, is the very fact that it lends itself readily and pliantly to manipulation by the political authority without the need to serve public notice, that is, by action taken through purely administrative channels. It can be used as a medium for rewarding friends and punishing enemies.

Even so, it is important to note that the instances of prompt action on the part of the monopoly in the world market have to be viewed as the exception rather than the rule in the functioning of the state trading apparatus. These are the instances in which a higher ranking authority bypasses the clogged channels of the Ministry of Foreign Trade. True, both agencies in question act in behalf of the same government, and both are free of any restraint in regard to cost. The fact remains that most of the spectacular commercial deals that have recently attracted our attention have involved the short-circuiting of the normal state trading machinery in the interest of a clear political advantage.

III. POSSIBLE DEFENSIVE MEASURES

At the present juncture in international relations, the United States may

¹ "Trade Between Countries With Different Economic and Social Systems," by A. K. Cairncross (Glasgow University) UNESCO, SS COOP, EC, 7 Paris, Feb. 17, 1958.

legitimately consider the adoption of certain measures to enable it to defend the national commercial interest in parts of the non-Communist world. There are two types of situations in which the U.S. Government could conceivably intervene to prevent the erosion of legitimate commercial rights:

One, in which pressure is brought to bear by the Soviet trade monopoly on an individual market in the form of uneconomic prices, or similar unfair practices, for the purpose of expelling from that market established United States sellers. The presumption in favor of action in such cases would be that the price cutting is only a temporary device employed by the trade monopoly to achieve the desired result. For the long term, even the Soviet trade monopoly is under orders to sell at the highest obtainable price.

Two, in which the purchasing power needed by some friendly countries for United States goods is frozen in the form of commodity surpluses that cannot be easily marketed to their normal nation-customers without the use of credit. Here the United States would be acting as an intermediary to keep trade flowing through ready channels, reduce the opportunity for Soviet pressure, and at the same time help unfreeze potential cash resources for the purchase of U.S. goods.

To cope with situations of this sort, it may be advisable to consider the establishment of the following instrumentalities:

First. An anti-dumping fund to enable American exporters to withstand Soviet attempts to expel them from established markets by the device of price cutting. Traders in this position may be regarded as victims of a planned Soviet political maneuver against the United States as a nation rather than against them as individuals.

Second. A U.S. commercial corporation to undertake commodity transaction with foreign countries which involve barter, credit, three-way transactions and other exchanges having a clear national economic or political objective that could not be pursued by a profit-motivated business firm.

In connection with the above, it is worthy of note that, according to the press, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS disclosed before the American Management Association that he planned to reintroduce a bill in the next Congress calling for the creation of a U.S. trading corporation. It would grant financial assistance to American industries faced with unfair competition from the Soviet Union—New York Times, November 6, 1958.

IV. THE NEED FOR PERSPECTIVE

It would be shortsighted, however, to jump to the conclusion that the United States should establish a trading monopoly of its own to combat that of the Soviet Union, for to do so would be to recommend state trading to combat state trading. This is one case where fighting fire with fire could be disastrous.

The present foreign trade policy of the United States, which was inaugurated in the 1930's as an antidepression measure, has become too passive to offer an effective response to the Soviet trade threat.

The present need is for a more vigorous foreign trade policy, one which, instead of confining itself to the multilateral reduction of trade barriers, would bring about a maximization of imports and exports by the countries of the non-Communist world. Such a policy, one that would be geared to the very real strategic needs of the United States, could be evolved only after a searching reexamination of our present and future international economic position with particular reference to the economic strategy of the Soviet Union.

BRIEF STATEMENT ON THE BULK-PURCHASE PROGRAM OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The British Government does not have a monopoly of foreign trade. During and after World War II, Great Britain has engaged in a form of state trading through the use of what are known as bulk-purchase contracts. These contracts, or bilateral agreements, concluded between the British Government and other governments, quasi-governmental bodies or private groups were concerned with the volume, the types and the terms of exportation and importation of specific goods for a specified period of time.

Such contracts provided that Britain would buy a fraction or a specified quantity of the exportable surpluses of the commodity produced in a given country. The price of the commodity was usually subject to revision up to a definite maximum at certain stated intervals. A program of bulk purchase was continued after World War II because it was evident that food and other commodities would have to be rationed for a period of years and the Labor Party leaders felt that the retention of central purchase would give the most effective control of distribution of supplies within the country.

The bulk-purchase contracts served several purposes: First, they served to steer trade from the dollar area to the sterling area and to soft currency areas; second, they tended to assure a fairly constant flow of imports at relatively favorable prices; since the contracts were ordinarily for a period of years they tended to promote price stability. They provided a certain amount of protection to British producers or investors since such contracts directed trade toward those British dominions or territories in which British capital was invested.

Usually the bulk-purchase contracts specified the exchange of an array of goods from Britain for raw materials and foodstuffs of equivalent value. Postwar contracts were for longer duration extending—in most cases—from 3 to 15 years.

Over 40 separate contracts were negotiated covering trade with other Commonwealth countries and possessions and with countries in Latin America, Eastern and Western Europe, and Asia. About one-half of all British imports were covered by such agreements up to 1950.

The Conservative election victory in 1950 resulted in a policy of honoring existing bulk-purchase contracts, but of negotiating no new ones.

State trading existed in the United Kingdom after World War II, but it co-existed with private trading and was not

a monopoly. In recent years, the volume of state trading has declined.

I include here a letter I have received from Hon. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and a letter from Harold Boeschstein, Chairman of the Committee on World Economic Practices, Business Advisory Council, Department of Commerce, which is currently engaged in a study, at the request of President Eisenhower, of how we can meet the Russian trade threat effectively.

I also include an article by James Reston of the New York Times of December 2, 1958. I would like to say that in the development of this information I have had the assistance of Leon M. Herman, specialist in Soviet economics, Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in international trade, and Elden E. Billings, analyst in international finance of the Library of Congress:

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 15, 1958.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Many thanks for sending me a copy of your statement of December 16 on the Soviet economic offensive. I certainly agree with your thought that this is a matter which demands our full attention.

As you have pointed out, the situation with respect to the underdeveloped countries is especially urgent. Our best estimate is that the Sino-Soviet bloc has extended credits of almost \$2.6 billion to these areas since 1954. More than 90 percent of this amount has gone to seven countries.

As of possible interest, I am enclosing a copy of my recent speech before the American Management Association, which deals with the subject of Soviet foreign economic policy.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORP.,
Toledo, Ohio, December 18, 1958.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I appreciate receiving the copy of your recent release on the Sino-Soviet economic offensive and concur that there is nothing more vital to our Nation than the manner in which we face up to this.

As you may know, I am a member of the committee, referred to in your release, created by the Business Advisory Council at the behest of the Government. Inasmuch as the work of the committee is not finished, I know you will understand why I should not comment at this time other than to say that such vigorous concern as yours is clearly needed among men in your position.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BOESCHSTEIN.

[From the New York Times of Dec. 2, 1958]

TRADE POLICY QUANDARY—SOVIET ECONOMIC DRIVE BEGINS DIVISION IN ADMINISTRATION ON COUNTERMOVES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—The annual battle over the Nation's foreign economic policy started today with the administration more divided than ever over how to deal with the Communist world's economic offensive.

When experts from seven Federal agencies finished testifying this afternoon before a House Ways and Means Subcommittee on the

challenge of Communist trade policy, Chairman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, remarked: "They all recognize the danger but have no policy equal to it."

In the last few days several isolated incidents have illustrated the nature of the danger they were discussing:

Last week it was disclosed that the Soviet Government had concluded an agreement to sell \$13,500,000 worth of benzene to the Dow Chemical Co., at a price equivalent to 24 to 25 cents a gallon. The current price in the United States is 31 cents a gallon.

Coincidentally, Augusto Frederico Schmidt, head of the Brazilian delegation to an inter-American economic conference in Washington, announced that his country was increasing its exports to the Communist nations. The British Commonwealth and the European common market nations, he observed, were "gradually closing their doors to our production," and the United States was not able to absorb Brazil's losses in those markets.

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, in his latest maneuver to influence the political future of Berlin and Germany, held out once more the promise of a vast market for German products in the whole of the Communist world.

A high official of the United States Government, discussing the problem of meeting the Communist offensive, commented this afternoon:

"It is politically impossible for us to discuss in public the radical changes we shall have to make to deal effectively with the Soviet economic offensive.

A POLITICAL INSTRUMENT

"They control all of their foreign trade. They can use it as a political instrument regardless of cost. They can take losses to drive competition out of a given market precisely as large producers once were able to do to eliminate small competitors in this country.

"We have been discussing quietly inside our own Government for 6 months the need to establish an overseas trade monopoly to compete with the Soviet monopoly on equal terms, but this is so foreign to our normal way of doing business that we dare not mention it in public."

What the public hearings before Chairman BOGGS' Ways and Means Subcommittee demonstrated today was that the administration was just as divided on less radical policies than the creation of a monopoly for the sale of U.S. products overseas.

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, predicted that the administration would ask the next Congress to approve tax concessions to encourage increased private investment abroad.

DIVISION IN DEPARTMENT

It is known, however, that some of Mr. Kearns' superiors in the Commerce Department are opposed to dealing with the problem through tax concessions, and the Treasury Department's chief tax expert, Dan T. Smith, refused to go along with Mr. Kearns' prediction that the administration would ask for tax concessions.

The division within the administration on this subject reflects the conflict between those who have been stating the Nation's foreign policy objectives and those who have to tend the Nation's Treasury.

The State Department and the International Cooperation Administration, concerned with the dangers of Communist economic subversion, are prepared for a radical revision of U.S. foreign economic policy to meet what they regard as a radical attempt by the Communist nations to upset the whole pattern of foreign trade.

The Treasury Department, however, faced with a \$12 billion deficit in the current fiscal year, tends to oppose any new programs

that might reduce revenue and create a double standard of taxation.

To minimize this dilemma, the Administration is now studying the possibility of reducing military aid to underdeveloped countries and increasing economic aid.

It is also discussing with Britain and the so-called common market countries of Western Europe ways and means of preventing the common market countries from discriminating against trade with countries outside the common market.

More than likely a compromise will be reached on this latter point under which the Common Market countries will agree not to raise tariffs against the United States, Britain, Switzerland and other nations for a period of 18 months. But this again is regarded here as merely a postponement of the problem.

The main point under discussion here is that the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries are concerting their foreign trade policies for political purposes, while the administration and the other free governments of the West are divided over how to deal with a wholly new situation.

Chairman BOGGS was not hopeful tonight that his hearings would find a way out of this problem, but he planned to carry them on in order to make clear what the problem was.

Tax Credit for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

The increased financial burden is a major barrier to the student's education. This bill is designed to encourage many parents to reappraise their financial ability to pay the costs of a child's education, so that more children can avail themselves of our country's rich educational opportunities.

The basic features of my bill which I believe to be sound in terms of fairness to the taxpayer and of service to the national interest are the following:

First. The bill would apply only to higher education—that above the 12th grade—including colleges, graduate schools, professional schools, junior colleges, technical institutes, teachers' summer courses, and the like.

Second. The payments involved would be only those made to educational institutions which meet the tests for special tax treatment under the present income-tax laws.

Third. In order to eliminate any possible feeling that the bill would discriminate in favor of taxpayers in higher brackets, it would provide that 30 percent of the student fees would be taken as a tax credit on the tax bill. Thereby the cost to the Government would be approximately the same as if the student fees were made deductible, but the relief

to all taxpayers would be the same regardless of their tax bracket.

Fourth. A ceiling of \$450 for each student would be placed on the amount of the tax credit. This would mean that that portion of any tuition above \$1,500 per year would not result in any further tax credit. It would be hoped that this ceiling would be sufficient to cover the tuition charges for graduate and professional education as well as for that at the college level.

Fifth. There would appear to be no occasion for limiting the taxpayer entitled to receive the tax credit to any particular relationships with the student. The neighbor or employer of a promising but financially poor boy or girl frequently proposes to pay his or her tuition to make higher education possible, provided the tax payment can be made deductible, but this is difficult under present laws. It would be expected that the tax credit plan would bring out more funds in the nature of scholarships to those unrelated to the taxpayer but in whom the taxpayer has some philanthropic interest.

Sixth. No tax credit would be allowed on amounts for tuition and fees supplied in the form of scholarships, fellowships or grants from sources other than the taxpayer himself. It would be assumed that payment of tuition and fees would be the first charge against such a scholarship, fellowship, or grant.

It is my opinion that such a tax credit will be a stimulus to more efficient use of private and public institutions. The result would be encouragement of broad distribution of student enrollment in all types of institutions, an objective which has always been considered to be in the public interest, and which is of even greater importance in the current emergency situation.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. Tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education.

"(a) General rule: There shall be allowed to an individual, as credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to 30 percent of the aggregate amount paid during the taxable year by such individual to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees for the education of such individual or of any other individual at a level above the twelfth grade.

"(b) Limitations.

"(1) Individual receiving education must be full-time student: Amounts paid for the education of any individual which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only if such individual is a student (as defined in section 151(e) (4) for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins.

"(2) Adjustment for scholarships and certain allowances: In the case of any individual who for any period receives—

"(A) any scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a) (1)) which, under section 117, is not includible in gross income, or

"(B) any education and training allowance under part IV of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,

any amount paid for tuition or fees for such period which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only to the extent that the aggregate of such tuition and fees charged such individual for such period exceeds the sum of (i) an amount equal to all the scholarships and fellowship grants described in subparagraph (A) received by such individual for such period, plus (ii) an amount equal to 3 percent of all the allowances described in subparagraph (B) received by such individual for such period.

"(3) Maximum taken into account: Amounts paid during any calendar year with respect to the education of an individual which (but for this paragraph) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be taken into account only to the extent that they do not exceed \$1,500. The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the application of this paragraph in cases where two or more taxpayers pay amounts with respect to the education of the same individual.

"(4) Credit not to cause refund of tax: The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(c) Institution of higher education defined: For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only an educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on;

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade; and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which are deductible under section 170."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957.

Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this the first day of the 86th Congress a very arresting article written recently by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This article is entitled "Counterattack on Juvenile Delinquency." As all of us

know this is one of the very grave problems confronting our Nation and I commend the sane, sensible thoughts of Mr. Hoover to the attention of all of you.

The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, Oct. 26, Nov. 2 and 9, 1958]

COUNTERATTACK ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

PART I

America is facing an emergency, a crisis which threatens the very future of our Nation.

It is the emergency of juvenile delinquency. The tide of youthful lawlessness is rising at a terrifying pace. By 1962 one million of our teenagers will be arrested each year—at the present rate.

My considered opinion is that we must act—and promptly. The time has come for a counterattack against juvenile delinquency. Unless this counterattack is successful, no street or park in the Nation will be safe. Worst of all, every child in the Nation will be exposed to the vicious acts of the delinquent minority.

Thousands and thousands of words have been written recently about the juvenile-delinquency problem. "Are the schools to blame?" "Are the parents to blame?" "Is our whole culture at fault?" are some of the questions which have been argued at length in newspapers and magazines. But now the time has come for action.

I am delighted that This Week magazine has asked me to propose such action in this series of articles.

Medicine of two kinds.

In this series, I will outline what I believe to be an effective two-pronged counterattack against juvenile delinquency designed to (1) bring existing delinquency under control and (2) prevent future delinquency.

But first let's define the scope of the problem.

During 40 years in law enforcement I have seen thousands of youths skid downward along the path from minor delinquency to vandalism, petty theft and progressively more serious crimes. Those of us who recognize juvenile delinquency as the training school for adult crime are seriously alarmed at its increase.

Here are the statistics that worry me and all law enforcement officers: During 1957 persons under 18 years of age comprised 53 percent of all arrests for the major offenses against property. Last year, more than two-thirds of the auto theft arrests, over one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests, and one-fourth of the arrests for robberies in cities involved juveniles.

No one is immune

Throughout the United States, an estimated 740,000 youngsters under 18 years of age were arrested last year. This is 3.3 percent of the population in the 10 to 17 age group, and it means that 1 out of every 30 youngsters was arrested for violating the law.

Since 1952, our juvenile population has increased approximately 22 percent. Juvenile arrests in the same period have risen 55 percent.

And the offenses committed by young people are characterized by more violence, more contempt for law and order. In every one of our cities terror runs down the street as youthful hoodlums grow increasingly bold and vicious.

This is the scope of the problem, a problem which cannot be dismissed as affecting only one area or one class. Juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime are not restricted. No child—rich, poor, city dweller, or suburbanite—is inherently immune to delinquent behavior.

Delinquency is a worldwide disease. A recent study in Great Britain disclosed sharp

increases in sex offenses, drunkenness, and crimes of violence among British teenagers, notably the "Teddy Boys." In Russia, an official Soviet Government booklet entitled "The Fight Against Hooliganism," reveals that knifings, beatings, thefts, and destruction of property by Soviet youth, constitute a menace of great concern behind the Iron Curtain.

But we're concerned with the causes of juvenile delinquency in the United States. I believe that this menacing cloud, mushrooming across the Nation with its terrifying portents for the future, is indicative of a deep-seated national illness. I am certain that here is proof once again you cannot dance without paying the piper. Over the past quarter of a century all too many Americans have been ignoring the basic traditions of work, discipline, and vigilance on which our Nation was founded.

Values are to blame

We seem to have misplaced the sense of values which made this a great Nation. Self-indulgence and the principle of pleasure before duty on a vast and growing scale have become a phenomenon of our adult world. These are warning symptoms of the "decadence disease"—which has contributed to the decay of so many civilizations throughout history.

When children, without discipline and without moral standards implanted by a stable home, are thrust into a culture in which pressures from every direction promote the principle of self-indulgence, what reaction can be expected? To such children, restraints are unbearable. When they want something, they take it.

These children are victims in a very real sense. They are the victims of a society which has substituted indulgence for discipline. They are the victims of a breakdown of authority and moral standards in the home, in the neighborhood, and—too frequently—in the entire community. And they are the victims of those practitioners of expediency who have blurred the lines between right and wrong, good and evil.

So, in large part the juvenile delinquent is a byproduct of our self-indulgent age. As such, he deserves understanding and sympathy, as well as an effort to rehabilitate him. Yet, while seeking to save those who can be salvaged, we must not make the mistake of adding to the problem by repeated, misplaced leniencies.

The treatment accorded youthful criminals must be fair, reasonable, and realistic.

I have been called an advocate of the get tough policy. To an extent, perhaps I am. I have seen too many instances in which repeated leniency has encouraged misbehavior, and I have also seen occasions when the policies of a realistic judge proved to be very effective deterrents to crime.

The "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile" attitude on the part of scores of young hoodlums is a clear-cut indication of how sentiment can supplant sense. Too frequently, misguided sentimentality, along with a policy of blanketing all youthful offenders under a protective covering of anonymity, actually encourages juvenile misbehavior. The knowledge that one can get by, not once but time after time, breeds bitter contempt for law and makes a mockery of our system of justice.

Let me repeat here what I have said many times. I heartily endorse reasonable consideration for children involved in minor delinquencies and first offenses. I do not, however, believe that the umbrella of special privilege should be held impartially over all juveniles, including those who commit heinous crimes or those guilty of repeated offenses. Leniency is misdirected when it is applied repeatedly to those whose every act expresses disdain for law.

Prelude to worse crimes

When "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile!" becomes the scornful slogan of increasing numbers of youthful cynics, we need to be wary. Such youngsters, through actual experience, are beginning to visualize themselves as immune from the law. If they get by repeatedly with the little things, the temptation grows. All too often the little things have become a prelude to really vicious crime.

I do not exaggerate when I use the word "vicious." The appalling rise in juvenile crime is equalled only by the increase in violence and brutality displayed in the commission of such crimes.

The three most prevalent juvenile offenses are: burglary—in 1957, 54.8 percent of all arrests for burglary involved youths under 18. Example: On the west coast last fall, two boys, aged 15 and 13, were surprised by a merchant while they burglarized his store. One of the boys fired a .22 caliber pistol at the businessman, killing him instantly. The gun had been stolen in a previous burglary; larceny—in 1957, 51.3 percent of the persons arrested for larceny were youths under 18. Example: A series of burglaries and larcenies committed on the east coast was finally traced to a small juvenile gang. Among their other crimes: making bombs out of stolen explosives in order to blast open the coin boxes in telephone booths; and auto theft—in 1957, 67.6 percent of all arrests for auto theft were youths under 18. Example: Last June, a young hoodlum arrested in a stolen car admitted a number of crimes in Texas, California, and Arizona. His ambition: to "shoot it out" with the police some day. "I've taken shots at officers, and I've been shot at before," he boasted.

The three most vicious youth crimes are—Rape: In 1957, 19.5 percent of all arrests for rape involved youths under 18. Example: On the East Coast a few months ago, a young couple in a parked car was held up by three teen-age hoodlums. The girl, aged 15, was separated from her companion and taken to a remote area where the youths attacked her.

Assault: In 1957, 7.8 percent of the persons arrested for assault were youths under 18. Example: In Washington last summer, 10 youths in two cars stopped their vehicles, jumped out, beat three young sailors, leaving one unconscious, and fled. Two of the youths were apprehended a short time later. They could give no reason for the assault.

Criminal homicide: In 1957, 6.4 percent of all arrests for criminal homicide were youths under 18. Example: Last December the robbery spree of a juvenile gang ended with the shooting of a liquor-store proprietor. None of the gang members were over 17 years old. For the youth who pulled the trigger, this killing was the culmination of a series of vicious crimes.

In many ways the second list is more frightening than the first. And for a very good reason. In recent years, reports on youth crimes have indicated a mounting savagery, a senseless brutality which makes one's blood run cold.

I will list just two examples of this nightmarish criminality:

New York—Two young men, refugees from Communist tyranny, were quietly walking along the street. When they stopped to ask directions of a trio of youths, they were attacked and beaten violently. Reason? According to the news account, the three assailants were "toughs" who had been drinking beer for hours on a tenement roof, then had descended to the street "to find some action."

Two of the perpetrators of this vicious attack, each 18 years old, were out on bail pending trial for felonious assault and malicious mischief in another case. The third, 16, allegedly greeted his mother with an

unprintable epithet when his parents arrived at the police station.

Philadelphia—A young foreign student was returning from mailing a letter near the campus of his university last spring when he was accosted by an 11-member juvenile gang. Two youths shackled the student's arms, others knocked off his glasses and began beating him. A blackjack, lead pipe, and hard-toed shoe were used. The young man's face was chopped to unrecognizable pulp, and his clothing was searched for the money he did not have. Within minutes after police arrived on the scene, the victim of this brutal attack was dead. And what had his 11 attackers—all teen-agers—been seeking? The admission price of 35 cents to attend a neighborhood dance.

Blind, senseless brutality. No conscience. No sense of right and wrong. Violence for the sake of violence. This is the frightening face of juvenile crime in its most terrible form.

Yes, our juvenile-delinquency problem is real, and it is growing. It may even be more serious here than in other areas of the world. Following a trip to the United States to study juvenile criminals, an Austrian educator reported in a lecture that he had found a fundamental difference between juvenile delinquency in Europe and in the United States. He indicated that the American way of life requires more self-control and discipline than the European one and that when the juvenile aggressor casts off his inhibitions, his acts are more ruthless and elemental. In short, the American juvenile delinquent is more deadly than his European counterpart.

Trigger-happy Americans

The Austrian educator said: "If someone in Austria is threatened by a juvenile gangster holding a pistol, he might be able to talk him out of it. No chance of that in America. The young rowdy would pull the trigger."

Much of the trigger-pulling in America occurs in the new urban menace—the juvenile gang.

The swift growth of these gangs holds a deadly portent for the future. The drive and purpose of the bopping gang are, with rare exception, alien to juvenile groupings of the past. Emotional intensity without moral responsibility renders these packs of young hoodlums increasingly explosive and dangerous. Vicious and arrogant, cruel and cowardly, seeking to rule a specific area of the city by fear and violence, the modern juvenile gang assembles an arsenal of zip guns, switch-blade knives, steel chains, and other deadly weapons.

The terror which exists in those areas infested by the juvenile gang reaches its ultimate in outbreaks of savage brutality and murder. Witness, for example, the gang killing of a crippled 15-year-old youth and the vicious assault on his companion in New York last year. They were kicked, beaten, and stabbed.

Another aspect of delinquency is the ever-increasing juvenile vandalism. Schools have been wrecked, cemeteries and houses of worship have been desecrated. And vandalism has led to more than property damage.

Last year a 12-year-old boy admitted starting a fire which took three lives. Police files showed that despite his youth, this boy had an impressive record. He previously had been picked up for throwing rocks, shooting an air gun and placing torpedoes on street-car tracks. He admitted starting four other fires in addition to the fatal blaze.

Terrifying picture

Senseless brutality, gang killings, vandalism—these, together with the other major crimes I have mentioned, add up to a truly

terrifying picture of juvenile delinquency today.

What can we do about juvenile delinquency? In this series, I propose the following two-part counterattack:

First, we must bring under control existing delinquency. To do this, we must launch an immediate program of decisive action by police, the courts, and parents.

Second, we must prevent future delinquency. This means a long-range but positive plan to strengthen the moral fiber of America.

We must act now to halt this spreading disease, which if not stopped, will bring the law of the jungle to every American street.

PART II

Seven steps to halt teen-age terror

"I want to be a good burglar, and I figure I'll have to go to prison to learn the business . . . but you know, I'm a pretty good burglar right now." These words were voiced last January by a 10-year-old. He was, indeed, a "pretty good burglar." This boy had admitted breaking into a bar, a machine shop, and a lunchroom. He had had other brushes with the law—including one in 1957 which had prompted his mother to complain that she could not control him.

Unable to control a 10-year-old child. What an absurd statement. Here is but one more example of a modern phenomenon which is sweeping across America—the abdication of parental responsibility that underlies the nightmare growth of juvenile delinquency.

Last Sunday, I outlined the scope of the problem.

In today's article, I wish to present a counterattack, a comprehensive plan to control delinquency, make our streets safe from gang warfare, protect our property and our very lives. It may be summed up in seven points.

We must:

1. Drive home to parents what their responsibilities toward their youngsters are.
2. Improve the effectiveness of juvenile courts and juvenile aid facilities.
3. Stop coddling known young criminals.
4. Take the protective wraps of secrecy and anonymity off juvenile hoodlums.
5. Crack down hard on the corrupters of youth—the dope peddlers, pornographers, etc.
6. Attack delinquency problems at the local level, mobilizing community resources for a unified front against immorality and crime.
7. And this is most important: begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure in America to prevent future delinquency.

The first six points in my program make up a plan to control existing delinquency. Let me elaborate on them—and on the urgent need for them—today. I will discuss the final point in next week's concluding article.

Responsibility of parents

Any program to combat juvenile delinquency can begin in only one place—the home. Abdication of parental responsibility—a malignant form of self-indulgence before duty—has gained a strange hold on all too many American households today. One jurist said recently:

"The (delinquency) problem is not so much an improper youth as it is an improper home."

Unquestionably, the very heart of the delinquency problem rests with the family. When mothers and fathers fulfill responsibilities of parenthood, juvenile crime cannot exist.

Everyone is aware of the problems confronting the children of broken homes. But how about the problems of children in "bent" homes? Let me illustrate:

The pressures of business have estranged thousands of youngsters from their fathers.

The distance between office and home has grown increasingly greater, and in many families the young children are in bed before their father gets home from work. Under circumstances such as these, mothers have been forced into a role of greater authority and responsibility. The man of the house tends to be looked upon as merely a weekend handyman—a tired, silent partner.

Many fathers are forced to hold two jobs in order to make ends meet. In some families both father and mother are employed.

The result of the above situations is obvious: the children suffer. Repeated rationalizations—"After all, it's in the interest of the whole family"—are small consolation to the youngster who thirsts for the love and attention of his "too busy" parents.

These are the practical problems of what I call "bent" homes. What about the psychological factors?

A terrible degree of moral decay has infected those parents who flaunt press clippings concerning their numerous marriages and divorces. And how much further into degradation can some mothers and fathers sink after exposing their children to wild parties and thinly veiled promiscuity? Yet, these are common occurrences with the growing ranks of those "sophisticates" who pride themselves on never permitting moral considerations to interfere with their personal desires.

In a normal child, the stamp of character is imprinted early. And it is imprinted deep. Youngsters learn quickly by the example of their parents.

And even more important, boys and girls who have known little or no real family life invariably long for the security of a genuine home. Subconsciously aware that they are being cheated, they do not understand exactly how life has failed them. So these youngsters react blindly and compulsively, striking out at society in general. This is the beginning of juvenile delinquency.

How can we relate parental neglect to delinquency? In some States there are laws under which penalties—including fines and jail sentences—have been levied against the parents of juvenile offenders. This is one way to make disinterested parents face up to their responsibilities to their children.

Where parental neglect is found to be a factor in delinquency, society has every right to demand that the parents of the young offender be called into court and be required to account for their actions. Neglectful mothers and fathers are no less a menace to the community than are their children. Let them be identified and publicly recognized as such.

Improvement of juvenile courts

Every State has special courts or special court procedures to deal with juvenile crime. Yet many of these facilities are sorely inadequate to handle the load.

One Maryland judge complained last June that in his county the juvenile court was expected to function with an inadequate staff, no juvenile detention facilities, no treatment institutions for disturbed children, and no police officers trained in handling juveniles.

In another community it was revealed that youngsters in immediate need of psychiatric care had to wait from 6 months to a year to get into one of the city's child clinics.

A metropolitan newspaper recently editorialized, "As long as young criminals can, figuratively or otherwise, thumb their noses at police and the courts because they know that usually there's no place to commit them—except in the so-called custody of their parents—just so long will our city be in a sorry and perilous fix. The inadequate facilities for neglected children are likewise a disgrace to the city."

It is a common practice to heap a greater burden upon the existing facilities than they possibly can bear. This has been true of

probation and parole systems where supervision of released offenders becomes a sham when the existing staff of officers is required to supervise greater and greater numbers of cases. This also has been true of welfare departments such as the one in which a case worker complained that it was impossible for her to do an adequate job for any of the 90 children assigned to her.

We need improved and enlarged juvenile court and juvenile aid facilities to help stamp out delinquency.

Coddling of known young criminals

Frankly, I am alarmed at the extremes to which some authorities have been permitted to go in protecting young offenders. Under a pretext of rehabilitation, tragic blunders have been committed against the American people.

As I said in last week's article, I know that I have been called an advocate of the "get tough" policy. To some extent this is true. I think the time has come when we must be realistic. We must show the hard-core delinquents who have no respect for law and order that we mean business.

Sometimes the coddling of delinquents takes an ironic form. In a number of cases, misguided humanitarians have succeeded only in ruining the lives of the juveniles they were so earnestly trying to help.

Let me illustrate with an actual case. Last February a 17-year-old hoodlum was captured after a gun battle with police. He was well known to the authorities in his city, having built up an extensive juvenile record over a 5-year period. A probation officer familiar with this youth's case said that the boy idolized his father. Who is his father? A veteran criminal, now serving a 15-year sentence for burglarizing a grocery market.

Several months before his gun battle with the police, this teen-ager and his father had been arrested for grand larceny. The youth was convicted, but the charges against his father were dismissed for lack of evidence. Here was an opportunity to remove this young man from the influence of his father. Instead, he was merely placed on probation, and, in effect, permitted to continue his apprenticeship in crime.

Coddling of delinquents must be stopped—for the protection of the youths themselves, as well as the general public.

Protection of delinquents by secrecy

Closely linked to the coddling of young criminals is the widespread practice of sheltering them under a cloak of secrecy. A number of investigative agencies have been dangerously hampered in protecting the public by the secrecy which many courts attach to official proceedings involving juveniles.

For example, last Christmas four teenagers brutally beat an attendant and escaped from the detention hall in a southern city. Three of the boys were being held pending their transfer to the State reformatory. They had been picked up for robbery. The fourth boy reportedly was being held as a material witness in a sex case.

Despite the extensive records of these young hoodlums and despite their brutally executed escape, juvenile authorities were said to be powerless to identify them to the public. One juvenile court judge was quoted as stating, "If they are not recaptured within 24 hours, we may name the boys and describe their records as a matter of public welfare. But at the moment we are bound to respect the fact they are juveniles and withhold their identity."

A more realistic approach to delinquency certainly is needed when dangerous teenagers such as these are permitted to hide under an umbrella of secrecy. Youths who commit vicious crimes, as well as those who are guilty of repeated offenses, are not mere delinquents. And they should not be accorded all the special considerations which delinquents have come to expect.

We must stop shielding young hoodlums from publicity. We should use publicity positively to fight delinquency. It can be a powerful weapon. Let's bring all the names and facts about teen-age crime out into the open.

Corruption of youth

Our country is plagued today by an ugly brand of parasite who commercializes upon the immature judgment and curiosity of young people. In this category I include the fifth merchants, dope peddlers, and others who make their living by corrupting youth. These furtive characters frequently are found loitering near schools, playgrounds, and juvenile hangouts. They also run the mail-order houses which blanket the Nation with promotional material such as the following letter:

"Hello!

"My name is Mary.

"I'm an art model—pose in the nude you know, and I thought maybe you would like me or my girl friends to pose for you in a very special way."

The Post Office Department, which has jurisdiction when obscene material is sent through the mails, has received thousands of complaints from parents in all parts of the country whose children have received these letters. But our youngsters do not have to send away for indecent pictures and literature. There probably is a generous supply on the shelves of a neighboring newsstand.

Dealing in pornography and other forms of filth has become a multimillion-dollar business. In one city, the police recently arrested the operator of a bookstore who had been selling indecent photographs, color slides, pamphlets, and books at prices ranging up to \$75. Two squad cars were needed to haul away the filth which was found in his apartment.

As a law-enforcement officer, I am required to exercise strict control over my emotions. But frankly there are times when I cannot help feeling my blood boil. This is particularly so in cases where an adult has deliberately set out to corrupt the morals of a child.

The examples, unfortunately, are legion. In one city, the head of the juvenile bureau complained that the delinquency problem had been compounded by the fact that homosexuals were plying local teenagers with liquor and making advances toward them. In another city, 2 boys, aged 16 and 18, were taught the criminal art of stealing and forging checks by an ex-convict.

And in a third city, a middle-aged mother of 5 children was found to be the supplier of weapons for a gang of young robbers.

But of all the corrupters of youth, perhaps none is more terrible than the dope peddler. The dope pusher entices children to try narcotics, and in many cases the youngsters become addicted to drugs. It is well known that drug addiction leads directly to crime. The addict craves larger and larger doses, and the price is high. To get expensive narcotics, youths often follow the trail which leads from larceny to burglary and to more serious crimes.

All calculated assaults upon the standards of youth should be met with stern law enforcement and punishment. In communities where existing laws are inadequate to thwart the fifth merchants, the dope peddlers, and the rest—let's have new laws, laws with teeth in them.

Mobilize community resources

An effective attack against the delinquency problem can be launched in only one place. That is at the community level. Crime and delinquency are essentially local problems.

In the final analysis, immoral conditions persist within a community only because the last person to recognize his responsibility and acknowledge his blame is the individual citizen. He finds fault with the police de-

partment, ignores the pleas for assistance of youth-serving agencies, berates the schools and complains, "Why hasn't the Federal Government done something about this?"

How absurd. Despite the pleas for creation of a special Federal agency to spearhead the fight against delinquency and crime, I want to assure you that the Federal Government has no vaccine or cure-all to overcome moral sicknesses which exist in local communities. If the frightening growth of youth offenses is to be stopped, the forces for good within each community must unite.

As a first step, local efforts must be coordinated. Agencies must pool their resources. Petty jealousies and differences must not stand in the way when there is vital work to be done. Church groups, parent-teacher associations, public and private youth-serving agencies, civic organizations and local law-enforcement agencies must all work together—for the benefit of all.

The second step requires a realistic appraisal of local weaknesses which are a detriment to the cause of decency. Inadequate police budgets, lack of playgrounds in crowded residential areas, obsolete juvenile detention facilities, weakness in existing laws, overcrowded schools, and lack of supervised recreational programs are among the many dangerous conditions which prevail in all too many cities across the Nation. These conditions can best be recognized—and corrected—by the local citizens themselves.

The third step is action. Not only must corrective measures be initiated but each one of them must be carried through.

There you have my plan for the basis of a counterattack on existing delinquency.

Now, what about my seventh point: that we must begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure in America to prevent future delinquency.

I feel this step is tremendously important. Any plan to control delinquency must look to the future as well as to the present. Point Seven calls for a reaffirmation of the moral values that can stop delinquency in the future.

We cannot allow this situation to continue. We must make our towns and cities safe, now and forever, from juvenile terror. Once Americans understand this, I am sure they can do it.

PART III

Where does discipline begin?

Last summer a very interesting newspaper article came to my attention. It concerned an outdoor camp for boys—one established under the sponsorship of a religious organization. This is no ordinary boys' camp. It caters to youths whom many other camps would reject as undesirable.

After school had closed for the summer, a group of about 100 boys departed for this camp from the crowded streets of a large eastern city. Their ages ranged between 14 and 21. No less than 40 of them had court records, and a number of other belonged to juvenile gangs. Heading the group as it boarded buses for a month's stay at the camp was a youth worker who was only a few years removed from childhood himself. Did this young man have any misgivings about the backgrounds and court records of these boys? Not in the least. In the following words he expressed his attitude toward the challenge presented by these boys:

"We have some of the toughest guys in the city. We know what they've done and what they're capable of doing. But we show them what toughness really is—being able to face up to problems and assume a responsible place in the community."

The man who spoke these words, and the camp in which he works, are doing an effective job in combating juvenile delinquency. I would like to contend in this article that his philosophy is our true final answer to this terrifying problem.

We must show youth what toughness really is. These are profound words. Character, pride, resourcefulness, excellence—these qualities require real toughness. It takes strength and courage to be good, to stand for the principles which we all know are right. If we can help our youth develop this moral toughness, they will become the kind of citizens America needs to survive as a free Nation.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the delinquency situation. The current wave of youthful crime and vandalism is mounting in both size and intensity.

In community after community across the land, youthful hoodlums are going on the rampage. Juvenile arrests are rising at such a rate that 791,000 arrests of persons under 18 years of age are predicted for 1958—and 1 million will be recorded each year beginning 1962.

As I said 2 weeks ago in my first article in this series, juvenile lawlessness must be stopped. The time has come for a counter-attack against juvenile delinquency.

Last week I outlined half of a counter-attack against juvenile delinquency. I presented a six-point plan to control existing delinquency by:

1. Accentuating the responsibilities of parents.
2. Improving our juvenile courts and juvenile-aid facilities.
3. Stopping the coddling of young criminals.
4. Stopping the protection of juvenile hoodlums by secrecy.
5. Cracking down on the corrupters of youth.
6. Attacking delinquency at the local level.

Fighting existing delinquency, however, is only half the problem. At the same time, we must also begin today to reestablish a firm moral structure to prevent future delinquency. We must stop sowing the seeds for more frightening delinquency in the years to come.

Today, I will suggest an approach to this most difficult problem. I will try to indicate a cure for the underlying sickness of our age which I call "decadence disease." If a cure can be found, if we can restore to America the firm moral precepts of our forefathers, we can ward off future delinquency.

How can we head off future delinquency? How can we convert the arrogant toughness of our teen-agers into a moral, constructive toughness? The best way is by example—adult example. Yet, as examples thousands of American mothers and fathers are proving themselves dismal failures.

The "decadence disease"

From the examples of these parents, more and more youngsters are learning dangerously harmful lessons: "Rules are made to be broken." "If you are smart enough, you can get away with anything." "After all, you only live once."

Corrupt slogans. Parents by their own words and deeds are beckoning youngsters to abandon the principles which have made this a great country.

"Decadence disease" is infecting our children. And self-indulgence, the insistence upon pleasure before duty, the constant search for "the easy way"—are its symptoms.

When a child is exposed to dubious morality at home, he invariably becomes confused. When glaring inconsistencies exist between what he is told is right and what he sees going on, neither praise nor criticism from his parents can have any real meaning. Mothers and fathers who bask in self-indulgence are grossly ineffective at disciplining their children or inspiring them toward worth while goals.

Confronted with the charge, "You kids are making this a lousy world," one member of a tough juvenile gang replied, "Yeah? That's the way we found it." And if the adult atmosphere surrounding this young

man and other members of "bopping" gangs is taken into consideration, it probably will be impossible to disagree with his flippant remark.

Discipline is the opposite of self-indulgence. Show me a home in which the parents practice self-discipline and I'll show you a home where a mother and father hold the love and respect of their children. A youngster asks only to be taught the boundaries of acceptable behavior. Discipline, fairly and consistently invoked, breeds pride and respect. And children want—desperately—to be disciplined.

They need guideposts

Superficially, they may rebel. But on a deeper level, where character is formed, a child wants to be told what he can and cannot do. He needs guideposts to help him orient himself to the world. He looks to his parents for these guideposts. If parents are lazy or indifferent or overindulgent, is it any wonder that a child loses love and respect for them? How can a child continue to look up to a parent who continually compromises and yields to him?

No American, regardless of his age, outgrows the need for discipline and self-discipline. In a democracy, restraint and self-control are essential in all phases of life. This fact should be evident to all normal adults, and it should serve as a guide to them in rearing their children.

Frankly, I become irritated when I hear doting mothers and fathers say, "I love Junior so much that I just can't bring myself to punish him." In reality, these parents do not love their children. It is a strange kind of love indeed which turns a normal infant into a maladjusted child.

And let there be no mistake, an undisciplined child cannot help being maladjusted. Frustration, tension, and resentment confront him on all sides.

On the west coast last February, three young boys were caught in the act of letting air out of automobile tires. The father of one of the boys, an 11-year-old, was summoned to police headquarters. Told that the youths had deflated scores of tires, the father unhesitatingly said, "Son, pump them up again." After supervising as the boys inflated 16 tires with hand pumps, he yielded a bit and rented a power air pump for them to use. But he saw to it that the job was completed.

What a refreshing and praiseworthy attitude. Contrast this with the attitude other parents whom law-enforcement agencies encounter day after day:

"Oh, no. Not my Harry. You officers are always picking on him. Why don't you let him alone?"

A firm hand

Pampering, overprotection, making excuses, and cooing soft words when a firm hand across the seat of the trousers would be more appropriate are practices which create contempt for authority and obstruct decency among youth. These practices are harmful enough when they exist merely in the home. But today we even find them spreading to some of our courts.

In California last year a 17-year-old hoodlum was arrested following an attempted burglary. This young criminal cursed at the arresting officers and boasted that regardless of the kind of report they made, the courts would release him in a couple of days. What made him so certain of this? "I've been arrested and released before," he sneered in defiance.

Near the Nation's capital, a 15-year-old was attacked from behind and viciously beaten by an older boy who was wielding a milk jug. The victim's skull was fractured, his nose broken, and he required a number of stitches. The attack was unprovoked. Yet, when the assailant appeared in court, the judge dismissed the assault charge.

In another case local policemen were assaulted by two 17-year-olds who called them obscene names and shouted at a crowd of people to help kill the officers. During the fracas a gun was taken from one of the teenagers. Both of these youths had police records. Yet, for openly defying the law, each of them was sentenced to serve only 60 days in jail and a term of probation.

Let there be no mistake. I do not advocate handling all violators under the same rules which are applied to hardened criminals. I do feel, however, that the seriousness of violating the law must be impressed upon juvenile delinquents and other young offenders. They must learn that, in spite of the leniencies they may receive in the interest of rehabilitation, and in spite of their youth, society still holds them responsible for their acts. And that repeated violations will not be tolerated—no matter how young the offender may be.

Appropriate punishments

In dealing with juveniles, it is essential that the punishment fit both the offense and the offender.

Earlier this year, six boys in Virginia were convicted of savagely beating and mistreating a mule. They used planks and pummeled the poor animal so cruelly that it was feared it would lose an eye. The judge who heard the case ordered that the boys be given what many may regard as an appropriate punishment, a good, sound, old-fashioned whipping by their parents. In addition, each of the six was released to the custody of his parents on strict injunction of good behavior until he attains the age of 18.

In another case, a 17-year-old boy who had committed extensive acts of vandalism in a high school was placed on probation under the provision that he find a part-time job after school and make restitution at the rate of \$20 per month for the damage he had done.

If, as a result of their sentences, the six Virginia youths learn to respect the feelings of animals and the teen-age vandals learn to value the property of others, the courts will have helped them to become better citizens. What more can we ask of our juvenile courts than a record of positive accomplishments such as this?

But we must understand that a child will never reach a juvenile court if his parents believe and practice discipline. No child will hate his parents if firm but fair discipline is consistently applied. On the contrary, the youngster will feel his father and mother care enough about him to want to teach him the differences between right and wrong. Indifference and overindulgence breed contempt. Discipline breeds love.

The deadly slogans

Our teen-agers must be taught discipline outside the home, too. Many visitors to our shores simply cannot understand, for example, how an American youth could ever strike a teacher or, for that matter, refuse to obey a teacher's command. The homelands of these people have a deep-bred respect for teachers and other public officials.

The teens are difficult years. They are a stage of life when virtually every child begins to feel new pressures. "Conform." "Give in." "Join the crowd." "Don't be a square." These are more than expressions. They are real and awesome forces in the teen-age world.

The stereotype of our modern-day troubled teen-ager is an unruly, outspoken, rock-and-roll addict who cruises the streets in a souped-up jalopy, shouting insults out the window. In appearance he aspires to looking shaggy and to leaving behind the impression that he has not been near a barber shop in weeks.

The teen-agers who fit into this general pattern are fickle, aimless and confused. Whether drag racing down a major highway

or thumping a pencil in dejected boredom over their schoolwork, these boys and girls feel a basic insecurity. A void exists in their lives, and they are constantly experimenting—shifting from one fad and one "craze" to another—trying often pathetically to fill the gap.

The bravado and self-confident air of these youngsters veil only thinly a basic fear and uncertainty, an emptiness which gnaws deep in their souls. These children long for something which cannot be found without the help of adult society: discipline and direction.

We are plagued by a growing juvenile problem only because adult America has failed its youth. Rather than standing aloof and asking "What is the younger generation coming to?" we adults must establish a closer relationship with our youngsters. They need standards, goals, wholesome examples. They need vision and imagination such as burned so intensely in the hearts of our forefathers. They need adults who will help give direction to their lives.

In my book, "Masters of Deceit," I wrote: "... youth gravitates toward companionship with competent, generous, and experienced adults. ... If the adults can show, in action, that it is possible to combine high idealism with solid practicality and patience, the results will enhance character and citizenship development manifold."

Our adult delinquency

Herein lies the solution to the problem. We adults must set the example for young America. Let us invade the juvenile world with ideals. Let us bring meaning and purpose into the lives of our children. Let us leave no room in their minds for ugly thoughts or vicious deeds. And they will have no need to turn to either criminality or to communism to fill a void.

If we adults succeed, if we can change destructive toughness to firm moral toughness, we will have succeeded in preventing delinquency in the future. And we will have bequeathed to our children—and to our Nation—the greatest gift of all. We will have given them the toughness, moral fiber, strength and courage to keep our Nation strong and free.

A Solemn Inaugural

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, and as an adjunct to my reintroduction this week of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to our Federal Constitution, I wish to quote the radio message of Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian Amendment Hour under the title of "A Solemn Inaugural."

The message is as follows:

A SOLEMN INAUGURAL

(Radio message by the Rev. R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

This series of broadcasts is designed to reach the minds of all true Americans. These discussions are not to be political, partisan, denominational, or sectarian—in any sense. They are addressed to loyal citizens of the United States who love their country and seek for it the "blessedness of a nation whose God is the Lord."

Life magazine, in its portrayal of the inauguration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, January 21, 1957, for a second term in office, used this caption (Feb. 4, 1957): "A Solemn Inaugural and a Gay Celebration."

The writer in Life magazine, with a keen sense of the relative importance of things, has caught and brought together in the heading of his article the two dominant emotions which surged in the hearts of 75 millions of Americans who watched the proceedings on television, or heard them by radio.

The solemnity of the induction as Mr. Eisenhower, with his left hand upon the open Bible, his finger pointing to the words, "Blessed is [in Hebrew 'Oh the blessedness of] the nation whose God is the Lord," and his right hand raised to God, in whose presence he was standing, was emphasized as he added to the words of the oath prescribed in the Constitution—the prayer, "So help me God."

It is no wonder that Mr. Eisenhower, a Christian, should say to the many reporters gathered about him, "And I will tell you this: When you stand up in front of America and take your oath . . . you can't feel anything but solemn."

Not only so but clergymen of four different faiths offered prayers that God would give the President His blessing and divine guidance in the performance of the duties which belong to the high office of the Presidency of the United States.

Furthermore, those who followed the prayers carefully, observed that three of the clergymen offered their petitions to God, the Father, and "in the name and for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour."

The Reverend Dr. Edward Elson, Mr. Eisenhower's pastor, implored Almighty God to "guard, guide, and empower Thy servants in this solemn hour of dedication."

In his first inaugural, the President prefaced his address with a prayer, which he had written. On this latter occasion, while he did not offer a formal prayer, he declared that "peace with justice" is the "bold and solemn purpose" of his second White House term. He branded "international communism and the power that it controls" as "the great divisive force" loose in a world which, he said, rarely has "known such peril as today." And closed with this petition: "May the light of freedom, coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly until at last the darkness is no more."

The whole address rose above party and above nationalism in its appeal to all men who love freedom to join with America to break the tyranny of atheistic communism.

Never before in the inauguration of our Presidents has our dependence upon God been so clearly enunciated.

The Reverend Dr. Elson, Mr. Eisenhower's pastor, in his sermon on January 20, in the presence of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon, said: "To be under God is to acknowledge that this is God's world, that He is the Sovereign Lord and Ruler of all life. He is the God of Creation . . . Americans believe that God is above the Nation."

He also said: "Rightly do we sing:

"Our Father's God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright,
With Freedom's holy light.
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

To quote once more from Dr. Elson's sermon. He said: "To be under God is to be guided by Him. That nation which seeks to understand and obey His laws; that nation which seeks to discern and do His will—only that nation becomes an effective instrument of God's purpose on earth. Above all, over all, guiding and empowering all is

the transcendent God. To the degree we possess His mind and spirit which is at the center of the universe, and which we Christians believe to be revealed by Jesus Christ, we are and shall remain a Nation under God.

"In the beginning God." On these first words of the Bible early America staked down its life."

Dr. Elson is right. And the further we go back into the beginning of our Nation the more evident it becomes that the Founding Fathers "staked down" the "very life" of the Nation they proposed to establish on these shores, on the doctrine of the Sovereignty of God and of the Kingship of Christ as the One to whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been committed.

Read the compact made on board the *Mayflower*, November 11, 1620, which reads in part as follows: "In the name of God, amen. We, whose names are underwritten, . . . having undertaken for the glory of God, and the advancement of the Christian faith . . . a voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern parts of Virginia; . . . do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid."

The charters of the 13 Colonies—"laid down authoritatively the Christian principles in accordance with which their governments were to be administered, and made suitable acknowledgments of God the Creator as their source of authority."

The effect of these firm pronouncements is found in the provision for Chaplains in Congress, our establishment of the day of Thanksgiving, our motto "In God we trust" on our coins and postage stamps and, more recently, the inclusion of the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

There are evidences that Christian citizens of the United States are coming to realize that, in the turmoil of the world, there is need for a closer walk with God.

What will the next step be?

What ought the next step to be?

It seemed to many who heard the President take the oath as it was administered by the Chief Justice, as it is prescribed in the Constitution—and the Chief Justice in administering the oath felt that there was something lacking in the constitutional oath—something that should have been there and was not there.

Both the President and the Chief Justice knew the nature and the form of the prescribed oath.

They had taken the oath in the prescribed form many times.

Were they aware that the oath was not what it ought to be?

Otherwise why did the Chief Justice add to the oath the words—words which are not in the oath—"So help you God"? And did Mr. Eisenhower, by answering solemnly and firmly in words which are not in the oath, "So help me God"—did he in doing that indicate his belief that an oath is not a valid oath unless it contains an appeal to God?

A Study of the Present Russian Civilization and Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article into

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is perhaps a little different from the type that usually is inserted.

The title of the article is "Pasternak and the Russian Community" and was written by Charles B. McLane, professor of Russian civilization at Dartmouth College, where students desiring to do so may major in Russian civilization.

The question might be raised, What has a book review to do with legislation? The point is this: A more thorough knowledge of Russian civilization and the Russian people is very important if this Congress is to legislate intelligently in many fields from defense to education.

If the Un-American Activities Committee has run out of things to do, which I do not believe is the case, it might undertake a comprehensive study of the present Russian civilization and its people. Such a study would be invaluable to the legislative committees, including the committee concerned with studying and passing out legislation designed to cope with the threat of Communist infiltration into the United States and other countries with whom we are allied. This article by Professor McLane provides a good philosophic starting point.

I am happy to advise that the Joint Economic Committee is going to update and make more comprehensive its study of Russia's economy within the ensuing months. The last study of the committee, "Soviet Economic Growth: A Comparison With the United States," made in 1957, limited as it is, provides about the best information we have today on the Russian economy. It is when I look at the limitations of this study and realize that it is the best we have that I begin to worry.

It is important that we start discussing Russia from the standpoint of knowledge and facts instead of as a convenient bogeyman to try to get Federal appropriations for the Defense Department or for Federal research or for Federal aid to education.

As I have said many times before in speeches on the floor of the House by overestimating Russia—if we are—we enhance her reputation in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples of the world. The dangers of underestimating Russia have been sufficiently elaborated upon by people in public life and in the public relations media so that I am satisfied we have little to fear that we might go that route.

It is my personal conviction after some degree of studying the matter that we are continuing to badly overestimate Russia; and certainly in our statements in regard to Russia's accomplishments, and she has had many, we have been unanalytical.

Russia has not followed pure Marxism for several decades. In many ways she is going further and further away from communism to adopt procedures and principles which are peculiar to the private enterprise system. Khrushchev is quoted recently as laughing at one of the basic doctrines of communism "to each according to his needs, from each according to his abilities," as well he might. Certainly Soviet Russia of 1959

is hardly a society where that principle is observed.

As a working hypothesis I suggest that Russia has been able to advance economically almost in ratio to the extent to which she has abandoned communism. If this hypothesis is true we had better start getting that information out to the peoples of the rest of the world who might otherwise be tempted to become a part of the Russian empire thinking that they were becoming part of a Communist system that had worked so well.

I have a further hypothesis that the extent to which the United States has not been going ahead is the extent to which she has been going away from the private enterprise system and adopting certain of the ineffectual programs of state socialism, or communism, if you please.

The reader will note the reference in the first paragraph of Professor McLane's article as follows:

Soviet Russia's alleged educational accomplishments (alleged, incidentally, much more noisily here than in the Soviet Union where the entire educational edifice has been undergoing an agonizing reappraisal).

At another point in the RECORD I am inserting the remarks I made last year before the subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee considering Federal scholarship programs.

Professor McLane's article follows:

PASTERNAK AND THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY

(By Charles B. McLane, 1941, professor of Russian civilization at Dartmouth, joined the faculty in 1957, was cultural attaché with the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, 1950-52, and formerly taught at Swarthmore College)

The Pasternak affair has been on many minds in recent months and will not soon be forgotten. I think the episode met a need in the United States. It came at a time when for more than a year the news out of Russia had been too good for our peace of mind—sputniks, alleged educational accomplishments (alleged, incidentally, much more noisily here than in the Soviet Union where the entire educational edifice has been undergoing an agonizing reappraisal), and, as usual, continued success relative to ours in diplomatic gambits. It was therefore comforting to have world opinion reminded—we, of course, knew it all along—that persecution of non-conformity is a more enduring characteristic of the Soviet system than a show of free competition in the world of ideas and values.

This sense of relief is natural enough and, all things considered, not a wholly unworthy emotion. But it has made more difficult a dispassionate evaluation of Pasternak's controversial book as a work of art. The fact that few here have heard of Boris Pasternak prior to the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* last summer (despite the recognition long since accorded him outside the Soviet Union as one of the foremost Russian poets of this century) is far less disturbing than the general unwillingness, with the book now before us, to judge it except in a purely political context.

A colleague whose perception in literary matters I generally respect recently expressed the view that it was not really necessary to trouble with *Zhivago*, was it? In a season so crowded with other talent—like "that other Russian," as he called him, Loieita's Nabokov—there was hardly place for a Russian martyr whose notoriety sprang from the proffer, and his rejection, of a Nobel Prize.

The difficulty Americans have with Pasternak, even when they try, is one of access—access to his rich but immensely involved language. It is generally recognized that the present American edition of *Zhivago* is an inadequate translation, but it is also true that no translation of Pasternak can be entirely adequate. For he is a poet, and a particularly difficult poet, despite the fact that he has described *Zhivago*, whimsically, as a "novel in prose." Small wonder, then, that many honest citizens who have read the American *Zhivago* conscientiously have been puzzled by the acclaim it has received. So far as the Nobel Prize is concerned, they have murmured "Politics!" (murmured so as not to be mistaken for Soviet pundits who of course are saying the same thing). Others, searching further for the greatness, have attempted to locate it in Pasternak's continuation of the tradition of "War and Peace" a vast Russian panorama, in the old manner, against a background of war and social upheaval. But Pasternak is only incidentally concerned with these matters. So little is he preoccupied with the Revolution, for instance, that the reader with even modest knowledge of chronology is hard put to say at what juncture in history this or that episode in his narrative occurs.

Not revolution, but the impact of revolution on man, and more particularly the capturing of the transformations which arise from this impact in a prose that has few peers in the Russian language—this is Pasternak's business. To Soviet bureaucrats the infuriating thing about Pasternak, in *Zhivago* as in all his work, must be not that he is hostile to the Revolution—this they could deal with—but that in a deeper sense he ignores it. This in Russia is unpardonable.

It must be obvious then that a proper review of *Zhivago* is a very exacting and scientific exercise, far beyond the scope of these brief observations and beyond the capacities of the present writer, a political scientist. To qualify, one should be versed in symbolism, in Joyce and Proust (despite the fact that Pasternak has evidently turned to Proust only in recent months), and in the entire evolution of modern formalism. *Zhivago* is a book in this tradition. To seek mere entertainment in it, larded perhaps with a vaguely social message, is to miss the whole point of Pasternak's effort.

No writer, not even Pasternak, can be judged wholly outside his times and his community. It is currently fashionable, of course, to picture Pasternak as an indomitable David living in splendid aloofness and disdaining modern Soviet Goliaths such as Surfkov (head of the writers' union) and Semichastny (a particularly arid persecutor from the Komsomol). He is imagined as the rare flower that blooms from a barren land. Moreover, Soviet propaganda itself inadvertently supports this thesis by insisting so stridently that Pasternak was never and is not now a member of the integrated Soviet community. But Pasternak himself speaks otherwise. In declining, under pressure, the Swedish prize, he gave as his reason the opprobrium attached to this honor "in the society to which I belong." This was understood abroad to have been a gesture, necessary as a minimum stratagem for survival, but meaningless. Since, however, Pasternak is a man not easily cowed and not one to resort lightly to stratagems, it is worth re-examining his claim. Is he part of the Soviet community? More particularly, has his greatness in any sense been nurtured by this community to which he claims to belong?

In certain specific respects Pasternak unquestionably is—or was until very recently—a member in passable standing of the Soviet literary community. For instance, his home in the dacha-village of Peredelkino, a refuge and resort for established Soviet writers, testifies to this. His income was assured

through translations of Shakespeare and Georgian verse. Much of his own poetry has circulated in manuscript for years and evidently has not been without influence on younger writers (though admittedly, the influence is not yet apparent). He has not been without companionship. Even his silence has been tolerated. All this suggests that Pasternak has been less in a state of absolute isolation than is sometimes fondly imagined.

Yet, when all is said and done, the question of his being truly a part of Russian society today remains unanswerable so long as he stands thus sharply opposed to its official spokesmen. One thing only is certain: he belongs to no other community. Some day, under happier circumstances, "Doctor Zhivago" will be read in Russia—where, of course, it has not yet appeared. As Edmund Wilson predicted in *The New Yorker* of November 15, in one of the finest reviews of the book yet to appear, the children of Pasternak's present persecutors will speak of Larisa, *Zhivago* and Antipov as naturally as their parents now speak of Tatiana, Onegin and Lensky, or of Natasha, Pierre and Bolkonsky.

Fair Campaign Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of American political campaigns is the frequent use of smear techniques on the part of campaigners or their supporters. Vigorous political debate and honest public criticism are essential ingredients in a healthy political process, but slander, character assassination, and distortion have no place in a democracy.

In an effort to curb some of the shabby campaign practices that have been displayed in recent campaigns, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee was formed under the leadership of a number of concerned citizens of both political parties. Mr. Charles P. Taft and founding member and present chairman of the committee reviews some of the committee's observations to date in an article which appeared in the October 12, 1958, *New York Times* magazine which I include at this point:

CAMPAIGN TO STOP THE CAMPAIGN SMEAR

(By Charles P. Taft)

Webster defines the word "smear" thus: "To besmirch, sully, defame; specifically to vilify by applying a debasing epithet (smear word) or by secretly and maliciously spreading gross charges or imputations." Meade Alcorn, Republican National Chairman, has his own political test for defining smear, which he says has kept him out of trouble: "Is it true? And is it relevant?"

The problem of what constitutes a political smear is one that arises almost every week during national political campaigns. In 1951 the problem was etched on the public mind by the Senate Subcommittee on Elections, exploring the excesses of the Butler-Tydings campaign of 1950 in Maryland. This led to the formation, in the fall of 1954, of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The citizens who organized the group were outstanding men and women of

both major parties, increasingly concerned over the substitution of accusation and vilification for fact and argument by candidates. The committee set out to induce all candidates for Congress and State governorships to sign—and thus to pledge publicly to observe—a code of fair campaign practices based on the proposals of the 1951 Senate Elections Subcommittee. Among the practices the signers agreed to shun were:

Personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaigns, libel, slander and scurrilous attacks on a candidate or his personal or family life.

Use of campaign material which misrepresents, distorts or otherwise falsifies facts, and malicious or unfounded accusations aiming to create or exploit doubts without justification as to a candidate's loyalty.

Appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

The final plank in the code committed candidates who signed it immediately and publicly to repudiate support based on such tactics.

Many candidates in 1954 signed. But not all observed the code, as political observers with any memory can vouch. Yet it represented a start in a direction that members of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee felt was not only essential but considerably overdue. The committee met in 1956, and found compliance with the code by candidates substantially above the 1954 level. Paul Butler and Leonard Hall, Democratic and Republican national chairmen, respectively, in 1956, appeared publicly in Washington to sign the code. And last month Butler and Meade Alcorn, Hall's successor, likewise signed and publicly endorsed the code that, if followed, could change the nature of much of the political campaigning that has characterized our land of the free—and the free swinging.

Why all this concern over campaign techniques? Is not electioneering in the rough-and-tumble style of the frontier an indelible part of the American tradition? After all, have not American election campaigns down through history been pretty raw?

They certainly have. No American statesman now safely ensconced—indeed, revered—in the history books has been proof against calumny on the hustings. George Washington was verbally scarred in the infant days of the Nation. Jefferson was called "worse than a traitor." In the Jackson period, handbills called Old Hickory a murderer and graphically presented the theme with woodcuts of 13 coffins. Lincoln was described as "that obscene ape from Illinois." The legitimacy of Cleveland's child was the subject of jape in the streets. Theodore Roosevelt was described—among the more charitable epithets—as "that damned cowboy." And the maledictions pronounced upon Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt are still within the memory of many adults.

If in earlier days it was commonplace for a candidate to traduce his opponent in a libelous fashion, why the concern today?

For one thing, the wrenching change in communication has altered the freedom that at one time surrounded a politician seeking votes in a small and isolated community. What once could be said free of the risk of offending a voter 50 miles away cannot be uttered now without being offered, via the press associations and television, to the whole Nation. A candidate for national office, seeking to stir voters in one of New York City's 22 congressional districts, can, if his oration is fiery enough, turn voters in California for—or more likely against—his whole party.

Another factor is the increasing self-consciousness of ethnic and religious minority groups in the United States. Negroes, Jews, Italians, Irish, Germans, Poles, and Mexicans have become numerous enough in some areas to wield significant—indeed, decisive—political power within their communities.

Occasionally they have voted as blocs, and sometimes still do. In the political world,

when blocs develop, they are courted for their bloc vote. And when a bloc is large enough so its vote may elect or defeat, it not only is courted as a bloc but in some quarters is feared. Even the small extremist groups may be something to be feared, especially when they are represented by fanatical and able hate merchants.

Where do we stand today in our efforts to bring about observance of a fair campaign code? Most campaigns for major office are less offensive than the classic examples of high, wide, and anything-but-handsome electioneering in the old days. But the exceptions, while arithmetically modest, are glaring and dangerous in the light of today's communication system.

In 1950, the Nation was shocked by the Maryland senatorial campaign already referred to, in which a composograph merged one picture of former Senator Tydings with quite another picture of Communist leader Earl Browder. The end result, a seemingly candid photo showing the conservative southern Democrat in intimate conversation with the onetime Communist chief, carried much weight with Maryland voters.

In 1952 and 1953, a rash of fast and loose accusations of softness or lack of due diligence toward communism, playing on the national temper of the time, helped divert public attention from records and issues. It was the excesses of this period that stimulated the establishment of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

During the 1956 campaign our committee received few complaints of violation of the code, and political observers felt there was less vituperation than in recent years. But before we could congratulate ourselves we began to hear rumors from here and there that one or another candidate had been the victim of a Machiavellian smear effort.

Disturbed, we launched in 1957 what now will be a biennial, off-year, State-by-State study of the actual use of smear. To our surprise and pleasure we received the instant and enthusiastic cooperation of nearly two-thirds of the 96 State chairmen of both parties.

What we found last year did not square at all with the initial report about the ethical level of the 1956 campaign. In 26 States one or both parties claimed one or more of their candidates had been smeared. Effects varied widely. Smear elected some candidates whom it was intended to help, but in some cases it backfired and defeated some candidates it aimed to elect.

In one case, a senatorial candidate had his putative Washington romantic life explored in the style of a sensational magazine. In another, a candidate who, a generation earlier, had been indicted for embezzlement and subsequently cleared when the culprit confessed, was assailed with photo reproductions of the clipping announcing his indictment, with, naturally, no mention of his exoneration. In an Eastern State a teetotaler was described as a drunk, and in the Midwest a moderate drinker was described as a prohibitionist plotting secretly to dry up his State's resort areas.

Although the Communist issue was on the wane as an automatic vote getter, a Senate candidate was, for the third time, the target of a brochure printed on pink paper, citing parts of his voting record out of context to make him look like a slave to the Communist Party line. The gambit, which had twice kept him from the Senate, this time failed and he won election.

The anti-labor issue was raised with increasing frequency and stridency in 1956. One candidate was described as the beneficiary of vast labor contributions and the recipient of detailed labor instructions. He was depicted in a prominent newspaper side by side with his State's then CIO chief, ostensibly taking orders. Investigation revealed that the photograph had been cropped to eliminate a third man—the head of a

manufacturers' association. The man in the middle, the candidate, had been mediating a labor dispute.

In the same State this year, a member of the opposite party running for the same post received a telegram from a labor leader demanding that he repudiate a statement contemptuous of labor that had been attributed to him. The candidate, instead of answering by wire or mail, went personally to confront his accuser. He asked what could have prompted such a charge from a labor leader he long had counted as a friend. "I know it's a lie, you know it's a lie, and I know you know it's a lie," he said.

Nothing came of the episode for several weeks. Then, virtually on election eve, anonymously distributed handbills quote the telegram, and added the utterly false statement that the candidate had not even answered the accusation.

The Negro issue began to come to the fore in 1956. In one Midwest State a letter ostensibly on the letterhead of a southern white citizen's council (which eventually proved to be nonexistent) suggested that a vote for the Democrats would keep Southern Democrats in control of Congress, and that these men could be relied on to keep the colored in their place. The catch was that, seemingly inadvertently, the letter went to Negro voters in a heavily Democratic district.

Last year, in a special election for Congress in an eastern district, the Negro issue figured in anonymously distributed literature. Negroes were touted off the Democratic candidate with inflammatory photo reproductions of Negroes being clubbed by white men. The conditions leading to such maltreatment were ascribed to Democrats in Congress.

Already this fall, somewhat in advance of the last-minute period so commonly associated with scurrilous campaign literature, a Republican candidate for State office in a rural southern district is a target of hate literature which depicts—in this heavily pro-segregation district—a Negro man and a white woman on a bed. Fully clothed, but on a bed nonetheless. This, the leaflet suggests, is to become commonplace if the candidate, a known integrationist, is elected.

Integration is not the only inflammatory 1958 issue that lends itself to such tactics. Labor always produces a hot argument, and promises to do so more and more, with a good many right-to-work proposals on the State ballots.

The Knowland-Brown-Joe Kamp affair in California has lately been in the headlines. Kamp, a notorious pamphleteer, had written a lengthy screed against Walter Reuther which seemed apt to some of the supporters of Senator Knowland, Republican candidate for Governor. Mrs. Knowland, who did not recognize Kamp's name and reputation, initially authorized some distribution of the pamphlets among proponents of the right-to-work plank of Knowland's platform in California.

Paul Butler, as Democratic National Chairman, objected in accents of righteous indignation, tempered probably only by partisan glee at being handed so eminently exploitable an issue. He demanded that Meade Alcorn repudiate the pamphlet, which Alcorn immediately did.

From this point supporters of Edmund (Pat) Brown, Knowland's Democratic opponent, took up the cry in California, bending every effort to make the Knowland team look not only like "right to work" advocates but the willing beneficiaries of neo-Fascists as well.

Where does righteous attack on a smear leave off and smearing-by-crying-smear begin? The line is difficult to draw. And in the California case it is complicated by the fact that the principals of the piece are not candidates.

Kamp's pamphlet was directed at Reuther. In much of it Reuther was described in terms for the most part quite acceptable to many conservative Republicans, and, indeed, acceptable to many Democrats fearful of increasing labor dominance of politics. But this was not enough for the pamphleteer. In addition to denouncing the labor leader in terms acceptable—or at least tolerable—in polite society, Kamp also characterized Reuther in some dreadfully intemperate language—"foul-mouthed agitator * * * vile perveyor [sic] of vicious slander * * * ruthless, reckless, lawless labor goon * * * persistent prevaricator * * * double-talking, rabble-rousing opportunist who glibly repeats the fallacious fulminations of his Red-tinged ghostwriters * * * an evil genius."

At all events, Alcorn repudiated Kamp, and Knowland stopped distribution of the pamphlet as soon as he learned of it, on the stated ground that it carried no printing trade union label. Joe Kamp could hardly get one. But this did not deter some of the Brown forces from identifying the Knowland people with every Kamp association that could be disinterred, including a jail sentence for contempt of Congress. Guilt by association has not often been a Democratic argument.

Even with the change in the national temper that has obtained on the Communist issue since the demise of Senator McCarthy, the issue is not dead in 1958. It has been raised in the campaign of a Western Congressman whose name appeared on letterheads of organizations once described by a House Un-American Activities Committee report as subversive. Despite the fact that Un-American Activities Committee members on both sides of the aisle defended the Congressman against any implication of knowing participation in pro-Communist ventures, the charge—not made by his opponent, but by an independent newsletter operator in Washington—is doing his campaign considerable harm, it is feared.

The unique thing about this case is that it has cropped up early in the campaign. Traditionally, the time for this sort of attack is the last week before election. The Congressman in this instance has already had time enough to file a libel suit, and conceivably could have it tried before election day. This might suggest that the smear artists are losing their sense of timing. If so, we can all rejoice. But if not, as is more likely to be the case, what needs to be done about the problem? Indeed, what can be done?

In my estimation, public education at every level is the only ultimate answer. The Fair Campaign Practices Committee has initiated five steps that I believe are making slow but real headway.

First, and longest range, is education in the schools. Two years ago, none of the major high school texts in American Government or the like dealt directly with smear tactics in an election campaign. This gap is being filled. We have developed a teaching-aids program which integrates material covering this subject with existing texts. Authors and publishers of textbooks have begun to use it in new books and revisions of present ones.

College political science texts, since our committee began agitating on the subject a few years ago, are beginning to deal with it at new and greater length. Our young citizens will emerge from school with a more realistic idea of the distinctions they must be prepared to make as mature and voting citizens.

Second, our State-by-State smear study enables us to keep abreast of what actually is being done, by whom, against whom and where, and to make it known in an off-year when the vision of the people is less campaign inflamed.

Third, we are working with civic and church organizations, which enjoy a unique capacity to translate latent concern among the citizens into active political and social terms. As more and more voters become more sophisticated about dirty campaigning better able to spot a smear or a whispering campaign or to suspect a rumor or half-truth or cropped photo—the profit in these tactics, which always is in proportion to the difficulty of detecting them, will dwindle. Then, more and more smears will boomerang. When this happens, obviously, they will stop—we hope. (Already we have found that one of three smears backfires.)

Fourth, in a series of public conferences undertaken this year we have found intense interest, not only among civic leaders but also among individual citizens concerned with political morality, in what steps can be taken to mitigate the evil of scurrilous electioneering. We will continue and extend such meetings.

Finally, the usefulness of working with politicians themselves must not be underestimated. Though never really true, it is no longer quite so fashionable as it once was to count all politics as a dirty business, beneath the participation of decent men and women. I have grown up among politics and politicians, from the presidential to the city council level. I know that politicians are decent and responsible citizens, with only a few exceptions—certainly no more proportionately than there are in business.

Our program is working to destroy the lethargy that leaves political control in the hands of a few and deprives the many, by default, of a voice in choosing party leaders and party platforms. Responsible political figures at every level are among the most enthusiastic supporters of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. We intend to continue to court their support.

I might say in conclusion that the current "Don't Pass the Buck" drive is working in its own way to improve the level of citizen participation in politics—and thereby the level of politics. Yet, I cannot leave the subject without a plea for the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, which, with a small but influential membership of distinguished citizens and a small and devoted staff is working without regard for a constant and demoralizing financial problem to bring the sold but largely unspoken moral convictions of more Americans to bear more and more directly on politics.

And, after all, the quality of our politics is the way we in America claim to distinguish ourselves from and above the rest of the world today. If you are concerned give—and think, talk, and write about it.

Uniforms for Holders of the Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 121, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of uniforms to persons awarded the Medal of Honor. This is the same bill I introduced in the 85th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of letter which I received from Mr. Miles D.

Kennedy, director of the legislative commission, the American Legion, together with copy of resolution adopted at the 1958 national convention of the American Legion, supporting this measure:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1959.

HON. ELIZABETH KEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KEE: Referring to your bill H.R. 12631 which you introduced on May 22, 1958, relative to furnishing uniforms to holders of the Medal of Honor, I enclose a copy of Resolution 181 adopted at our 1958 national convention supporting your bill.

In view of the enclosed resolution we would be more than pleased to have you reintroduce your bill during the early days of the 86th Congress.

Thanking you for your courtesy and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

RESOLUTION 181 (WEST VIRGINIA)

Committee: Military affairs.

Subject: Men receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor be furnished uniforms be consolidated with Resolution 181 and adopted.

Whereas there are approximately 340 men upon whom the Nation's highest military honor was bestowed who are still living; and

Whereas these men are the symbols of the highest traditions of bravery and devotion to the armed services and to our country; and

Whereas these Medal of Honor winners are asked on many occasions to participate in civic and patriotic events every year, such as Armed Services Day, Veterans Day, Medal of Honor conventions, conventions of civic and fraternal organizations, dedications and other memorable affairs; and

Whereas most of these men have been out of military service for many years and do not have uniforms suitable for these occasions; and

Whereas it is appropriate that these men of valor, who have earned the highest recognition within the gift of a grateful nation, be outfitted with the necessary and appropriate uniforms to wear at the many public functions they are expected to attend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That The American Legion in national convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., September 1-4, 1958, support in every appropriate manner a similar bill to H.R. 12631 in the House of Representatives introduced by Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of the 5th Congressional District of the State of West Virginia in the 85th Congress which provides that, "At the request of any such person who was awarded a Medal of Honor in the name of Congress, the Secretary concerned shall, not more than once each 3 years and under such regulations as he may prescribe, furnish such a person an appropriate class a summer and winter uniform (including insignia) without charge."

Approved.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Jim Wright's Christmas Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the 12th District of Texas, Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., has the reputation of speaking from the heart as well as from the head. This amazing and energetic young man grew up in a small town, subsequently becoming mayor of it, and still later serving as member of the Texas Legislature. He is now a Representative in the Congress from the fourth largest city in Texas.

JIM WRIGHT has a way of speaking his mind that is both refreshing and compelling, and he is a writer, moreover, of considerable power and warmth. In his newsletter for Christmas week, JIM WRIGHT sent out a rather remarkable document that is a lesson, I think, for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD JIM WRIGHT's Christmas newsletter, along with an excellent editorial from the Dallas Morning News commenting on Congressman WRIGHT's proposals.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 25, 1958]

IT'S A STRANGE CHRISTMAS

It is a strange Christmas in a strange world. We send four tons of potential destruction careening around the globe and install in it a mechanism to proclaim peace on earth and good will toward men everywhere. The strange part about it is that we really mean the destruction—and we really mean the benediction.

If Ivanovich and John Doe could only sit down together, as Representative JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, suggests, they would have no trouble at all finding that they could understand each other and get along with each other. But the people at the summit stand in the way. That is why all our summit conferences fail.

Speaking for John Doe, JIM WRIGHT suggests that Russia and the United States forget a part of their program for destroying each other and invest the savings in health. Health isn't dangerous. It isn't subversive. Nobody wants to shoot health or exile it to Siberia. Everybody can use health.

Well, then, says John Doe, per JIM WRIGHT, speaking to Ivan Ivanovich, why not have a new 5-year plan for Russia and for the United States, too? In 5 years Russia will spend, under this plan, the one-half amount of rubles Russia now spends each year in getting ready to wipe out the United States. And in that 5 years, the United States spends one-half the amount of dollars that it spends getting ready to wipe out Russia.

At the end of the 5 years, every town of 10,000 population in the whole world would have a hospital. There would be money left over for schools and colleges. And typhoid, smallpox, malaria, leprosy, and yellow fever would be disappearing from the earth.

And somewhere, maybe, in all this, the world would learn the lessons of peace and brotherly love and of the divine providence which sent the Christ Child to us almost 2,000 years ago.

THE WRIGHT SLANT ON WASHINGTON

"There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."

As I look through the window today upon Washington—like Rome, a city from which decrees go out—I can see the severely beautiful Washington Monument. In the eye of imagination it looks like the finger of a wise man pointing to a new star in the heavens. On the Ellipse behind the White House towers the national Christmas tree, tall as a six-story building.

Aside from such landmarks, Washington is just about like any other big city at Christmastime; neither better nor worse. There is the same commercialism, the same emphasis on material things, the same congested traffic and frantic haste. And, as in every other city, the only time you can really see the light that shone over the shepherds on their hilltop in Judea is when you look closely into the eyes of a little child.

"And she brought forth her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling clothes and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn."

Just as it was in Bethlehem, so it is in Washington in 1958. No room under the tree for another present. No room in the post office for another package. No room on our engagement pads for an additional plan. No room in the department store aisles for another shopper. And in too many hearts—no room for Him and His message of a better way.

At the conference tables in Geneva and elsewhere men discuss more and more and settle less and less because there is no room in their minds for a new idea of peace on earth—still new and still largely untried after 2,000 years. Our thoughts are on guided missiles with nuclear warheads, and not on the star.

"And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shown round about them: and they were sore afraid."

Afraid? Well, yes, the average person in today's world is afraid. And maybe that's one reason we stay so busy, so we won't have time to think about it.

"And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

To all people? Even to those we don't like and don't trust? Even to those who plot and plan against us? Good tidings to Democrats and Republicans alike? To the rude motorist who squeezed you out of your lane in the Christmas traffic today? Good tidings of great joy—even to the Russians? Well, that's what the angel said.

"And on earth, peace, good will toward men."

"Peace," the word the angels sang, must have seemed as impossible a dream in those days as it does now. There was then, as now, the temporary absence of major armed conflict, the uneasy, and repressed order of a

Pax Romana. But real peace must be something more than just a nervous stalemate enforced by fear. It has something to do with good will.

Is there any real basis for good will? Did the angels speak the truth? Did he who lay in the sweet straw of the manger amid the barnyard noises bring into the world a flowering promise that lives and grows in the hearts of men amid even the bitter passions of this hour?

We say he did. We who celebrate his birth state that he did. And how strongly do we feel it?

Suppose that each of us could write a sincere and searching letter to someone—average as ourselves—in Russia, a letter to those who are the victims of a cruel history and an ugly system which has turned out the lights of Christmas. Who knows what good we might accomplish could we but establish intimate communications with these people? I'd like to write such a Christmas letter to all the plain, afraid, average men who live in Russia. And here is what I'd say:

"DEAR IVAN: I've been thinking about you. I've been wondering how you were. Guess it must be mighty cold over there. It's been downright chilly here, in fact. Hope you've got a nice, warm place for the wife and kids."

"We're feeling pretty warm inside right now. It's Christmastime. You see, Ivan, a lot of us have the belief that God himself came to earth in the person of a man and taught that all of us should love each other. That may sound a little silly to you, maybe a bit overly sentimental. Anyway, that's what we celebrate at Christmas."

"Let me be painfully frank about this thing, Ivan, and admit that I haven't been feeling very kindly toward you lately. Guess you haven't felt exactly good about me, either. Truthfully, I suppose we've both been a little bit afraid. For one thing, we believe in entirely different economic systems. Now, I'm convinced that our system of capitalism or free enterprise is the best. But if you don't like it, Ivan, I certainly don't want to force it on you. That comes under the heading of your own business."

"Why can't we just look at this thing straight and agree that we have a healthy competition going on between us to prove which system can do a better job for its people—and that neither one of us is going to change just to suit the other?"

"If we could agree on that, then maybe we could agree to a moratorium on trying to force the rest of the world to copy either one of us. Oh, I don't mean we wouldn't keep on telling people how great we think our system is, nor expect you to stop saying how well you like yours if you really do. But there just isn't any sense in trying to cram it down their throats. With armies, I mean. Starting wars and getting a lot of people killed. Why can't we just let them look at both of us, and listen to both of us, and then make up their own minds?"

"You know, this military business can get out of hand. That's why we're both a little nervous, isn't it? And here's the reason, the big thing we have in common—I've got kids, Ivan. And so have you. My kids mean more to me than anything else in all the world. Surely you feel the same way about yours. Now there just isn't an ounce of sense in our horsing around and acting like plain fools and arranging things so that our kids will have to be killing each other some-

day. My kids are thinking about Christmas, Ivan. Little starry-eyed things, they're not mad at you or at anybody.

"You know what, Ivan? We folks over here are spending right at \$45 billion this year on armaments. That's because we're scared of what you'd do if we didn't. I don't know quite what your folks are spending on this sort of thing, and I don't expect you do, either, but I figure it's just about the same as we're spending.

"Tell you what I'd do, Ivan. I'd make a binding contract with you. We'll cut down ours if you'll cut down yours. Now, of course, it would all have to be open and aboveboard, right on the top of the table, or no go. But I'm willing, if you are. We could start out easy.

"Let's do it this way. We'll cut 10 percent from our military expenditures this year if you'll do the same thing. Right out on the top of the table, now. We'll take \$4½ billion out of our military spending this year if you'll do the same thing, match it dollar for dollar. We'll both put our money into the same fund. That'll make \$9 billion for the first year.

"If the deal holds, we'll double it next year. We'll both cut our current military budget by another 10 percent, and each of us will put up \$9 billion next year. That'll make a total of \$27 billion in the fund.

"Want to help mankind, Ivan? Well, here's your chance. Here's your chance to help mankind and get rid of your fears at the same time. You like 5-year plans, so I'll make you a 5-year plan. Let's keep this up at the second year's rate for 3 additional years, and we'll have put a total of \$81 billion into this fund between us at the end of 5 years. Neither one of us will have missed it, because it will have come out of what we'd otherwise have been putting into weapons which would just have made both of us more nervous.

"We could make an \$81 billion gift to humanity, Ivan.

"Do you know how much \$81 billion is? Well, it would build and equip a brandnew \$2 million hospital for every city of 10,000 or more in the world. Our medical experts say that with \$4½ billion they could absolutely eradicate malaria, typhoid, smallpox, yellow fever, and leprosy from the face of the earth. It would build 120,000 high schools or 250,000 elementary schools. It would build and stock 250,000 first-class libraries and it would provide 20 million 4-year college scholarships. It would build 20 million modern homes to replace the world's infested slums. It would build almost a million miles of modern roads—enough to circle the earth several times. Take any combination of these benefits you like—it still adds up to a whole lot more sense than spending this money on the implements that kill and destroy rather than those that build and ennoble and improve.

"Then, after 5 years we could slack off. We could reduce our contributions to the Christmas fund and give some tax relief to the folks who have been carrying the burden for so many years—yours as well as ours. Think of it, Ivan. Imagine what the effect would be in Russia if just 20 percent of all the money now being spent on military hardware were being plowed back into the economy and spent on the merchandise of peace. Think what it would mean in terms of automobiles and homes and household appliances.

"It's a wonderful dream, isn't it, Ivan? It could be a reality if we would only play fair and square with each other and do away with needless secrecy. Of course, you'd have to know that we weren't cheating. You'd be entitled to know it, just as we'd be entitled to proof of your compliance. We could use the United Nations organization to inspect and police our operation to insure good faith on both our parts. We'd

have to open up our borders and let one another come and look—but what would there be to fear if we both were playing straight?

"You know, Ivan, we could give the world the greatest Christmas present since the first Christmas, 1,959 years ago. We could really bring tidings of great joy and, for the first time in two millenniums the greatly troubled people of this old world of ours could obey the angels' injunction: 'Fear not.'

"That would be the best part, that everybody could gradually stop being afraid. If we ever got together on this we could make all the old hatreds and fears and misgivings vanish like hot breath on a looking glass.

"Think it over, Ivan. We've both been trying the other way long enough. Think it over carefully. And, meanwhile, have yourself a merry Christmas.

"Sincerely,

"JIM."

Whimsy? Perhaps. Perhaps there is no way effectively to get such a message through to Ivan, insulated as he is by curtains of iron. Maybe such a plan, offered by our President, could form the basis for a major breakthrough in the diplomatic stalemate. If such a sincere and honest message could be broadcast to Ivan through the Voice of America, it might do some good. At worst, it could certainly do no harm.

Citizenship Role in American Political Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] at a dinner meeting of the National Conference on Legislative Education, held in Schenley Hall of the University of Pittsburgh on November 14, 1958, on the subject "Citizenship Role in American Political Life."

Senator RANDOLPH's remarks on this challenging topic were both thought-provoking and profound, and I know that his many friends who missed the opportunity to hear him speak at the University of Pittsburgh will welcome the opportunity to read the speech which he delivered there in November.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP ROLE IN AMERICAN POLITICAL LIFE

(Address by JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator, West Virginia, at dinner meeting of the National Conference on Legislative Education, Schenley Hall, the University of Pittsburgh, Nov. 14, 1958)

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to participate in this conference and to be a party to the development of what may well become a fresh and significant contribution to the political process.

It is particularly appropriate that this exercise in political groundbreaking, so to speak, is being initiated by the United Steelworkers, whose tradition for responsible unionism was so significantly expressed in the

life and work of the late Phillip Murray. And if these sessions are successful in bringing forth a marriage between the academic and scholarly discipline of political theory and the practices of political action in organized labor, then it will have moved further toward the goals that Mr. Murray envisioned.

You have asked me to discuss tonight the question of the "Citizenship Role in American Political Life." This is a topic that one must face with some awe and humility—especially when addressing such a distinguished body of practitioners and students of the art of politics. But this is a topic on which I have had some occasion to reflect—particularly during the past few months when I have been meeting the citizens of my own State at a somewhat accelerated pace. I shall later bring to bear some of the experiences of these past few months on the questions that will arise in the examination of our problem.

But first, the problem must be defined. And since the role of the citizen in a dynamic society must change with the altering structure of society, we might best take a brief historical glance at certain of the assumptions that underlie our view of the matter. I propose to offer nothing new on the subject, but merely to establish a context within which to approach the problem.

For this purpose I believe we can agree that the role of the American citizen was first most clearly expressed in the writings of Thomas Jefferson. Here was developed the view of the American citizen as the independent freeholder, jealous of his own integrity and independence, informed on matters of public concern, and capable of exercising reasoned judgment in the light of this information. The underlying assumption of this view was that man acts of his own free will, guided by the light of innate reason, and that all men are potentially capable of exercising reason.

During the 18th century and for the first half of the 19th century, this typical American citizen found himself in a society which was predominantly rural and agrarian. And with the continual advancement of the frontier there existed in general a harmony between the public interest and the interests of the individual citizen. We need not cavil at the truth of this picture in every instance. This, I believe, is in general a fair sketch of the surrounding conditions and the basic assumptions of the historic image of the American citizen. This is still the image that governs much of the political thought and rhetoric of today. But what of the change from the conditions that gave birth to this image?

Beginning with the great immigration waves of the 1840's and continuing with the industrialization of the North after the Civil War, American civilization underwent a major reconstruction. The conditions of life changed from the rural and agrarian society to an increasingly urban and industrial one. I suggest that we have not yet accommodated ourselves to this change. We have not yet fashioned the new symbols and techniques with which to organize political life; we have not yet clarified the assumptions on which must be based the new citizenship role called for by this change.

Much of the confusion in political thinking today, even perhaps much of the so-called apathy of the voter, stems from this failure—from the failure to establish symbols and attitudes relevant to contemporary circumstances.

Let me illustrate with reference to my recent campaign experiences in West Virginia: after speaking to literally hundreds of audiences, the one characteristic that most impressed, and I might say, most troubled me as well, was the almost complete lack of people under 30. Wherever I went—whether in mining areas, in the farming areas, or in the industrial areas—I experi-

enced the same situation—audiences composed largely of the middle aged and elderly. In part, of course, this was due to the fact that the predominant campaign issues in West Virginia were economic ones—unemployment, recession, and inflation. And these are, of course, felt more keenly by older people and those with families.

But I believe there is another and perhaps deeper reason. During the primary campaign I met an alert and lively gentleman by the name of Charles L. Watkins, in Shinnston, W. Va. Mr. Watkins, a semi-invalid, who is more than 97 years young, informed me that in 76 years he had never missed voting in an election, and that he would make this one as well even if he had to take an ambulance to the polling place. Mr. Watkins is only the most dramatic example I encountered—but there were others as well.

What I am suggesting is that these citizens formed their commitments to political participation at a time when the political process was meaningful to them. They have since maintained the habit and the identification.

Somehow we have failed with our young people. We have failed to communicate to them the significance of the vote—the meaning of the franchise of freedom. Now, I am not afraid of the misuse of the ballot; a poor or unwise vote can be corrected the next time at the polls. But I do fear the nonuse of the ballot—the increasing withdrawal and isolation of the individual from the political processes, and especially as it is exhibited among our younger folks.

The failure to which I refer is a failure for which many of us bear a measure of responsibility—the politicians and public officials who too often avoid the direct issue rather than address the challenging problems that confront us, the segment of the press and communications industry which often emphasizes the sensationalism of charges and countercharges rather than the meaningful interpretation of events, and the many teachers and intellectuals who hold to the notion that politics should be shunned.

All of these have been instruments in our default—the default to communicate to the individual citizen the drama of the most important political experiment in history and his role in it.

This failure is characteristically dealt with in terms of the lack of interest of the voter. And we all recall, I am sure, the closing days of the recent campaign, when the leaders of one of the parties took themselves out to bestir the people. The resulting rhetoric, I believe, generated considerably more heat than light and apparently had small effect on the turn of events.

I would suggest, therefore, that the problem is not primarily one of apathy, but of confusion. And to define the problem as one of confusion rather than apathy is to prescribe a radically different cure. On the one hand, we attempt to launch a crusade to the roll of drums and the blare of trumpets; on the other hand we attempt to dispell the confusion in the mind of the individual and thereby enable him to identify his own interests with the policies and principles set forth by the respective parties and candidates.

It is, therefore, essentially a problem in communication. I have indicated what is considered to be one of the chief sources of this problem—that we are continuing to try to communicate in terms of a world that no longer exists and on assumptions about human behavior that we know are no longer valid. The Saturday Evening Post cover picture is no longer an accurate portrayal of the conditions of American life—nor is the notion that the individual is necessarily guided by the light of innate reason.

I would go further and submit the opinion that another, though related, source of this confusion emerges from the increasing

mechanization and specialization of modern life. Although the individual citizen today is caught up in a vast web of associations—legal, commercial, social and personal—he finds no general community of values which he can share. He finds no consensus with which he can achieve harmony and direction and purpose in his contact with public affairs.

Participation in political life first requires this identification with and sharing of some community of values. But it is this very relationship which is being eroded and chipped away by the growing complexity and specialization of modern life.

The once relatively simple functions of government to which the individual could easily relate have necessarily grown and expanded into a bewildering and complex variety of activities. In the process the individual, whose own integrity as a person is under constant assault, becomes increasingly detached and isolated from the political forces that govern his own affairs.

It would seem, therefore, that we must develop mediating institutions that can bridge the gap—restoring both a sense of wholeness to the individual and a means of enabling him once again to participate in political affairs. Such institutions must, however, embrace a certain consensus of values.

We have such organizations in embryonic form if we wish to consider the voluntary associations that devote themselves to promoting such worth aims as forestry, conservation and preservation of natural resources. These, as well as the more specifically political action groups, throughout the range of the political spectrum, all function in some measure to fill the vacuum between the citizen and the formal political structure.

However, in a larger way, the labor unions can become such mediating institutions. With the growing concern for union welfare, recreation and educational programs, unions can become increasingly the kind of institutions which will enlist the individual's loyalties over a wide range of values. They can thus assume even more fully their legitimate function of promoting the valid interests of their members.

Let me remark, in passing, that I am not one to whom the term "special interests" necessarily has evil connotations. The American Federal system is based upon the constant reconciliation of conflicting interest groups. As Arthur Fisher Bentley pointed out 50 years ago in his "The Process of Government,"

"Logrolling is . . . in fact, the most characteristic legislative process. When one condemns it in principle, it is only by contrasting it with some assumed pure public spirit which is supposed to guide legislators, or which ought to guide them, and which enables them to pass judgment in Jovian calm on that which is best for the whole people. Since there is nothing which is best literally for the whole people, group arrays being what they are, the test is useless, even if one could actually find legislative judgments which are not reducible to interest-group activities. And when we have reduced the legislative process to the play of group interests, then logrolling, or give and take, appears as the very nature of the process. It is compromise, not in the abstract moral form, which philosophers can sagely discuss, but in the practical form with which every legislator who gets results through government is acquainted. It is trading. It is the adjustment of interests."

I suggest that this is at the heart of the American political process, and it is precisely this element of compromise that gives our political institutions their flexibility and durability cast.

Acknowledging, then, that special interest groups are a characteristic and essential part of mediating between the individual and the

formal political structure, liberals as well as others can view favorably the growing concern in business organizations and the chamber of commerce for increased political activity of their members. For the more concrete experience that members of the business community have in practical politics the less likely they are to be critical of those who devote useful careers to the public service.

However, I cannot emphasize too strongly that politically active interest groups—whether labor unions, the chambers of commerce, trade associations, or whatever—do a grave disservice to the democratic process when they engage in wild charges of conspiracy and call for a war of extermination between the two major parties.

We had something of this (if you will pardon me for a slight partisan comment) in the closing days of our campaign in West Virginia, as well, I understand, as in some of the other States. I refer, of course, to the opposition party's innuendo that the Democratic Party has become the captive of Walter Reuther and COPE. In reply to such irresponsible nonsense I stated then and repeat now that I am mindful of the money and the support that we have received from the voluntary contributions of organized labor. And when I say that the philosophy of the Democratic Party reflects Main Street while that of the Republican Party mirrors Wall Street, I do not therein imply that either party is a captive of certain interests.

It is simply that the Republican Party, and its antecedents, the Whig and the Federalist Parties, have customarily identified the chief function of government as the protection of property interests, while the Democratic Party has sought to distribute the fruits of our society to the widest possible number of interest groups—workers, farmers, small businessmen, etc.

In closing, let me summarize by saying that we may as well recognize the fact of bigness in American life—big government, big labor, and big business. But with this, we must find the means and the techniques to prevent the individual man and woman from being lost in the shuffle. I have suggested some tentative lines that we might explore. I am confident that the papers that will follow during the rest of this conference will lay out other fresh and creative avenues. But I believe that all persons professionally concerned with government, whether in public office, in teaching, or in the labor movement, must guard always against the danger of converting the means of government into their own ends; for the only proper end of a democratic form of government is always and ultimately the safeguard and enhancement of the values of the free citizens.

Speech of Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, at Constitution Day Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following Constitution Day speech I made before the Sons of the American Revolution, New Orleans, La., September 17, 1958:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure and privilege to be invited to participate in this Constitution Day ceremony here in the coun-

cil chambers of our city hall. I congratulate all of the wonderful civic, patriotic, and fraternal organizations who have made this occasion possible. I am pleased, if you will pardon a personal reference, to be numbered among the members of quite a few of the sponsoring organizations here today.

I am glad that you are meeting here at the seat of local government. The very essence of our Constitution is in its recognition of the various areas of sovereignty, and the government which is encouraged most under that system is local government because it is closest to the people and thus has a fuller appreciation of their problems, needs and difficulties. We have seen too many efforts made by too many people, especially during the last 50 years to chip away local authority and to move it to the Capitol in Washington.

Some time ago, one of the great American television networks made its facilities available to the blustering present-day leader in the Kremlin, Mr. Khrushchev. Utilizing this opportunity, he had much to say. Among other things, he told the American people that our grandchildren would live in a Socialist society. Socialism to him, of course, meaning Russian communism. He based this prediction on his assertion that this Russian communism represented progress and that our system represented reaction and the lack of progress. This prediction of the loss of liberty for all Americans will not come to pass, unless we forget the lessons of history and unless we fail to understand the overall struggle in which we are now involved.

To say that Mr. Khrushchev's premise is false is, of course to repeat the obvious. In my judgment, there can be no doubt about the fact that the men who drafted our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights were divinely inspired because they concocted a system of government with precise checks and balances; of division of authority between State and Federal sovereignties, and between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branch in the Federal structure which was not only to become the model for all democratic peoples throughout the world, but was also the most revolutionary system of government ever invented.

The Communist system, on the other hand, Mr. Khrushchev's system, is pure reaction. The Russian revolution simply substituted one form of serfdom for another. Some of you, no doubt, have read the book entitled "The New Class," written by Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav Communist who is now in prison. There he points out the rise of a vicious new class system under communism. The American Revolution, on the other hand, actually gave people the opportunity to strive and to work in an atmosphere of maximum security and freedom and without the stultifying impediments of the class-ridden societies of Europe, or the heavy-handed interference of a ruthless central government.

This essential freedom, made possible by the American Revolution and the American Constitution, accounts for the greatness of America. But to fail to recognize the dangers we face would be inviting destruction.

And, frankly, my friends, the thing that worries me about Mr. Khrushchev's challenge is that we, like many people who have preceded us, may be becoming too self-centered, too self-satisfied, too complacent. As wrong as the Communist idea has been, they have nevertheless succeeded in obtaining dedicated people to work for that wrong idea. Believe me, we need more dedicated people.

The idea that nations are permanent, that they cannot be vanquished, is one which has never been proved in history. What happened to Rome and Greece is well recorded in ancient history, and in more recent time, we have seen the end of empires dominated

at one time or another by the Dutch, the Spanish, the British, the French, the Germans, and the Japanese.

As a matter of fact, today as if by some omnipotent magic, the stage of the world has been stripped of all but two titanic actors: the Soviet Union and ourselves. It is against this background that we must ponder the future and take stock of our weaknesses as well as our strength. And, believe me, we do have many weaknesses. Some of them all of us are aware of.

In a sense, I believe that most of us are influenced by what might be called the installment plan mentality. This mentality dictates that you yourself never have to do anything for yourself, provided you make a small downpayment and pay the rest on easy terms, stretching into a vague but always rosy future.

Or, put another way, we are the victims of what is called the easy way. We see this every day all about us. Turn on your television set. Like as not, you will see an ad of a housewife in a kitchen holding a greasy skillet that within a second or two, and without any exertion on her part—merely through the application of some miracle cleaner—the skillet is brand new and shines like the sun. This easy-do-it philosophy is applied to everything.

Other advertisements tell young men and women that they can acquire the equivalent of a college education if they but buy a set of books (on the installment plan) and look at them a few minutes every day; that you really don't have to work hard to get an education.

In other words, there is always some shortcut.

Unfortunately, we have translated this so-called easy way into our national thinking and into our foreign policy. We want an easy Defense Establishment, one that does not require too many dollars, or too many hours of training, or too much research, or too much study and experimentation, or too much time, or too many young men.

We seem also to suffer from an obsession of being in a hurry. In the conduct of foreign policy, we seem to think that we can get each job done like constructing a building and then turn to some other project. The idea of patient, time-consuming negotiations seems to elude us completely. On the other hand, our antagonists unfortunately seem to understand time. To give you but one example:

During the First World War when the Germans had defeated czarist Russia, and Lenin had begun the Russian revolution, the Germans through the Treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk, practically dismembered Russia, so great were their seizures of former Russian, Polish, and Finnish territory. Because of this many Russians wanted to resume war with the Germans. But Lenin forbade it. "Let the Germans have it," he said quietly, "one day we'll get it all back."

If time is of the essence to us, it is not necessarily of the essence to our antagonists. If we like to set target dates and keep them at whatever cost in diplomacy, our antagonists are unconcerned with them. And, I might add, neither is destiny concerned with target dates.

We are in a marathon contest with people to whom the marathon distance is congenial. We must, therefore, learn to contain ourselves lest we become exhausted before the race is half run. We must revise our attitudes toward time. We must think less of target dates and more of the long range goal. We must find ways to be patient. All of this is difficult. But it is not written in the stars that our lives should be easy or that we should always live with our way uncontested by others.

Let's note another of our traits. When we are facing a concrete objective, such as fighting a war, we bring to the struggle

whatever may be necessary for victory. But once the objective is achieved, once the war is over, and other qualities must come into play in order to win and to keep the peace, we falter.

Once the war is over the qualities necessary to winning and keeping the peace are patience, tact, conciliation, compromise, and above everything else—tenacity. Here we fall short. After the First World War these qualities did not assert themselves among us and so there was set in motion the train of events that led to the Second World War.

But scarcely had the guns of the Second World War stopped firing when, despite all our talk about sticking it out, we did not even hastily demobilize. We hysterically disbanded the mightiest fighting force men had ever known. We abandoned or shoved into the sea billions of dollars worth of military equipment. And in doing all this we not only left vacuums that others rushed in to fill, we also presented to the world the disquieting and revealing spectacle of a people who knew how to do a job but did not know how to complete a task.

If these are our attitudes, are they likely to fill others whom we must have as friends and allies, with confidence in our leadership?

The easy way, unfortunately, has even been translated into our educational system. We have found ourselves falling back in training scientists and technicians, engineers and physicists. We realize now that there is no easy way to get these people, that there is no substitute for hard work, hard study, and long hours.

Unfortunately, somehow or other, we have even failed to translate the picture of America to the rest of the world. No nation has ever been more generous and asked for less in return. During this century we have fought two tremendous wars and not only have we not acquired 1 inch of territory as a result thereof, but we have spent billions of dollars to rehabilitate our former enemies. We have encouraged the new nations in their struggles for self-expression and self-determination all over the world.

As a matter of fact, not a new flag flies under the sun today that in some way does not owe at least part of its liberty to the great American Revolution with its Declaration of Independence, its Bill of Rights, and its Constitution. And yet, we are unfortunately being portrayed to the world as a Nation of complacent people interested only in the accumulation of wealth and greater comforts.

In the Middle East, for example, the whole concept of freedom and liberty is the result of our people—our engineers, our businessmen, our missionaries, our American university in Beirut. The great progress made there against poverty and disease is largely the result of our work. And yet, today in that area of the world, we are pictured as greedy and grasping, interested only in exploiting the oil riches and totally unconcerned with the needs of the people.

The record of American largess and of concern for other peoples is a long and a magnificent and a glorious one. There are countries in the world where millions of people have been saved from pestilence by the work of our Government and by the work of private American institutions.

In Thailand, for instance, the dread malaria has almost been eliminated, and in Colombia the frightful and painful disease of yaws has been wiped out in a few years. The same applies in countless areas. And yet, we have demonstrations against our Vice President and other public officials in some of these countries. This means, as I see it, my friends, that we are failing miserably to portray America as it really is to other peoples of the world—to give the real picture of life on our farms, in our towns, and in our cities, and how we as Americans do more to help one another in everyday

life than probably any people on the face of the earth.

But you see, the battle for the minds of men is every bit as important as the military struggle and in this arena as in others, there is no easy answer, no quick solution.

I was amazed and astonished by the recent polls conducted by Dr. Gallup which indicated that in the opinion of most Americans it is thought that the average return on the average corporate investment runs 20 to 30 percent. Even more astonishing were surveys conducted outside of the United States which showed people in Montevideo saying that the average investment yielded 60 percent and people in Western Europe using figures as high as 47 percent. This demonstrates that American business, in general, has a real job of public relations to do!

Certainly, this is the result of the Communist party line that free enterprise means tremendous profits for a few people without passing on a fair share of earnings to the workers. This nonsense must be counteracted with the truth, not only in the United States but throughout the world.

What are the cures? Well, as the saying goes, the following are for sure:

We must adopt a long-run view of world affairs. The race is not always to the swift.

We must accept struggle and peril as part of our daily portion.

We must possess ourselves in patience.

All this may require a substantial transformation in our temperament. We are impatient. But our potential enemy is endlessly patient. Many of his ambitions of today were his ambitions 400 years ago.

The price of freedom has always been high. It was high at Valley Forge and Lexington. It was high at the Marne in 1914. It was high in France in 1944. But the price of defeat is death and slavery.

If the price of freedom is eating hoecake and molasses, I am for that.

If its price is hoecake and branch water, I am for that.

We must elect to be wise or foolish; to vacillate or persevere, to survive or perish.

Finally, we must have a genuine appreciation and understanding of American liberty and freedom; we must as individuals dispel by word and example, wherever we go, the clever Communist propaganda directed deliberately against us; and we must realize that our society will not survive unless we will it so; that our Constitution as great as it is will only survive as long as the people are dedicated to its principles.

Statement by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles Before Senate Foreign Relations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the statement made today by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1959

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is today changing more rapidly than ever before. But the fact that much is changing does not mean that everything has changed. There are certain values, certain principles, that are enduring. Among these are the concepts of individual human dignity and the supremacy of moral law.

In a changing world our task is to strive resolutely that change shall increasingly reflect the basic principles to which our Nation has, from its origin, been dedicated.

II. OUR BASIC PURPOSES

1. At a time when war involves unacceptable risks for all humanity, we work to build a stable world order.

2. We seek for general acceptance of the concept of individual dignity which will lead to the spread of responsible freedom and personal liberty.

3. We seek that the free nations shall attain a more rapid rate of economic growth, so that their independence will be more secure and vigorous and so that there will be greater opportunities for cultural and spiritual development.

III. THE PRIMARY THREAT

The Soviet Union and Communist China are expanding their economic and industrial power at a very rapid pace. They do so by a system which combines governmental rule of all labor with imposed austerity. This makes it possible greatly to accelerate capital developments.

There is emphasis, too, on quality. A spectacular product of Soviet material accomplishment was its recent space probe. In this field, the United States is still trying to catch up and make up for the head start of the Soviets. Our space accomplishments during the past year justify the belief that we are making good relative progress.

The Chinese Communists seem to be going into a dark night of massed regimentation and forced labor. What they call the great leap forward is in reality a tragic fall backward into the abyss of human slavery.

Asian nations are experiencing one aspect of Communist economic development: The Communist tactic of flooding their market places with goods at less than prevailing prices. This has widespread effects, some of which reach into our own country. As one example only, the dumping of cotton textiles in Southeast Asia has reduced Japanese exports in that area and is already reducing exports of cotton from the United States to Japan. As Communist economic power grows, we must anticipate and plan for further shocks to the free world economic structure from the Communist trade offensive.

Communist economic methods involve costs in human privation and misery that, for us, are not only repugnant but completely unacceptable. We believe that over the long run such a process must inevitably be altered. Already there are indications that the Soviet leaders are beginning to realize this. There is some scaling down of their heavy industry ambitions. They are beginning to heed demands by workers and peasants for more leisure and for a greater share in the fruits of their labor. Peoples sufficiently educated to operate a modern industrial state may be expected also to acquire the desire for freedom and the capacity to get it. History gives us good reason to believe that the Soviet peoples will not indefinitely submit to dictatorial rule by the International Communist Party leadership. It would appear that the Communists will encounter difficulties increasing in the long run.

But for the short run—and this may be a period of years—the situation is full of danger.

That means that we may face a period even harder than we have become used to. To get advantage from time we shall have to stand on our course. We shall need the national will to stand firm in the face of aggressive threats and probings from the Sino-Soviet bloc. We shall need to make whatever unusual sacrifices may be necessary. People respond to this kind of demand when they understand that a temporary emergency requires it. But these burdens seem to grow heavier the longer they must be borne during a period of relative peace. Our people will need to show what freedom can mean in terms of self-sacrifice and self-discipline; and in terms of fortitude and perseverance.

IV. WORLD ORDER

Let me speak now about world order. This requires an elimination of the use or threat of force to accomplish international change. This was always a bad method. It has become an intolerable method because the force at man's disposal could now practically obliterate human life on this planet.

The United States and other free world nations have, by their conduct, done much to establish, for themselves, the principle of the renunciation of aggressive force; and they have shown their ability and will to deter such use of force by others.

At the time of the Suez affair and the Israeli-Egyptian hostilities, the United Kingdom and France, and then Israel, responding to the overwhelming opinion of the United Nations, withdrew their armed forces and accepted a United Nations solution. This may well prove to be a historical landmark.

During the past year the United States and its partners have further shown their opposition to change through force or the threat of force.

When Lebanon and Jordan seemed threatened from without and appealed to the United States and the United Kingdom for emergency aid, we responded with promptness and efficiency. When the emergency was relieved by United Nations action, we promptly withdrew our forces.

Throughout the world small nations felt a profound sense of reassurance.

In the Far East the Chinese Communists, with Soviet backing, initiated military action designed, as they put it, to expel the United States from the western Pacific. We stood beside the Republic of China as it resisted what seemed the preliminaries of that attack. Our free world associates generally supported our position that change in that area should not be effected by force of arms.

The Government of the Republic of China itself made a notable contribution when, last October, it declared that it relied primarily upon peaceful principles and not upon force to secure the freeing of the mainland. This courageous and statesmanlike act has strengthened the free world's cause in the western Pacific.

Now in Berlin we face an effort to expel the small western contingents in West Berlin. Their presence constitutes an indispensable safeguard to the freedom of that city. The NATO powers, at their December meeting, unanimously vowed that such expulsion should be resisted.

Step by step, discernible progress continues to be made in consolidating a system of collective security which will effectively operate to exclude the use of force to effect international changes.

The mutual security arrangements which we have with free world countries no longer assume the aspect of mere military alliances.

They are the framework of consultative processes that, day by day, are steadily reforming the society of free nations.

In primitive and frontier societies, security is on an individual basis. Each householder defends himself by his own means. That primitive formula is now obsolete domestically. It is becoming obsolete internationally. Many free nations combine to help each other. The resultant power is not a power which can be or would be used for any aggressive or nationalistic purpose. It is a power dedicated to the common welfare as mutually agreed.

The United States has repeatedly made clear—and I said this again at the last December NATO meeting—that we regard our own military power as being a trust for the benefit of our free world partnerships; that we are ready to make known to all the defensive purposes and circumstances under which that force might be used; and that we shall heed in this respect the advice and counsel of our partners just as we would expect them to heed our advice and counsel with respect to the international use of their force.

Thus, out of what may originally have been conceived primarily as military alliances, there is developing an international structure which provides collective security on the basis of organized and continuous collective consultation. That is something new in history.

I might add that accomplishment is not always easy given the variety of national development and national viewpoints. Nevertheless the free world practice in this regard constantly grows in efficiency.

World order is not, however, assured merely by the elimination of violence. There must be processes of peaceful change. These, too, are rapidly developing within the Free World. The General Assembly of the United Nations is a forum where these needs find effective expression. The General Assembly does not have the power to legislate change. But it has a capacity to induce change, at least in the case of governments which have respect for, and are responsive to, world opinion.

The peace of the Free World is not a peace of political stagnation or a peace which sanctifies the status quo. It is a peace characterized by peaceful change reflecting new human aspirations and potentialities.

There is, of course, need not only for processes which permit of peaceful change, but there is equally a need for stability in adherence to basic values, including that of respecting international agreements and treaties. This requires that, unless international law and treaty engagements are changed by common agreement, they should be respected.

There has not been as great a development of international law and recourse to judicial processes as would be desirable. The United Nations General Assembly Committee on the codification of international law has made little progress. Some significant progress in law development was made at the recent Law of the Sea Conference, and that Conference will be resumed in 1960. Inadequate use has been made of the International Court of Justice. As the President said last week in his State of the Union address, we envisage further steps to encourage the greater use of that Court.

In such ways as I describe progress is being made toward establishing a world order where peace rests, not on mere expediency or on a balance of power, but on a basis of sound institutions.

This evolution is not spectacular and rarely considered "news." What attracts attention are the aggressive probings of the Communists and the free world reactions thereto. That gives the impression that our foreign policy consists primarily of reacting to Communist initiatives.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that day by day, month by month, and year by year, we are building, quietly but steadily, in the United Nations, in NATO, in the OAS, in SEATO, and other organs of consultation, the solid foundations of an international order based upon justice and law as substitutes for force.

The Communist rulers do not share in this effort to build a stable world order based upon justice and law. International communism avowedly seeks world-wide dictatorship. The concept of justice is alien to the Communist creed, and law, in our sense of that word, is unknown. The free world and Communist concepts are mutually antagonistic.

This, however, does not mean that there cannot be useful contacts and negotiations with the Communists. We have had many such. We are striving to make progress in the field of disarmament and in that connection deal with the Soviets, particularly in relation to the controlled discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We also seek agreement on possible measures which might be helpful in preventing surprise attack.

At Warsaw we negotiate with the Chinese Communists.

We have made clear our willingness to negotiate about the German question.

We have now an agreement with the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific exchanges which is operating satisfactorily. Also important are the visits to and from Russia of influential citizens.

President Eisenhower urged this in his letter of February 16, 1958, to the then Soviet Premier. Following this initiative, there have been useful visits on both sides, and we are glad that the First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikoyan, is now here learning about our country. We would like to see a broader exchange of students. We believe that in such ways false premises and miscalculations can be reduced in the interest of peace.

V. THE INEVITABLE MOVEMENT TOWARD FREEDOM

I turn now to our second major purpose.

One of the strongest forces working in the world today is the movement toward independence and freedom.

This force is notably manifest in Africa. Here change is rapid, new states are arising almost overnight. This great continent presents a challenge to the United States to do its best to assist the peoples now emerging into independence and new opportunity.

Another such area is our hemisphere to the south. The peoples of Latin America are making clear their determination to control their own destinies. One by one dictatorships have made way for governments more responsive to the popular will.

The worldwide movement toward freedom is accompanied by a growing awareness of the deadly nature of Sino-Soviet imperialism. The leaders of the new freedom are coming more and more to see international communism as an immediate threat to their liberties, not, as some have thought, a mere bogeyman of so-called western imperialism.

The Communists are paying a price for the forced growth of their material power. There is a developing fear in the less powerful nations around the world of the dangerous combination of burgeoning economic and military power with the imperialist drive of the Communists for world domination. This menacing combination brings home with force the threat which, when the Communists were not so strong, was but a matter of vague and largely academic concern.

There has recently been a surprising clarification of understanding around the world of the real purpose of Communist leaders—to subject all the world to the dominant influence and control of international communism, with its primary power centers at Moscow and Peking.

In the Middle East the deadly designs of communism are now far more clearly realized than a year ago.

In southeast Asia liberty-loving peoples are struggling—and with success—to remain masters in their newly built national homes.

In general, I believe the leaders and peoples of Asia now understand better the sincerity of American policy favoring their independence and our willingness to support unconditionally their efforts to stay free and do so in their own way, which may indeed be a non-Western way.

In France, we are witnessing an inspiring example of national renewal.

The tide of freedom is running strong in Western Europe as Communist strength there ebbs.

Even in Communist countries there is a powerful and persistent craving for greater national freedom. Yugoslavia has been steadfast against all threats and blandishments from Moscow and has courageously maintained its independence.

Hungary's great effort to throw off its shackles, even though crushed by force, has been an inspiration and a tribute to man's unquenchable thirst for liberty. And throughout the bloc, even in the U.S.S.R., revisionism is a living force and ferment. Moscow considers it a deadly enemy, and with reason.

The pull of freedom is daily manifested in the flow of refugees from the Communist bloc to the free world.

The free people of West Berlin have, during years of uncertainty and danger, been an inspiring beacon light for all those whose liberties have been lost to Communist tyranny. We are determined that this light shall not fall, and that Berlin shall not be engulfed in the Red undertow.

As we look ahead, we see freedom as a predominant force, shaping our 20th century world. As Americans, we have faith that the aspiration, deep within the soul of man, to live freely and with dignity in a just and peaceful world is stronger than all the material forces which the Communists invoke as the pledge and promise of their power.

VI. ECONOMIC PROGRESS

I turn now to our third basic purpose.

We believe that economic progress is a necessary condition of stable and free nations. There must also be acceptance of economic interdependence of nations. No nation can live completely to itself.

Unless and until the less developed areas reach the stage of self-sustaining economic growth, the world as a whole will suffer. For the inhabitants of those areas, an increasing rate of economic development has become an essential condition of free societies. The demand for economic and social betterment is now universal, and if progress cannot be achieved in freedom, it will be sought by methods that jeopardize freedom.

The Communists are fully aware of the universal demand for progress, and they point to the Soviet and Chinese Communist accomplishments in industrialization as proof that their way is better than the way of freedom.

Our aid and investment must continue to support the efforts of the leaders of the developing free nations to sustain their peoples' confidence that economic progress can be attained in freedom.

We have not been alone in providing such support. Other highly industrialized states have made significant contributions.

These industrialized nations have also shown a growing awareness of interdependence among themselves. This is particularly gratifying to us. A common market for Europe was one of the policy objectives stated in the preamble to the European Recovery Act of 1948. Now, after 10 years, the six-

nation European common market is a fact. The Western European currencies have become more freely exchangeable and there is a strong movement for broader economic cooperation in Western Europe.

Free world economic progress does not permit complacency or relaxation. It calls instead for renewed effort to increase the forward momentum.

In the years ahead, we must through our trade and financial policies continue to promote recognition and positive use of the benefits of interdependence. These benefits, and the inevitability, of economic interdependence become more clear each year. What is being done in the European Community of Six provides an example and an inspiration for greater economic cooperation elsewhere in the world.

We must continue to apply our will, energy, treasure, and techniques to the problems of the less developed areas. The cause of freedom can be won—or could be lost—in these areas.

VII. CONCLUSION

Let me in conclusion recall the basic purposes underlying our policies:

1. The renunciation of aggressive force and the substitution of collective institutions of peace, justice, and law among nations;
2. Promotion of the concept of human dignity, worth, and freedom;
3. Stimulation of economic growth and interdependence to create enlarged opportunities for realization of cultural and spiritual values.

These goals are not attainable in a few years, but will require decades and, perhaps even generations. Why is this so? We are but one nation among nearly a hundred sovereignties, and but a scant 6 percent of the world's land surface and population. Our foreign policy is not something we can enact into world law or dictate to other peoples. It means rather constant adjustment to forces which, though beyond our control to direct, we can influence through wise statesmanship and adherence to sound principles. With our immense wealth and power, and even more because of our spiritual heritage of faith and freedom, we can exert a shaping influence on the world of the future.

The price of failure would be the destruction of all our other national objectives. While mustering all our resources, both material and spiritual, we must press on with courage to build surer foundations for the interdependent world community of which we are part. This will call for austerity and sacrifice on the part of all. We must put first things first.

Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Freedom Is More Than Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the principal criticisms of the United States abroad has been its "we know best" attitude in talking to government officials. We must remember that local government is the best government and must be tolerant of the views of the people who would make their own laws.

I might inject a note at this point that such tolerance would be welcomed in this body by the South from Senators from other sections of the country who feel that they know better than we southerners how to govern the South.

The Boston Christian Science Monitor on December 1, 1958, ran an editorial from the Toronto Globe and Mail entitled "Retreat From Democracy," pointing out that democracy is something relatively few nations in the world can afford. Also, on December 1, 1958, the Boston Christian Science Monitor commented on this editorial with one of their own entitled "Freedom Is More Than Form."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FREEDOM IS MORE THAN FORM

A phenomenon deserving more attention is the trend toward military dictatorships. In country after country the generals are taking over from the premiers. In an adjacent column we reprint today a thoughtful analysis of this development from a distinguished Canadian contemporary. Since the Globe and Mail's editorial was written Thailand and the Sudan have been added to the list. Iraq made the shift in July.

The Toronto paper has done well to call attention to this situation. Its estimate is somewhat more somber than our own. But its warnings should be given serious consideration. For the picture was never so bright as wishful thinkers have assumed. And the retreat from democracy now is less startling mainly because the democracy in many of the nations involved has been more apparent than real. In Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East military men have often exercised the real power indirectly.

This may make the change look less dangerous—as does the fact that no great gains for communism have been involved. We believe also that a tremendously promising awakening is taking place in most of the countries which have still to learn how to make democracy work. Many which had expected the ending of foreign rule to bring utopia have been disappointed. Some are finding that foreigners are not the only exploiters and others are discovering that effective equality has to be earned and the wise use of freedom learned.

True, patterns of oppression and limitation have been broken, desires for better things awakened, new energies released. The potentialities for good are beyond calculation. As the Globe and Mail says, the peoples who have inherited democracy must be tolerant with those who are taking different paths, steps, and detours (some of them familiar in western histories).

It is heartening that free government has become almost the universal model. (Even the dictators feel it necessary to call themselves presidents.) Understanding of other peoples' difficulties in working toward freedom is essential if the maturer democracies are to be effective in helping the less experienced. Such help is one of the best ways to promote their own security and peace.

It is important for the new nations to learn that national independence provides only the opportunity to exercise freedom; it does not in itself confer either equality of opportunity or self-government upon the individual. And it is vital for the older democracies (especially for Americans with their fortunate inheritance) to realize that freedom (much less their own kind of democracy) is not something all people wish or

are prepared overnight to operate successfully.

As the Globe and Mail points out, relatively small are the portions of the world where the conditions are present that are required for effective free government. To its list we would add nonauthoritarian religion (fostering individual spiritual growth.) This means that the need for free peoples to cooperate among themselves and to promote the love of liberty among others is far too urgent to warrant present levels of apathy and dissension.

RETREAT FROM DEMOCRACY

The recent revolutions in Burma and Pakistan have called attention to a highly significant trend in Asia—the gradual replacement of democratic systems of government by military dictatorship.

Ten years ago, nearly all the independent nations of Asia, including those which had recently secured their independence, were equipped with representative institutions on the Western European model. Their constitutions provided for universal or nearly universal suffrage, elected parliaments to which the cabinet was responsible, independent judiciaries, and sometimes guarantees of free speech, a free press and other liberties. In many cases, of course, these constitutions were made largely inoperative by internal disorder; but it was taken for granted that they would some time force once peace and stability were secured. Most Asian political leaders of the period believed—under the influence of western books or teachers—that parliamentary democracy was the highest form of government, and the only one worthy of a free and progressive nation.

Today, the picture is totally different. All across Asia—even in the non-Communist areas—the effort to make democracy work is being abandoned. The Middle East is now about equally divided between military dictatorships on the style of President Nasser's, and old-fashioned absolute monarchies such as that of King Saud of Saudi Arabia. Even Turkey, the most stable of these countries, shows signs of sliding back to autocratic rule. Parliamentary government has collapsed in Pakistan and Burma, and the army has been called in to maintain order. In Indonesia, President Sukarno's guided democracy has led to chaos and civil war. Ceylon is racked by virulent racial and religious strife, and it is questionable whether its constitution, modeled on that of Britain, can survive the strain. . . .

In justifying the dissolution of Parliament and the abrogation of the Constitution, President Mirza of Pakistan . . . expressed skepticism as to the value of universal suffrage in a country where more than 80 percent of the population is illiterate. His words could serve as the epitaph for democracy in many another Asian state where it was attempted in the face of crushing political and economic difficulties and amid a people unprepared for it by anything in their national traditions.

The retreat from democracy, however, has not been confined to Asia. It has been equally striking in the West. Of the various parliamentary republics set up in Eastern Europe after the First World War, few survived the Second. In Germany, Italy and Austria, during the last 40 years, constitutional government has been an on again, off again affair. In Spain and Portugal, experiments in democracy ended in chaos, revolution and dictatorship. Even proud France last summer anticipated the experience of Pakistan; the strife of parties, paralyzing national life, forced her to turn to a military strong man.

In actual fact, democracy, as a stable and well-established system of government, is today confined to a surprisingly small group of nations. They include Great Britain

and its overseas offshoots; the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland; and the four Scandinavian States. Widely as these countries differ, they have certain very important characteristics in common—a system of representative institutions going far back into the Middle Ages and evolving gradually over the centuries; a large middle class tending to soften the clash between the extremes of wealth and poverty; and a tradition of moderation, compromise and respect for law in the conduct of public affairs. Where these things are missing, it is doubtful whether any experiment in democratic government can succeed. . . .

We need to realize that democracy is now, and is likely to remain, restricted to a small part of the globe. Elsewhere, other systems will continue to prevail—not because the people of these regions are stupid or depraved but because their problems, their history, and their temperament incline them to a more authoritarian type of rule. Over the centuries we have reached some degree of tolerance in religious matters. It is time we learned it in political affairs as well.—The Globe and Mail (Toronto).

The Work of Congressional Committees Detailed on the TV Program "Today"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. has a very interesting and informative television program with which I like to start out my day. They call the program "Today."

Just recently they did a series on Congress and at my request their able Mr. Frank McGee let me have a transcript of his remarks of last Wednesday on what he said about the work of congressional committees.

Those who heard it may want to see this again, and for those who missed it, here is a second chance. Mr. McGee said:

Visitors often stand and look in awe upon the Chambers of Congress where they think our laws are made. There is nothing wrong with their reverence—except it is misdirected.

Our laws are not written by Congress as a whole, but by congressional committees, working far from the floors of the Chamber. And since there are 34 standing committees, we actually have 34 Congresses.

Every bill introduced goes to one of these committees where it may be amended or completely rewritten, or simply shelved. If a committee votes against a bill, it is as good as dead. If the committee approves it, the rest of the Chamber usually does.

That's why a Congressman must be assigned to an important committee if he hopes to do any real lawmaking. And who makes the committee assignments? The Committee on Committees, naturally. But the list is drawn up the way the other members of the party want it drawn up.

The most important consideration is seniority, or how long the Member has been in Congress. The last consideration often is whether he knows anything about the type of bills he'll be considering. If he keeps getting reelected, he'll learn in time.

Nothing means as much as seniority to a Congressman. It decides his committee assignments, his standing among other committee members, and his influence in the party. Herblock, the cartoonist, suggests committee members are selected by the length of their beard, and offers the thought that this is not the smartest way in the world to run a railroad.

Now, if a Congressman keeps getting reelected long enough, he becomes chairman of his committee. That's the only way he can do it, and once he has the seniority, nothing can stop him.

Only Congressmen from politically safe districts or States get reelected this often. That's why such an unusual number of southerners are committee chairmen when the Democrats are in power.

The chairman has exceptional powers. If he doesn't like a bill that's sent to his committee, he simply doesn't schedule it for action and there is little the rest of the committee or Congress can do about it.

The chairman schedules meetings and selects witnesses who testify for or against a bill. And when a measure reaches the floor, the chairman handles the debate. If he's cool toward the bill, he's not likely to argue for it very convincingly.

Far and away the most powerful committee in Congress is the House Rules Committee.

It gets every bill after another committee is through with it and even though the other committee has approved the measure, the Rules Committee can kill it, amend it, rewrite it completely, or simply pigeon-hole it.

In addition, the Rules Committee decides how long and under what conditions the bill may be debated when it reaches the full House. It can cut off debate and forbid amendments—so if the House doesn't like the measure the way the Rules Committee wrote it, that's tough.

There are only 12 members on this committee. If 7 of these, a majority, oppose a bill, it is virtually dead and the other 428 Members of the House can just whistle—or go through the torturous and rarely successful process of trying to force it out of the Rules Committee.

Of course, bills are written with all these pitfalls in mind. Someone once described a camel as a horse—built by a committee. That's why some of our laws have such peculiar wrinkles.

The Nation's Television Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expects to hold early hearings on the Nation's TV fare. In this connection, several Oklahoma newspapers have commented editorially on the subject of the slow death of good television programs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of these editorials: the first, originally published in the Duncan (Okla.) Banner, and reprinted in the Ada (Okla.) Evening News of December 5, 1958; the second, published in the Enid (Okla.) Morning News of December 4, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duncan (Okla.) Banner, reprinted in the Ada (Okla.) Evening News, Dec. 4, 1958]

COLUMN OF COMMENT

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, who did a fine job investigating packing of automobile prices by dealers, is turning his attention to TV. Is there a villain? If there is, it's an economic one.

MONRONEY wants to know if the networkers aren't paying too much attention to ratings the programs receive. That's a good question.

Offhand, we would answer that in the negative. TV audiences, however, perhaps are only limited judges of the character of programs.

They love to complain about mediocre offerings, and they say they want better quality entertainment. Yet they shun educational programs like poison.

Their tastes vary, even among their favorites. Quiz shows, for instance, have hit the skids on ratings. Westerns and who-dunits are popular.

Grand opera has keenly appreciative, but limited audiences. Condensed better plays win plaudits of critics, but most viewers flip the dial somewhere else. TV audiences say one thing, practice another.

The networks must make a profit to stay in business. Sponsors want big audiences, not limited ones. Networks say they try to strike a balance.

Senator MONRONEY wonders if more Federal regulation is needed to improve quality. Chances are there will be a Senate probe to develop more facts.

Live drama has been one of the casualties on TV, but we haven't heard listeners complain much. For one thing, filmed drama has fewer limitations.

MONRONEY's view is that it isn't the advertiser who controls the programming, but the ratings offered by audience testing companies.

He may have a point there. Among three accepted rating services, there frequently are varying findings each week. Each uses different methods.

One startling revelation of a newcomer in the ratings field is that, from actual visits, not telephone calls, as many as one-third of the receiving sets turned on at a given time are not watched by anyone in the home.

MONRONEY's probes resulted in posted prices on every 1959 new car offered buyers. Perhaps he can come up with something beneficial to TV viewers.

[From the Enid (Okla.) Morning News,

Dec. 4, 1958]

POWER TO MONRONEY IN TRY FOR BETTER TV
FARE

More power to Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

Our Senator MONRONEY is stirring up a television fuss in Washington. MIKE is leading sort of a one-man movement to probe television practices in killing off quality television programs and placing cheaper and perhaps more profitable programs in their stead.

For example, if you've watched television at all you couldn't help but have noticed the rash of western programs appearing on the TV screen nowadays. There are more than you can shake a stick at. At the same time the information type and better quality type of programs are fading fast.

We think Senator MONRONEY is doing the public a real service if he can make the money-conscious TV networks think of something besides the almighty dollar. After all, the air waves are public property.

They are supposedly granted to television stations to be used in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. But are they? In other words we have a great and wonderful medium in television but are we using it properly? Do the old, old movies, horror stories, crime shows, westerns of all kinds enlighten and stimulate the population of our country or do they constitute a breeding ground for crime and indifference?

The TV networks and the individual TV stations have a terrific responsibility and we think that Senator MONROE's efforts may help make them realize this fact. We certainly don't think the National Association of Radio and TV Broadcasters has done any kind of job in policing the industry. It doesn't even make its own members live up to the industry's code. If you want an example of this just count the commercial time on the Jack Parr show or on the news, weather, and sports half-hour shows on the stations in this area. We listened to one 5-minute sports program recently where the commercial time actually was greater than the time for sports news.

But this is the subject for another editorial. Let's get back to the fact that Senator MONROE as the second-ranking Democrat on the United States Senate Communications Subcommittee is asking some sharp and pointed questions of the networks in regard to the slow death of good television programs. We say, more power to Senator MONROE.

Final Report: Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1958, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report filed papers of dissolution with the secretary of state of the State of New York. This marks the end of an 11-year organized effort to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government.

On January 10, 1947, after extensive studies had been made, I introduced H. R. 775, a bill to establish a commission on organization of the executive branch of the Government. Before preparing this bill, I studied previous efforts to reorganize our Government and found that none had been particularly successful. Perhaps the major accomplishment from these previous reorganizations was that of President Taft's 1912 Commission, from which stemmed—almost a decade later—the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921.

Our intensive research showed that various factors had been responsible for these modest results from previous reorganization efforts. Some commissions had been dominated by the Congress and failed of acceptance in the Executive. Others were dominated by the Executive and did not achieve full credence in the Congress. In other cases, partisanship adversely affected the eventual results. And, further, some excellent proposals were allowed to die in Government pigeonholes because there was no par-

ticipation from private citizens, and the recommendations received little public support. Therefore, in H. R. 775, a wholly new and balanced formula was provided.

The Commission was to have equal representation as between Congress, the Executive, and the public. It was to be balanced equally as to parties, and also each body of Congress was given the equal representation to the other within the congressional third of the Commission's membership of 12.

This formula, designed to correct the deficiencies in the composition of previous Commissions, succeeded beyond the fondest hopes of those of us who prepared it. To illustrate this, I would like to quote James A. Farley, a distinguished member of the second Commission, who said of the work of this Commission chaired by former President Hoover:

At no time did politics enter into the deliberations of the Commission. Where we differed, they were honest differences of opinion, and Mr. Hoover recognized the right of each member to give free expression of his views.

Public Law 162, approved without dissenting vote by the 80th Congress established the first Commission. It operated from 1947 through 1949. Seventy-two percent of its recommendations were put into effect.

Because of the success of this early Commission, I again, in 1953, introduced legislation, to provide for a second Commission. Again, the measure was approved by the Congress without dissent and was enacted into law on July 10, 1953. The second Commission, which operated from 1953 through 1955, again brought results far in excess of the hopes of many of us. As of late in 1958, President Eisenhower reported that 64 percent of the recommendations had been put into effect.

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Clarence Francis, as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, has now formally dissolved. That committee of 50,000 private citizens supporting our proposals should, as former President Hoover and President Eisenhower have pointed out, be very proud of its accomplishments; for the committee's efforts succeeded in bringing to the American people a realization of the need for more efficient and more economical government. As a result of the committee's efforts, 121 pieces of legislation were enacted to accomplish the Commission's objectives. This body of legislation is far and away greater than anything ever accomplished by a similar group.

Congress, too, should take great pride in its own accomplishments on this vast series of reorganization proposals. Not only did Congress create these two Commissions on a wholly bipartisan basis, but Congress also acted in a highly responsible manner in putting the Commission's proposals into effect. You, Mr. Speaker, the outstanding gentleman from the 12th District of Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and our beloved friend from the 14th District of Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] played intru-

mental roles in all of these matters and I think we all should be pleased with the constructive and bipartisan nature of our actions.

Upon the completion of this organized effort to reorganize the Federal Government, the citizens committee has prepared a final report. This historical report give the Congress and the public an authoritative statement of what has been accomplished and what yet remains undone.

FINAL REPORT: CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

DEFENSE UNIFICATION AND H.R. 8002 CROWN CLIMAX YEAR AS CITIZENS COMMITTEE DISBANDS—64 PERCENT OF SECOND COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED—HOOVER RATES SAVINGS AT UPWARDS OF \$3 BILLION A YEAR—"GREAT IDEAS ALWAYS GO FORWARD," FRANCIS SAYS—MANY GROUPS TO ACT ON UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Two of the most significant and far-reaching recommendations ever made in the name of the bipartisan Hoover Commissions are now the law of the land. They are H.R. 12541 for defense unification (signed as Public Law 599 by President Eisenhower on August 6) and H.R. 8002 for modernized Federal budgeting (Public Law 759 of August 25).

Thus, in the waning days of the 85th Congress, the climax year drive for governmental economy and efficiency was crowned with achievement as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report prepared to disband. Preliminary research figures show that 64 percent—63.9 percent to be exact—of the second Hoover Commission's recommendations have been adopted and are being put into effect.

Former President Herbert Hoover estimates the eventual economies resulting from these recommendations at upward of \$3 billion a year. In a message to citizens committee members, Mr. Hoover said: "Economies totaling \$7 billion can be traced to the first Commission's report. And we are on our way to savings of upwards of \$3 billion a year as a result of the second Commission's recommendations. . . . Your crusade has been the greatest education of the American people in civil government since the Constitution was under debate."

EISENHOWER COMMENDS COMMITTEE—PLEDGES CONTINUED INTEREST IN REPORT

Noting the disbandment of the citizens committee, President Eisenhower has addressed a message of warm commendation to its members. In a letter to Clarence Francis, national chairman, the President said: "Through its fine work the citizens committee has contributed significantly to the understanding of an interested and well-informed public—a very real and lasting source of strength as we look ahead to the future." The President said the administration would continue to implement the Commission's proposals and he predicted that the time will again come when there will be need for a new, comprehensive review such as inspired Mr. Hoover's monumental missions.

In its final assignment, the committee's research staff has drawn a comparison showing that the second Commission's record of 64 percent adoption fell somewhat short of the first Commission's 72 percent. On the other hand, a greater share of the second Commission's recommendations were of fundamental and major importance. That is because the second Commission was authorized by Congress to go into questions of policy, whereas the first was limited to problems of organization and management.

Citizen support of Commission recommendations came to a peak in 1958. Never has Congress been so impressed by the force of public interest in Commission legislation.

Never has bipartisan teamwork operated so effectively to get results. Executive branch officials, led by the President, worked closely with congressional leaders of both parties. Scores of cooperating national organizations fused their forces with those of the citizens committee to produce a heavy flow of congressional mail from every corner of the country.

At the same time, the opposition was never stronger. This applied particularly to defense reorganization (H.R. 12541) and modernized budgeting (H.R. 8002). The defense issue came suddenly to the fore in April when President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress calling for sweeping revision of the Pentagon chain of command; stronger civilian control of the military under the Secretary of Defense; central direction of defense research programs; and unified land, sea, and air commands in the field.

Based squarely on Hoover Commission proposals, the President's program was aimed at the root causes of confusion, delay, and waste in the Pentagon. Ten years earlier, the first Commission's task force had warned that "victory by bankruptcy" was an objective of the Kremlin—and that was before the era of Sputniks, guided missiles, and other 5,000-mile-an-hour menaces—not only to our freedom but to our very lives. In his call for a streamlined defense structure, the President spoke for safety with solvency.

Nonetheless, it soon became clear that the diehard opponents of unification would fight the new plan to the bitter end. The battle lines were clearly drawn as a long parade of witnesses came before the House Armed Services Committee. Many asserted that the plan would create a Prussian General Staff, endanger the Navy, and abolish the Marine Corps. On May 10, National Chairman Clarence Francis gave the defense bill first priority among the objectives of the citizens committee in its climax year.

At the start it seemed that powerful House foes of the measure would succeed in blocking it altogether. Citizens went all out in their demand for action, however, and on June 12, the House adopted, after a hot floor fight, a bill containing some features of the President's plan. The bill was badly watered down, however. So the President, in one of the most strongly worded messages he has ever sent to Congress, asked for four amendments to correct the most dangerous deficiencies of the House measure.

The scene then shifted to the Senate. Again public opinion, now sharply focused on the President's amendments, was brought to bear with all its force on the Senate Armed Services Committee. And it was here that the turning point came. On July 15 the Senate committee unanimously approved a strongly amended bill which the Senate itself adopted by a vote of 89 to 6 five days later. Thus ended, successfully, the battle for the biggest single achievement in the 10-year history of the two Hoover Commissions.

Meanwhile, however, it became evident that the final adoption of H.R. 8002 was by no means assured. It should have been on March 6 when the House approved the bill after an historic 2-day floor battle by a vote of 311 to 87. But it wasn't.

H.R. 8002, as passed by the House, differed only slightly from the Senate version, S. 434, which had twice been approved unanimously by the Senate. On March 10 it went back to the Senate Calendar for final approval. This should have been routine. But it wasn't.

Instead, H.R. 8002 got "hung up" in the Senate because of a technical change in the House language which created a minor conflict with Senate rules. Day followed day, week followed week, and still the Senate took no action. The delay began to look like a triumph for the wily parliamentarians who had, from the beginning, vowed that H.R. 8002 would never become law. By May 15,

in fact, they were openly proclaiming that the bill was "dead for the session" which, of course, meant dead for all time.

Aroused citizens then went to work. Soon the Senate was flooded with calls for action on H.R. 8002. On June 27 the bill was taken off the calendar and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. A hearing was held on July 8 when yet another effort to kill the measure was barely thwarted. Then back went the bill to the Senate Calendar. Its opponents strove for delay, delay, and more delay as the session neared its end. Public pressures mounted, however. Senators in increasing numbers became aware that something or somebody was stalling final action on an issue which they thought they had long since settled. Finally, on July 31, virtually the whole Senate rose up in protest and H.R. 8002, only slightly amended, was brought to the floor for a vote. It passed, 68 to 6. (About 18 of the absent Senators would have voted for it, too.)

The battle should have been over then. But it wasn't. H.R. 8002 had to go back to the House for final adoption. Again, obstructionists worked for delay. Again the bill went back to committee. Again pressures rose and, at long last, H.R. 8002 was brought to the House floor. There, on August 14, the opposition collapsed and the bill was approved by a voice vote—just 10 days before the 85th Congress adjourned.

In many ways, the story of H.R. 8002 epitomizes the history of the Hoover Commissions and the citizens committee. Briefly, they said it couldn't be done, but it was done. At all events any substantial reorganization of Government was considered impossible when the first Commission began its work in 1947—and on the evidence this was true. Since 1947, no less than seven boards, committees, and commissions had made studies and issued reports which were quickly forgotten. This discouraging trend was reversed by three principal factors: (1) Active congressional sanction (2) scrupulously bipartisan teamwork between the Executive and Congress in two administrations and (3) vigorous citizen support.

The dramatic and completely dispassionate quality of Hoover report research played a big part in the outcome, too. The Commissions gave tangible, understandable examples to support their findings; then they made specific, practical recommendations of a very clear nature. The public quickly developed confidence in the reports and the motivation behind them. Thousands of good citizens from coast to coast joined enthusiastically in support of the Commissions' proposals. Conscientious officials and Members of Congress welcomed their support. This was a pressure group of a new sort. Its members asked nothing for themselves—but much for the Nation.

HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS

1947: Congress unanimously created the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, a 12-man bipartisan body. At the suggestion of President Truman, former President Herbert Hoover was named Chairman. The Commission appointed 24 voluntary task forces composed of 300 eminent experts to perform detailed research and report back to the Commission.

1949: The Commission made its 19-volume report to Congress including 273 specific recommendations for streamlining governmental organization, improving efficiency, and eliminating overlapping duplication, and waste. Back of the Commission's report were 2,300,000 words of task force facts and figures.

In that year, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a voluntary, bipartisan organization, was formed under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University. Working closely with scores of organized national groups and

backed up by State committees from coast to coast, the citizens committee rallied unprecedented support for the Commission's recommendations. Despite the intense opposition of powerful special groups, within and without the Government, some 72 percent of the Commission's recommendations were adopted within the next 3 years.

1952: Its work largely done, the citizens committee became virtually inoperative in order to avoid the crossfires of politics in a presidential year. The committee continued on a standby basis, however, under the interim chairmanships first of the late Morris Sayre and then of Sidney A. Mitchell.

1953: Congress, again unanimously, created the second Commission on Organization and again Mr. Hoover agreed to serve as chairman. Given broader powers by Congress, the Commission, aided by 19 task forces including some 400 voluntary experts, began the 2-year job of forging an even more massive report.

1955: The second Commission made its report to Congress including 314 recommendations based on 3,500,000 words of task force research.

The citizens committee was fully reactivated under the chairmanship of Clarence Francis. Again good citizens of both parties joined forces and, aided by scores of national civic groups, threw the full weight of their support behind the second Commission's proposals, 64 percent of which were adopted and are now being implemented at eventual annual savings of over \$3 billion a year.

1958: Having designated this as its "climax year," the citizens committee made the most forceful effort in its 9-year history and, as the 85th Congress adjourned, announced its withdrawal from the national scene.

THE MEN WHO FASHIONED THE FINAL REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONS

Members of the first Commission on Organization (1947-49): Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman; Dean G. Acheson, Senator George D. Aiken, Representative Clarence J. Brown, Arthur S. Flemming, James V. Forrestal, Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator John L. McClellan, Representative Carter Manasco, Dr. James K. Pollock, George H. Mead, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

Members of the second Commission on Organization (1953-55): Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman; Representative Clarence J. Brown, Herbert Brownell, Jr., Senator Homer Ferguson (and Senator Styles Bridges) James A. Farley, Arthur S. Flemming, Representative Chet Hollifield, Solomon C. Hollister, Joseph P. Kennedy, Senator John L. McClellan, Sidney A. Mitchell, and Robert G. Storey.

The first Commission received a congressional appropriation of \$1,938,600 and returned a surplus of \$31,000 to the Treasury. The second Commission had an appropriation of \$2,848,534 and returned a surplus of \$84,000.

The box score in brief

	1st Hoover Commission, 1947-49		2d Hoover Commission, 1953-55	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total recommendations proposed.....	273	-----	314	-----
Total recommendations adopted.....	196	72	200½	63.9
Recommendations accomplished by administrative action.....	111	41	146½	46.7
Recommendations accomplished by legislation.....	85	31	54	17.2
Total legislative enactments.....	77	-----	44	-----

Thus, all told, 121 pieces of enacted legislation were based in whole or in part upon

or reflected recommendations of the two Hoover Commissions. This includes 44 presidential reorganization plans and 77 public laws. The presidential plans were made possible by the Reorganization Act of 1949 (as recommended by the first Hoover Commission). Under it the President may submit reorganization plans to Congress and the plans become law unless rejected within 60 days by a majority of either House. Since 1949 the act has been renewed biennially by Congress and is still on the books, effective until March 1959.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FIRST HOOVER COMMISSION

In addition to the Reorganization Act of 1949, the most significant gains resulting from the first Commission's report were:

1. The Military Unification Act of 1949. While this measure left our Defense Establishment far short of complete unification, it was a great stride toward that goal. And it came just in time to produce unprecedented teamwork among the armed services in the critical early days of the Korean action.

2. Creation of the General Services Agency (combining four previous agencies) for more efficient Government housekeeping through modernized purchasing, inventory control, storage, and records management in the civilian agencies.

3. Complete internal reorganization of the State Department to clarify responsibilities, expedite communications, and break down artificial staff barriers.

4. Consolidation of functions in a Labor Department of full Cabinet stature.

5. The end of political appointments in the corruption-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue which now operates under the merit system.

6. Regrouping of welfare activities and creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

7. Separation of "hidden subsidies" from payments for carriage of airline mail.

8. Elimination of much delay, waste, and duplication in the Post Office.

Savings from these and other measures became hard to trace in the budget upsurge created by the Korean war. Special studies by the citizens committee, however, show that a total of at least \$7 billion in savings was made—based on the official reports of the Federal agencies themselves.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

The most important gains resulting from the second Hoover report are found in the most important—in terms of cost, national safety, or both—areas of Government.

1. Defense unification (H.R. 12541, now Public Law 599): The constitutional principle of civilian control of the military was strongly reinforced by this measure. The authority of the Secretary of Defense was greatly clarified concerning the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, and abolition of functions. The effectiveness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a planning unit was strengthened. The number of Assistant Secretaries was reduced. Many basic causes of interservice bickering and delay were eliminated or at least diminished.

Moreover—and this bears vitally on the safety of the Nation and the very lives of its people—the measure provides for unified combat commands. Frightening evidence of confusion and dissension in the frontal sectors of our defense bastions were brought out not only by the Hoover Commissions but by highly expert witnesses in the hearings on the unification bill.

Finally, this law includes, as an amendment, an economy provision of potential great weight. The amendment authorizes the unified procurement and management, under civilian control, of common-use defense supplies such as food, clothing, and fuel. In this area the second Commission

saw one of the most grievous causes of waste in the whole far-flung Defense Establishment. While the law is permissive, rather than mandatory, it does give the Defense Secretary a chance to effect enormous economies—and its passage tells him that Congress would like him to do so.

2. Modernized budgeting (H.R. 8002, now Public Law 759): The Commission found the Government operating under an obsolete budgeting system. Congress made lump-sum appropriations for long-term projects and thus rarely got a second look at the expenditures in the succeeding years. Huge sums in unexpended carryover appropriations were flowing over the dam beyond further congressional review. (The total of such carryovers was estimated at \$70 billion, almost equal to 1 year's budget.) The Commission recommended and Congress finally adopted "annual accrued expenditures budgeting." This means that henceforth the Government will pay, in a given year, only for the goods and services received in that year.

Modernized budgeting would not be possible, of course, without modernized accounting. The Commission also recommended a business-like system of cost-based accounting. This the Congress had approved via Public Law 853 in 1956.

3. Reduction of Government competition with private business: No one law (though several minor laws played a part) was responsible for the results of the Commission's recommendation in this important field. But the results, stemming largely from executive branch action, are impressive.

For example, the Commission found some 2,500 business-type establishments engaged in useless and costly competition with nearby private businesses, usually small businesses, in the Defense Department alone. These included bakeries, laundries, and factories making paint, eyeglasses, ice cream, rope, and scores of other civilian products. The Commission recommended that these be closed. To date over 700 have been or are being shut down or curtailed.

4. An improved Federal career service: The gains in this field were less a matter of legislation than executive action, though some useful laws were passed. In any case the gains were notable. The Commission made a major point of the need for attracting and holding competent administrative, managerial, and scientific personnel in Federal service. Chairman Hoover said: "Government cannot be any better than the men and women who make it function." The Commission proposed the creation of a "Senior civil service."

Since then a Career Executive Board has been set up by administrative action. The Board, under chairmanship of Arthur S. Flemming, has been authorized to proceed with the establishment of a program very similar to that which the Commission proposed. Another major Commission recommendation, providing higher salaries for specialized executive, scientific, and technical personnel, was accepted by Congress in 1956 (Public Law 854).

5. Coordination and expedition of Federal research: First of all, the increase in upper-bracket salaries is showing beneficial effects in the Government's quest for scientific and specialized personnel. By far the most significant improvement in the Federal research picture, however, is provided by section 9 of Public Law 599. (See Defense unification.)

This, based on one of the most fundamental of the Commission's recommendations, amounts to a congressional mandate to the Defense Department to eliminate duplication and delay in its presently overlapping and confused research programs. Further, it establishes for the first time the office of a departmental director of defense and research and engineering with broad powers not only to centralize and coordinate the

various research projects of the armed services but to initiate research programs on his own wherever he sees a gap or a lag.

The importance of this development can hardly be overstated. Recent studies have shown alarming contrasts in the time required for U.S. missile and other projects to move from the idea stage to the drawing board and then into production as compared with the record of the Russians.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

The record of the five major achievements of the second Commission is by no means the whole story. Of lesser importance, but well worth working for, were:

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This not only put an end to Government loans to snake farms and juke box operators; it returned \$474 million in capital funds to the Treasury. (This was also strongly recommended by the first Commission.)

Elimination of red tape in surplus property disposal. Public Law 680 ends the requirement that all transactions must be cleared with the Department of Justice for antitrust violations. This was a cause of endless delay and an inhibiting factor all along the line.

Greater coordination of military hospitals, with one branch of the service handling medical care for all military personnel within a given region. This dispels an ancient, and costly, theory that soldiers could get well only in Army hospitals, sailors in Navy hospitals, and so forth, even if it meant over-filled hospitals here and half-empty hospitals there.

Improved and simplified governmental paperwork. The Commission found that paperwork costs the Government \$4 billion a year, a sum nearly equal to the whole Federal budget 25 years ago. Now a Government-wide program of simplification and better records management is in progress. Example: The 1,040 largest post offices now use 600 standardized national forms in place of 22,000 local forms.

Establishment of a National Medical Library. Priceless volumes, badly neglected and ill-housed, were scattered through many parts of the Government. On the Commission's recommendation, these have been brought together and safely stored in a place where they can be used.

These things are merely representative of the scores and hundreds of examples of genuine governmental improvement stimulated by the Hoover Commissions. Other examples include: Defense cargo to commercial carriers. Since 1954, the Department of Defense has shifted its outbound military cargoes from Government vessels to privately owned carriers until today the latter carry about 75 percent of all loadings. This has made it possible to lay up 25 large Government transport ships, transferring the personnel to other duties. Installations closed. The Interior Department sold the Bluebeard Castle Hotel in the Virgin Islands and returned \$410,000 to the Treasury. Interior also discontinued its fuel demonstration plant at Louisiana, Mo., and its underground gasification plant at Gorgas, Ala. This saves \$3,100,000 a year in operating costs.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSIONS

Many established national civic organizations have announced voluntarily their intention of following through on the Commission's recommendations. As a guide, therefore, Reorganization News lists the following:

Principal unadopted recommendations of the first Commission: (1) Reduction of the number of agencies reporting directly to the President, (2) unification of the Federal medical services, (3) elimination of inter-agency competition in the field of natural

resources, (4) unification of the management of public lands, (5) reorganization and streamlining of the Veterans' Administration, and (6) a clear policy on medical care for non-service-connected disabilities.

Principal unadopted recommendations of the second Commission which are largely noncontroversial: (1) Establishment of a legal career service within the executive branch, (2) adoption of a congressional policy to eliminate unnecessary Government competition with private enterprise, (3) gradual but complete abolition of the Postal Savings System, (4) investigation of defense mobilization policies regarding retention and disposition of industrial properties, (5) elimination of duplicate staffing by both military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, (6) authorization for the Comptroller General to assist the Appropriations Committee in reviewing budget estimates, (7) establishment, within the General Services Administration, of an overall policy authority for the disposition of surplus property, (8) investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority fertilizer and chemical activities.

Principal unadopted recommendations of the second Commission which have aroused some degree of controversy: (1) Establishment of a coordinating Federal Advisory Council of Health, (2) reorganization of the Federal legal services by establishing a Federal Administrative Court and by other means, (3) establishment of a joint committee on intelligence matters, (4) improving the efficiency of Government lending agencies and making them self-supporting, (5) reorganization of Federal water resources and power activities and restriction of Federal activity to areas where private industry cannot operate, (6) full implementation of the senior civil service principle, (7) modernization of Federal personnel procedures to eliminate abuses, (8) improved methods of handling veterans' hospitalization problems.

"NECESSARILY A CONTINUING TASK"

(Further excerpts from a letter by President Eisenhower to Clarence Francis, chairman of the citizens committee:)

"I have had frequent evidence during the past 5 years of the enthusiasm with which the citizens committee carried on its important mission, and I have been delighted and encouraged by the effective support the committee has given to the administration in implementing recommendations of the Commission," the President said. He noted that the administration has accepted 77 percent of those Commission's proposals and that 83 percent of these are now being implemented in the executive branch. He went on to say:

"Government reorganization and administrative streamlining is necessarily a continuing task. The fact that the citizens committee has fulfilled its mission does not mean that no further effort is needed in this field. Quite the contrary. The administration will continue to put into effect recommendations not yet undertaken and will, in the operations of the Government, apply day by day many of the principles featured in the Commission's work. In addition, other reorganization plans, suggested as a result of the Hoover Commission studies, will be proposed from time to time.

"The time will again come when there will be need for a new comprehensive review such as inspired Mr. Hoover's monumental missions. Meanwhile, representative Government requires the day-by-day interest of thoughtful and able citizens who are alert to the organization and management problems of good Government and are willing to devote attention to them. . . . As the committee prepares to disband, I hope you will convey to all your associates my appreciation of the time and energy they have so generously contributed to these public affairs.

Surely their work has counted in the results obtained."

HOOVER LETTER

The following letter was directed to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report by former President Hoover:

THE WALDORF ASTORIA TOWERS,

New York, N.Y., September 17, 1958.

To the Members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

The citizens committee is now closing its activities after nearly 4 years of intensive effort. Its accomplishments could be listed with four paragraphs:

1. Many of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government have been adopted by the Departments.

2. There has been legislative enactment of important recommendations. Notably, Federal budgeting has been put on a business basis and Congress has regained control of the purse-strings. The Defense Department has been streamlined and procurement greatly simplified.

3. There has been a great saving to the taxpayers as a result of this. Economies totaling \$7 billion can be traced to the first Commission's report. And we are on our way to savings of upwards of \$3 billion a year as a result of the second Commission's recommendations.

4. Your crusade has been the greatest education of the American people in civil government since the Constitution was under debate.

As its Honorary Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to its Chairman, Clarence Francis; the managers of its New York and Washington offices, Charles B. Coates and Robert L. L. McCormick; its headquarters staff in New York and Washington; its State chairmen; and each individual in its State organizations. But this comprises so great a host of dedicated men and women that it is impossible.

But they can each take satisfaction in the successful issue of their work. And I add my unlimited admiration for their voluntary aid.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

FRANCIS' STATEMENT

As the citizens committee finished its work, Chairman Clarence Francis made the following statement:

"To the Members of the Citizens Committee:

"In our work together we have witnessed a memorable new demonstration of the traditional American principle of citizen participation in governmental affairs. Through two administrations we have seen how much can be accomplished by bipartisan teamwork between the Executive, the Congress, and the public. We can look back with pride today upon a great experience. The citizens committee is leaving the scene, to be sure, but this does not mean for a moment that there will be no further action on the Hoover Reports. We know that President Eisenhower will continue his interest in the remaining recommendations. We have been assured by congressional leaders of both parties that Congress will work for further action on many Commission proposals.

"Then there are the scores of national civic organizations which, all through the years, have lent such effective support to the drive for 'Better Government at a Better Price.' Many of these have already stated their intention of following on the recommendations appropriate to their own spheres of influence. Finally, I feel sure that the Nation's newspapers will carry on the splendid job of public information which they have conducted so vigorously since the very first days of the first Hoover Commission.

"Great ideas always have a way of going forward. I have faith in the spirit of the

Hoover Commission, and I believe that this spirit will be reborn again and again, finding its own paths to new achievement, in the years to come.

"CLARENCE FRANCIS."

Mr. Speaker, I believe this body would be interested to have the names and occupations of those distinguished and public-spirited citizens who directed the work of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Honorary chairman: The Honorable Herbert Hoover, New York City.

Chairman: Clarence Francis, former chairman, General Foods Corp.; chairman, Fund for Adult Education, New York City.

Chairman, finance committee: Colby M. Chester, honorary chairman, General Foods Corp., New York City.

Treasurer: N. Baxter Jackson, chairman, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., New York City.

Assistant treasurer: Keith M. Urmy, vice president, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., New York City.

Executive vice chairman: Charles B. Coates, president, Charles B. Coates & Co., Inc., New York City.

Administrative director: E. J. Ade, president, E. J. Ade & Co., Inc., New York City.

Research consultant: Robert L. L. McCormick, president, McCormick Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Vice chairmen: Charles R. Blyth, president, Blyth & Co., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; P. B. (Jack) Garrett, former president, Texas Bank & Trust Co., Dallas, Tex.; B. E. Hutchinson, former chairman of the finance committee, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Frank P. Leslie, president, the John Leslie Paper Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Julian S. Myrick, consultant, Mutual of New York, New York City; Neil Petree, president, Barker Bros., Los Angeles, Calif.; Allan Rushton, president, Birmingham Ice & Coal Storage Co., Birmingham, Ala.; Freeman Strickland, senior vice president, First National Bank of Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.; John Stuart, former chairman, Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; John C. Vivian, former Governor of Colorado, Denver, Colo.; Tracy S. Voorhees, counsel, President's Committee To Study the Military Assistance Programs, Washington, D.C.

Board of directors: Charles Dana Bennett, consultant, Foundation for American Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; E. LaMar Buckner, former president, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mrs. Theodore Chapman, former president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Jerseyville, Ill.; Colby M. Chester; Charles B. Coates; Gen. William Donovan, former Director of Strategic Services, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine, New York City; James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, chairman, the Coca Cola Export Co., New York City; Clarence Francis; Clinton S. Golden, executive director, trade union program, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Cambridge, Mass.; Richard J.

Gray, president, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.; Robert Heller, chairman, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; Solomon C. Hollister, dean, College of Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, Washington, D.C.; Oswald B. Lord, U.S. delegate to the United Nations, New York City; Neil MacNeil, former assistant managing editor, New York Times, Southampton, N.Y.; Roswell Magill, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Cravath, Swain & Moore, New York City; Sidney A. Mitchell, former Executive Director, first Hoover Commission, New York City; Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Herschel D. Newsom, grand master, National Grange, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Fred D. Patterson, director, Phelps Stokes Fund, New York City; Neil Petree, Stanley Resor, president, J. Walter Thompson Co., New York City; Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker, chairman, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Wallace H. Savage, former mayor of Dallas, Tex.; Lane, Savage & Counts, Dallas, Tex.; Joseph P. Spang, chairman, the Gillette Co., Boston, Mass.; Steve Stahl, executive vice president, Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Robert G. Storey, dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, Dallas, Tex.; John Stuart.

Advisory board: Warren R. Austin, first United States delegate to the United Nations, Burlington, Vt.; Donald Comer, chairman, executive committee, Avondale Mills, Birmingham, Ala.; Colgate W. Darden, Jr., former president, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; Charles Edison, chairman of the board, McGraw-Edison Co., West Orange, N. J.; Henry Ford II, president, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.; John N. Garner, former Vice President of the United States, Uvalde, Tex.; Lessing J. Rosenwald, former chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Jenkintown, Pa.; Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Anna Lord Strauss, former president, League of Women Voters of the United States, New York City; Charles E. Wilson, former Director of Defense Mobilization, former chairman, General Electric Co., New York City; Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War, Topeka, Kans.

Progress and Development in Janesville, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days of problems and great challenges, we recognize that one of the great phe-

nomena on the face of America is the growth and expansion of our villages, towns, and cities. In 1950 about 65 percent of our population lived in urban areas. Today it is an even higher percentage.

The future promises even greater growth for our urban centers. As a result, cities are confronted with the tremendous problems which growth and expansion create, including, among other things, ever-greater need for public services and facilities.

From time to time I have welcomed the opportunity to call attention to progress in Wisconsin—to areas which are realistically attempting to meet the challenge of today.

For example, the Janesville Daily Gazette recently published an annual program edition for its 80,000 readers. This splendid issue reviews progress during 1958 in business, industry, science, agriculture, building, government and many other fields.

Although it is not possible to highlight all the significant programs touched upon in the special edition of the Janesville Gazette, I should like to invite attention to a particular article, entitled "City Has Made Great Strides," by City Manager Joseph Lustig, of Janesville.

In his roundup, Mr. Lustig reviews the progress made in dealing with local problems, as well as on projects and overall improvements for the city itself. These include such programs as schools, highways, parks, housing, and others.

We recognize, of course, that constructive, forward-looking programs are in progress not only in Janesville but also in our villages, towns, and other cities throughout Wisconsin and the Nation.

As an illustration of the constructive effort by the Janesville community in meeting today's challenges—as well as in dealing with the many problems faced by our communities—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article entitled "City Has Made Great Strides."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY HAS MADE GREAT STRIDES

(By Joseph Lustig, city manager)

It is again my privilege to report to the citizens of Janesville on the accomplishments and progress made in the various fields of community matters and improvements dealt with during the year 1958. Whatever has been accomplished has been made possible by the men who serve you on the city council. These men have shown a recognition of the needs of our expanding community. They have devoted many long hours of their time in discharging the responsibilities of councilmen. Their positive approach to the many projects and problems which were submitted to them has resulted in one of the largest public improvement programs ever undertaken in one season.

The outstanding achievements of the year 1958 lie in the initiation and completion of the many projects which were outlined in my message of a year ago.

The tremendous size of the public works program, amounting to \$1,250,000, taxed the manpower and resources of the engineering department to the very limit. The following brief outline of the year's activities of

1958 will indicate the type and scope of the many projects carried on during the year.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND SCHOOLS

City hall: On March 21, the public was invited to inspect the completely remodeled city hall. Approximately 1,500 persons were shown the greatly expanded facilities provided to all departments in the building. The police department now occupies the entire basement level. The engineering department now has the larger quarters made possible by the removal of the municipal court to the new courthouse. The health department occupies the former council room on the second floor, with the city council and the patriotic societies jointly using the Patriotic Hall. A new six-passenger elevator provides easy access to the second floor. This entire remodeling project completed at a nominal cost of \$88,000 will serve the needs of the city for a great many years.

Golf shelter: A beautiful new shelter on the golf course in Riverside Park was put into use at the start of the 1958 season. This attractive structure, built at a cost of \$65,000, provides for all of the conveniences normally found in buildings on public courses—showers, locker rooms, and rest rooms. Light lunches are served all day long in the large central lobby, as well as in the lounge. The new quarters have added greatly to the use of the course and have helped increase revenues approximately \$6,000 over 1957.

Schools: The new 16-room Jefferson School on Mt. Zion Avenue and the 21-room Lincoln School on South Oakhill Avenue were opened for the 1958 fall term. These beautiful and functional school buildings, dedicated on November 23, will provide for the needs of these fast growing sections of the city. The financing of the schools was provided for by a \$1,845,000 bond issue made in August 1957.

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

Concrete paving program: A continuing concrete paving program has resulted in the paving of 11 blocks of North and South Academy Street, 4 blocks of Pleasant Street, one-fourth of a mile of Magnolia Avenue, three-fourths of a mile on Milwaukee Avenue to the east city limits, 2 blocks of North Main Street north of Fourth Avenue, and the long needed paving of Eastern Avenue from South Cherry Street to Center Avenue. The removal of the railroad tracks from the roadway in North Main Street and the decrease in the grade on Eastern Avenue have greatly added to the effective use of both of these important streets.

Bituminous paving: The city continued its policy of providing the newly developing areas with curb and gutter and blacktop paving. Approximately 41 miles of streets were so improved during the past year.

Interstate highway: The year 1958 should see the Janesville-Beloit section of U.S. 90 well along toward completion. We were successful in our attempts to obtain additional underpasses with this highway at Mt. Zion Avenue and east of Palmer Park. The Palmer Park underpass was granted upon the condition that easements for a new road be obtained which starts at U.S. 11 and extends easterly through the requested underpass to County Trunk J. These road easements were obtained from the five owners of the land it traverses. The underpass makes possible a new arterial road to be known as Palmer Drive.

Centerway: Centerway and the new Fourth Avenue Bridge were opened to the public on July 1, 1958. The value of this project as a principal traffic artery is apparent to all. Traffic volume has steadily increased, so that now Centerway is by far the most heavily traveled street in the city and a great convenience to east-west travel.

Arterial street system: The council, by ordinance on October 27, established a system of arterial streets. This comprehensive plan creates an orderly and functional sys-

tem of main traffic arteries and should provide for easy and safe travel in all sections of the city.

Five points overhead: The council, acting upon the recommendations of the five points council committee, asked the manager to make application to the Wisconsin Highway Commission for the rerouting of Highway 11 westerly along West Milwaukee Street over the railroad tracks and west along Pleasant Street.

A continuing study of train movements will be carried on and from time to time these results will be submitted to the council Five Points committee for its further consideration. If further studies show a marked decrease in traffic stoppages and indicate a lessening need for a grade separation project, the council can alter its position with respect to its request for the rerouting of Highway 11. The present studies have shown a 52-percent reduction since 1951 in the number of traffic stoppages caused by train movements at this important crossing. This decrease can be attributed to the increasing use of diesel engines, the decrease in passenger trains, and the general decline in the railroad freight business.

Main trunk sewers: About 12.3 miles of sanitary sewers were constructed during 1958 in which are included 3 miles of main-trunk sewers. This system of main-trunk sewers made possible the extension of sanitary sewers to all areas east and south of the city annexed since 1954 and will serve future annexations to the east and south of the present city limits.

Off-street parking: There is an acute need in the central business district for close-in off-street customer parking on the west side of Rock River. This need has been partly met by the purchase of a parcel of land at Centerway and North High Street. This land will provide a 72-car parking lot for long-time parking and makes possible an extension of meter parking in the city hall lot. In addition to the twenty-two 2-hour meter parking stalls now in use, there will be installed 22 additional metered stalls which will provide for parking from 1 hour to 24 hours with a maximum charge of 25 cents.

The capacity of the South Franklin Street parking lot, opposite the YMCA, will be increased by the council-authorized purchase of a parcel of land lying adjacent to the alley east of the Franklin Street lot to provide for a total parking of 71 cars.

ANNEXATION

On September 29, 1958, the council by ordinance extended the east city limits one-half mile east by the annexation of 120 acres of land lying south of Ruger Avenue between the existing east city limits and the east line of the proposed right-of-way of U.S. 90, the new Interstate road.

PARKS

Palmer Park: Parking has long been a problem in Palmer Park. In connection with the annexation of the 120 acres of land referred to above, the owner of the land, Mr. Clarence Steinhilper, donated to the city some 22 acres of the newly annexed land lying north of Palmer Park for park purposes. A portion of this land will provide parking for 500 cars and will also provide for an extension of Palmer Park to the north and east.

Monterey Park: A historic marker was placed in the lookout on the big rock in Monterey Park. The marker, consisting of a bronze plaque mounted on a stone pedestal, was made possible by the friends of a former citizen and local teacher, Mrs. Lola Webb (deceased) and the Rock County Historical Society.

This marker points to the site of the first log cabin erected in Rock County. Mrs. Webb taught and was greatly interested in the early history of this area. The plaque was erected

in her memory and hundreds of interested citizens and third grade pupils attended the dedication ceremony on November 21, 1958.

HOUSING

An indication of the general growth of the city is evidenced by the 275 homes for which permits have been issued during 1958; of this number 129 are being built in the northeast quarter of the city.

SHOPPING CENTERS

The growth or spread of our cities is a phenomenon which followed the increase in the use of the automobile and the desire for suburban living. The general prosperity which we have been enjoying has created an ever-increasing number of homeowners who are building in the outlying real estate development in the newly annexed areas of this city.

This spread of the urban areas has brought about the outlying modern shopping centers which in Janesville are represented by the newly opened Creston Park Shopping Center in the northeasterly section of the city and Sunnyside Shopping Center on the west side. There are indications of another such development on the south side of the city.

TAXES

Janesville has for a great many years enjoyed an extremely low tax rate due to large sums of money returned to Janesville from State income taxes. That happy situation has now changed. The city of Milwaukee in 1957 filed a claim against Janesville contending that \$476,000 of income tax moneys was paid Janesville which should have properly been received by Milwaukee.

Your manager, together with legal and accounting counsel, fought against the validation of this claim by the Wisconsin Tax Commission. In spite of all our efforts the tax commission ruled against Janesville. Janesville has by reason of this decision suffered a loss of not only a large part of the \$476,000 claim, but over \$1 million which sum was deducted from Janesville's share of income tax money. This loss in a large part is responsible for the \$3 raise in the 1957 rate and the \$7.50 raise in the 1958 rate. Rising school and county taxes accounted for \$5.26 of the \$7.50 increase in the 1958 rate. It will be difficult to adjust to the higher tax rate but, needless to say, no city is immune to the rising school costs and overall general increases in costs of all services and commodities. I am sure when all the tax rates of other cities in the class of Janesville have been made public, we will again find Janesville's full value tax rate much below the average of tax rates for cities in our class.

1959

The coming year will be more nearly normal in the anticipated volume of public works projects. Projects which should be initiated in 1959 have been deferred owing to the financial crisis in which the city has found itself, resulting from the Milwaukee claim for misallocated income tax money. It is hoped that in the very near future the city will again be able to carry on the most necessary public works projects. Among such projects would be a garage to house the Janesville bus system. The city garage built in 1948 is more than half occupied by the bus department. This means that the department of public works must keep trucks and equipment out in the yard, instead of under cover. Starting motors in below zero weather is not conducive to good equipment maintenance, nor to efficient department operation during emergencies.

In conclusion, much has been accomplished during the past year that is important to the citizen's welfare and our economy. Janesville has made tremendous strides toward becoming a modern and progressive community and every citizen can look with pride upon these accomplishments.

It is hoped that this report, which of necessity is limited to a general overall picture, and includes but a few of the many varied and complex activities of your city government, will assist the citizen in understanding the operations of his government, so that he may better judge it. Your tax dollar will continue to be one of your best investments in the future of Janesville and it is the past accomplishments that have set an example of what can be achieved through the cooperative efforts of the citizens and their government.

In looking forward we hope we can continue a constructive program that will maintain Janesville as an outstanding community.

To all the residents of the city I would like to express appreciation for their interest in local government, their understanding of our mutual problems and good will shown by all in helping us deal with these problems.

Dope Peddlers in Pennsylvania Obtain Clemency Despite the Vigorous Objections of the Secretary of Internal Affairs, a Member of the Pardon Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the December 3, 1958, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer reveals the red-carpet treatment accorded dope peddlers in the State of Pennsylvania by Governor Leader's administration.

Despite the opposition of District Attorney Victor H. Blanc, of Philadelphia, and Miss Genevieve Blatt, secretary of internal affairs and also a member of the pardon board, Governor Leader ordered the release of 13 Philadelphia drug peddlers and 1 addict before expiration of their terms. Such a display of leniency for drug offenders has shocked narcotic enforcement authorities and has shattered their morale, as well as, seriously threatening the program to rid the Keystone State of dope peddlers.

The article by Joseph H. Miller, of the Harrisburg Bureau of the Philadelphia Inquirer follows:

LEADER IGNORES MISS BLATT AGAIN, RELEASES 13 MORE DOPE PUSHERS

(By Joseph H. Miller)

HARRISBURG, December 2.—Gov. George M. Leader today ordered release of 13 Philadelphia drug peddlers and 1 addict before their terms expired despite the opposition of Secretary of Internal Affairs Genevieve Blatt and District Attorney Victor H. Blanc, of Philadelphia.

As had happened before, Miss Blatt's name was again rubberstamped on the commutation papers as having approved clemency for the narcotics pushers. This time, however, her name was scratched off by pardon board aids before the papers were filed with the secretary of the Commonwealth's office. She is a member of the pardon board.

SPECTACULAR PROTEST

Last week Miss Blatt created a sensation on capitol hill when she marched to the

Commonwealth office and personally struck her name from commutation papers after learning her protest against clemency had been ignored by the Governor's office and that she had been recorded as voting her approval.

Twelve narcotics pushers were ordered freed at that time by Leader before the expiration of their 3- to 5-year terms. When the pardon board ruled they were entitled to time off under good behavior law.

Those ordered released by Leader today were serving 5-year terms imposed in 1955.

OTHERS BACK RELEASE

Three other members of the pardon board recommended freedom for the drug peddlers. They were Attorney General Thomas D. McBride, Lt. Gov. Roy E. Furman, and Secretary of the Commonwealth John S. Rice.

Clemency pleas for the narcotics pushers were filed by the board of trustees of the Philadelphia County prisons and were based on their good conduct while jailed.

Petitions filed in behalf of the addict and 13 pushers were heard at the September, October, and November hearings held by the board.

The effective date of the release of 11 drug peddlers was fixed for yesterday. Another was made effective today, while the others were ordered freed December 6 and December 18.

OPPOSITION BY BLANC

During pardon board hearings in Philadelphia and Harrisburg, District Attorney Blanc served notice on the commutation agency members he was opposed to the release of drug peddlers before their terms expired, regardless of the good-behavior law.

Despite the provisions of the good-behavior law, the Governor has optional power to compel the prisoners to complete their terms.

Drug peddlers serving 5-year terms who were ordered released by Leader included: James E. Gordon, Henry Anderson, William DeLoatch, Charles Vanderhost, Dock J. Carter, James Harris, Sterling Sparkman, Cash Sutton, Earl L. Jasper, Jr., Robert Matthews, Russell Arrington, Raymond Mor-torano, and Robert F. Clark, Jr.

William Marling, serving a 3-year term for use and possession of drugs, also was ordered released. His term will not expire until September 6, 1959.

Claim Farmers "Never Had It So Good" Is Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout the months preceding last November there was a spate of publicity emphasizing apparently favorable trends in the farm situation. The Secretary of Agriculture himself remarked at a chamber of commerce meeting in Pittsburgh that "farmers never had it so good."

These claims have faded out recently. But undoubtedly, they have left the impression with many that our present farm programs are succeeding, that the farmers' situation is on the way to improvement, and that nothing much remains to be done. This is a most unfortunate illusion.

The fact is, Mr. President, that farm operators' net income has declined by a

staggering one-third in the past decade, measured in terms of real purchasing power. That is, the purchasing power of net farm operators' income in 1947 totaled \$18.8 billion in dollars of 1957 value; the estimated total for 1958 was down to only \$12.8 billion. These figures are provided by Mr. Leon Keyserling, director of the Conference on Economic Progress, in a pamphlet just issued which is entitled "Toward a New Farm Program." Mr. Keyserling has computed the total net farm operators' income for each year in dollars of constant 1957 value, as follows:

Net farm operators' income (in 1957 dollars)	
Year:	Billions of dollars
1947.....	18.8
1948.....	20.3
1949.....	15.2
1950.....	16.3
1951.....	17.4
1952.....	16.2
1953.....	14.1
1954.....	13.2
1955.....	12.3
1956.....	12.0
1957.....	11.6
1958.....	12.8

(Estimate based on preliminary data from U.S. Department of Agriculture.)

One of the best brief statements of the real agricultural problem that I have seen was published recently in *Pure Milk News*, the official journal of the Pure Milk Association. This organization of dairy farmers who provide much of the milk consumed by residents of Chicago includes several thousand in Wisconsin. It is one of the most stable, responsible, and effective dairy farmer groups in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix the following statement by Mr. Walter E. Winn, president of Pure Milk Association, which appeared in the November issue of *Pure Milk News*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FACE THE FACTS

For several weeks past, the public has been treated to a barrage of goody-goody stories stating that the American farmer was in clover. He never had it so good.

Gross farm income and per capita farm income from all sources were at an alltime high—net income 22 percent above last year. Production was breaking all previous records and prices received by farmers were 8 percent higher than last year.

These statements will bear further examination and analysis. Taken at their face value, more manpower and capital could be attracted into farming to get some of this easy money. Why not, when farmers are represented as being so prosperous that they resent having to wash their own Cadillacs. I don't happen to know a single farmer who owns one but the metropolitan press gives that impression.

The average price of things farmers raise and sell soared early this spring because of scarcity of fruit, vegetables, beef, and pork. The first two fairly skyrocketed because of the Florida freeze. Beef was scarce because several years of drought in the Southwest was finally relieved with rain, and the ranchers then bid against the meat market for animals to restock their ranges. High-priced beef supported the hog market. Most other important farm products, such as wheat,

feed grains, and dairy products are selling for less than a year ago.

Certainly the orange growers who received the highest price in years welcomed their newly found prosperity. But the 20 percent of orange growers living in the area of the freeze had no income at all and did not join in the rejoicing. They will not for several years, or until their groves are rebuilt. Cattlemen in the drought area are in similar position.

Prosperity that has to be based on the misfortunes of others—or war—is poor cause for exultation. But much political credit is being garnered today for sound programs that pretend to have turned the farmers' fortunes again toward prosperity. Farmers badly need the turn in that direction but they had better understand the cause.

All those who have advocated more freedom to produce, no acreage limits, and lower price supports, are claiming the recent upsurge of farm prices and income as proof that their program is working and is in the best interest of farmers. Actually, this year's experience proves just the reverse. The high prices that were received were only on products that were severely restricted in production by disaster—frost and drought.

Almost without exception, farm economists are predicting that our surpluses in the coming years will increase, and that farm prices and income will go down. The following table tells quite a story:

(In billions)

Year	National income	Cash farm income	Net farm income
1947.....	\$185.4	\$29.7	\$17.2
1948.....	210.0	30.3	15.9
1949.....	206.0	27.9	13.7
1950.....	221.6	28.4	12.9
1951.....	253.3	32.9	14.8
1952.....	268.8	32.6	14.3
1953.....	281.5	31.2	13.9
1954.....	280.0	29.9	12.2
1955.....	302.4	29.5	11.6
1956.....	320.0	30.4	12.1
1957.....	333.8	30.3	12.1

These figures explain why, in recent years, there has been the greatest migration out of agriculture the Nation has ever seen. Although 1958 gross farm income is the highest of record, costs have mounted at an even faster rate leaving a constantly lower net income which is the figure the farmer really works for.

Many farmers have found their incomes so low that it has been necessary to help out with off-farm or industrial work. This is currently bringing in \$6 to \$7 billion a year, or a third of total income. When this is added to farm income and divided by the lesser number of farmers, per capita income from all sources is quite a different figure than just farm income. But when a farmer works 8 hours a day in town for needed money to support his family, leaving his wife and children to do the milking and chores, his wages shouldn't be added in and announced as farm income. There are a lot of families who like living in the country well enough to be willing to put in these extra hours and that is their choice. But let's be honest in the bookkeeping and not credit farming with an added 50 percent of income earned from other sources.

Farmers are leaving for city employment because their incomes are low, not high. With rare exceptions, they have thereby improved their income and living standards. Nothing apparently is going to stem this trend to larger and more efficient farms. Those who leave agriculture are likely to solve their own income problem but not that of agriculture. Those who stay will continue to expand total production.

The unanswered question is, "Will increased production at resulting lower prices solve the farm income problem?"

Farm organization leaders and agricultural economists are not in agreement. It is a time for study, not pessimism. Clouding the picture with a distortion of the facts will not aid in finding the solution. Headlines telling our consumers that a dairy farmer never had it so rosy when his earnings for 5 years have averaged less than 50 cents per hour, can only worsen our public relations at a time when the situation cries for better understanding.

Those who favor lower price supports have made no secret of their intention to work for lower milk prices in the next session of Congress. The inescapable facts are that farmers have new-found capacity to produce which so far has not been checked by either the controls tried or 5 years of lower prices. We have a built-up storage of feed grains and wheat which can, with our probable future expanded production, raise havoc with grain and livestock prices for some years to come. On this outlook there is little disagreement among the farm economists.

It means, among other things, that many more in agriculture will continue to seek other means of livelihood. Those who claim that all that is needed is to turn agriculture free to produce to the utmost, and that all will then be well, are ignoring all the farm history of 100 years. We do need changes in our farm programs but let's courageously face the facts and build accordingly.

The Senate Debate on Rule XXII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Times today contains a perceptive editorial summarizing the results of the recent Senate debate on rule XXII. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE FIASCO

Two months ago the results of the 1958 congressional elections were interpreted everywhere as a sweeping victory for liberalism, particularly in the Senate. Down to defeat went Mr. Bricker and other stalwarts on the Republican side. Into the Senate came new Democrats from the North and West, younger men with a lively interest in such matters as the cause of civil liberties. On all sides it was predicted that in these matters the new Senate would help to write a bolder and more rewarding record than its predecessor.

Perhaps that will happen eventually, but certainly the new Senate is off to a poor start in this direction. It has turned down a reasonable proposal to end debate by majority vote after it has become clear that debate has ceased to be debate and become obstruction. It had rejected a similar proposal to end such debate by a three-fifths vote. It has wound up by amending the present rule, which requires a two-thirds vote of the entire membership, only to the extent of requiring a two-thirds vote of those present and voting; but since the entire membership of the Senate is almost certain to be marshaled in a vote on ending debate on such matters as civil liberties the change is to all intents and purposes meaningless.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who engineered this meager result, characterizes it as a democratic victory: "It is the will of the people that is reflected here."

So thinks Mr. JOHNSON. Our own estimate differs.

Old No. 4: Yesterday and Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published by the Vermont Historical Society entitled "Old No. 4: Yesterday and Today." The article was written by Dr. J. Duane Squires. Dr. Squires is a noted historian, author, and lecturer whose recent history of the State of New Hampshire is outstanding. He is head of the social studies department at Colby Junior College, New London, N.H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD NO. 4: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

(By James Duane Squires, Ph. D., president, Old Number Four Associates)

In an article in the New York Times for Sunday, July 27, 1958, Joseph L. Wheeler describes how amateur historian-archaeologists in Vermont are now working in charting the course of four one-time colonial or Revolutionary highways. One of these, he points out, is the Crown Point Road, which ran from the Connecticut River near old No. 4 to Chimney Point, Vt., adjacent to the Crown Point Fort. Because of plans now underway to restore old No. 4, this particular colonial highway is of special interest to us today. It is of this fort and of this highway that I write in this essay.

In the first half of the 18th century, during the lull between Queen Anne's War (1701-13) and King George's War (1744-48), the Colony of Massachusetts determined to build four frontier forts to guard the western part of the Bay Colony from Indian forays out of Canada. These were located in the modern New Hampshire towns of Chesterfield, Westmoreland, Walpole, and Charlestown, but were then called by the serial number No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. Number 4 was at present-day Charlestown, and was the final jumping-off point for the wilderness lying between the colonies in New England and the French settlements in Canada. In 1740, by royal decree, these four forts were transferred to the jurisdiction of New Hampshire. In that year King George II made the present northern boundary of Massachusetts the definitive line between the two colonies.

Old fort No. 4 was built close to the Connecticut River and covered an area of three-quarters of an acre on a site on the main street of the present village. Archaeological excavations in 1957 definitely established the site of the old fortification, and brought to light a number of relics of the 18th century. It was composed of 13 houses joined together to make a quadrangle. As a further protection on three sides—the west, north, and east—a stockade was built. This was made of logs a foot in diameter and about 12 feet high above ground. This was the fort which under Capt. Phineas Stevens withstood an attack of several hundred French and Indians in April 1747. This was the base which was a key point in military operations

through modern Vermont during the French and Indian War, 1754-63.

In the early campaigns of that war the normal route for New England troops going to the areas around Lake George and Lake Champlain was across Massachusetts, over the Berkshire Hills to Albany, and thence north to Fort Edward and the fighting zone. For Massachusetts soldiers this meant a long tramp around two sides of a triangle. New Hampshire regiments usually went to old No. 4, thence down the river to Massachusetts, and then over the hills to the west. This meant marching or boating along three sides of a quadrilateral. However necessary this might have been in the early years of the war, after the French had lost Fort Ticonderoga, and Crown Point, a more direct road from New Hampshire to Crown Point was obviously desirable.

On July 27, 1759, the fleur-de-lis flag was pulled down at Ticonderoga, and the Union Jack went up. A few days later the same situation came about at Crown Point. General Amherst, the British commander, thereafter determined to begin construction of a military road from his new bastion at Crown Point to the Connecticut River opposite old No. 4, some 87 miles away. The preliminary orders were issued to Capt. John Stark of Rogers Rangers on August 8. Stark promptly set out to make a survey across modern Vermont. In the great central wilderness of the Green Mountains he and his men found not even a pathway or a blazed trail. Stark reported his findings to Amherst on Sept. 9. The general approved the recommended route and on October 26 sent out Maj. Zadok Hawks and Captain Stark with 250 men and proper tools to begin construction from the western end.

The two officers and their axmen started at Chimney Point and laid out the road through Addison, Bridport, and Shoreham in a southeasterly direction. In Shoreham the road changed its direction to east by south. Crossing portions of Orwell, Whiting, and Sudbury it came out on Otter Creek in the northwestern part of Brandon. From thence it went to the village of Fowler in Pittsford. From Pittsford it turned to the southeast through Rutland and into Clarendon. The Green Mountains were approached near the village of East Clarendon. The road climbed steeply to Shrewsbury and thence to Mount Holly. From this region the road turned toward Patch Pond and Lake Amherst. It is, of course, obvious that not all this could possibly have been finished in the autumn of 1759. The roadmakers were low in provisions and in morale, and were paid off at old No. 4 on November 16. Probably the first few miles only were at all adequately done, the rest being merely roughed out and blazed.

In the spring of 1760 Col. John Goffe of the New Hampshire militia with 800 men was assigned the task of completing the road from the eastern end. By the middle of June most of the regiment had assembled at old No. 4. The men, their animals, and materials crossed the Connecticut 2 miles above the fort at Wentworth's Ferry. Here they built a blockhouse for protection and storage of equipment. The road, beginning at this blockhouse on the western bank of the river, ran for about 11 miles northwesterly through Springfield and Weathersfield. From that town it crossed into Cavendish, keeping to the hills away from the Black River. At Twenty-Mile Camp in Cavendish, Colonel Goffe set up his headquarters for the final section of the road work.

Beyond Cavendish the new construction went through Ludlow and into Plymouth. In that town it descended toward Echo Lake and thence went to Lake Amherst. Here the builders reached the end of construction by the working party of 1759. No Indians had been seen during the course of the work, but Colonel Goffe was always alert. On July 28

men, wagons, and cattle began passing over the new road; and on July 31 the advance contingents of these reached Crown Point. The highway was now open, and for the first time in colonial history there was a direct route from New Hampshire across modern Vermont. Old No. 4 was the anchor point on the east, and Crown Point the terminus on the west.

Seventeen years later old No. 4 was again prominent in military affairs. This time it was the rendezvous for Gen. John Stark and his New Hampshire troops marching to Bennington. Stark and his men left the fort on August 3 and moved by the old road for part of their way across Vermont. On August 7 the force reached Peru, and on August 8 the general and his 1,000 men camped in Manchester. Throughout this crossing all supplies, reinforcements, and equipment were forwarded to Stark from his operational base at old No. 4.

These are some of the reasons why modern Americans are interested in the restoration of this important colonial and Revolutionary fort. About 10 years ago certain persons in Charleston, N.H., incorporated the Old Number Four Associates. Since then much has been done. A competent architect has been secured, and careful plans for the restoration of the fort have been made. A new site has been secured, the old one now being in the heart of the present village. But the new site is in every way comparable to the original location, and is even closer to Wentworth's Ferry than was the fort 200 years ago. Many groups in New Hampshire have endorsed the restoration effort: the State Planning and Development Commission, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, the New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, the Society of Colonial Wars, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and numerous local clubs and historical societies.

The estimated cost of the restoration of old No. 4 is \$200,000. This amount will buy the land, build the 13 houses, erect the stockade, and permit some operating capital for the first year or so. The first logs for the stockade were donated by Dartmouth College, and set in place in July 1958. A great pageant, telling the story of old No. 4, drew many people to the site on August 15 and August 16, and awakened in them a new understanding of the place and function of the old fort in colonial and Revolutionary history.

Many Vermonters have sensed the significance of this program of restoration. Vest Orton, chairman of the Vermont Historic Sites Commission, has written to the associates as follows:

"The commission feels, and we have emphasized this in our report to the General Assembly of Vermont, that there is a new and significant point of view toward the historic site mission in the States. It is this: Geography, we say, attracts people; history holds them. Good luck and all the success you so well deserve."

Prominent citizens of the Green Mountain State who live along the Connecticut River have served, and are now serving, as officers and directors of the Old Number Four Associates.

Such places as Williamsburg, Shelburne, Old Sturbridge, and others show clearly that restorations of historic sites and areas can charm and inspire modern Americans. It is believed that the restoration of old No. 4 in exactly its original form will have the same effect upon thousands of people, not only in Vermont and New Hampshire but also among our visitors. Perhaps by the time that we celebrate the bicentennial of the completion of the Crown Point Road in 1960, the old fort will be ready for inspection. From the same place that Colonel Goffe and General Stark took off 200 years ago, contemporary Americans may begin a trip across the scenic roads of Vermont.

How America Has Benefited Through 75 Years of the Civil Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay entitled "How America Has Benefited Through 75 Years of the Civil Service Act," written by Donald M. Van Dyke, of Arizona State University, in a recent contest conducted by various civil service groups.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW AMERICA HAS BENEFITED THROUGH 75 YEARS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

(By Donald M. Van Dyke, Arizona State University)

The Civil Service Commission was established by the Pendleton Act in 1883. Its objectives were few and simple. The act was to—

1. Assure proper qualification of Government employees.
2. Take the Government worker out of political bondage by prohibiting political officers from extracting campaign contributions from him or making his employment subject to political support.
3. Halt the creation of Government jobs for the purpose of rewarding political support.

There is no doubt that the Civil Service Act has done far more than accomplish the limited objectives of 1883. In its first year civil service placed over 10 percent of the Federal employees under a formal merit system. Over 2 million, or nearly 90 percent, of the Federal Government employees are now protected by civil service regulations. These figures do not tell the entire story. Many State, county, and municipal governments have passed versions of the Federal Civil Service Act which cover additional millions of local government employees.

The growth of civil service has not been in numbers alone. The standards required for entry into Government employment have continued to rise since the act was passed. In its beginning the Commission took a negative approach, assuring that Government employees possessed minimum qualifications and seeing that Government workers were not dismissed for political reasons. Today the Commission, in its drive for better government in the United States, seeks the highest qualified individuals rather than the "just" qualified; it encourages training programs for prospective public employees; and seeks to improve working conditions, in an attempt to make the American Government employee the best there is.

These improvements under the Civil Service Act are unquestionable. Those mentioned are most certainly not the only, nor necessarily the most outstanding, accomplishments, but they make up a representative list against which no argument will stand. This list only serves to establish that the civil service system has made great progress toward improving government service in the last 75 years. It is a base from which to ask, "What are the benefits of this growing civil service system?"

The accomplishments of the Civil Service Act include those gained under State and municipal civil service systems. A government employee may work for the National, State, county, or city government. A civil

service system may be in effect at any or all of these levels. The list of benefits from the Civil Service Act stems from all of them, not any single one. The terms "civil service system" and "government employee" include those of all governmental units in the country. These terms should be understood in this context if the full meaning of the benefits of the Civil Service Act are to be acknowledged.

Benefits from the Civil Service Act can be placed in four main categories. Civil service benefits to the Nation and the people, civil service benefits to the Government, civil service benefits to Government employees and benefits resulting for nonmerit system employees. Examples of how they have benefited from the Civil Service Act are discussed below.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS THE NATION AND THE PEOPLE

Not one day goes by but what each American is affected by some governmental service. Perhaps the most impressive example is the American food supply. Grocery stores draw stock from all parts of the Nation. Florida fruit can be purchased anywhere, Idaho potatoes are eaten in Maine and corn from Iowa is used for cornpone in Alabama.

The American housewife has no fear of unsanitary packing conditions contaminating the food she buys. She does not weigh or measure each of her purchases to see if she is actually getting what is marked on the package. Government employees, working under provisions of food and drug acts, laws prohibiting false advertising and laws providing for enforcement of sanitary conditions in packing plants and canning factories, do these things. Spoilage is reduced by fast transportation of perishable foodstuffs on highways constructed by the Government, or on trains and planes regulated by Federal commissions. Lettuce purchased in St. Paul today may well have been picked in Arizona yesterday.

Americans have these services because the Civil Service Act makes it possible to have confidence in government employees who administer them. Officials who carry out these programs are capable and competent. It is the civil service system which guarantees highly qualified employees to perform these services. In this way improvements in the civil service system reach into every American home every day of the year.

Medicine, drugs, gasoline, clothes, and heating fuels are other items which are supplied to the American consumer under Government supervision and protection. These are only a few ways in which the American citizen benefits from an effective civil service system.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS THE GOVERNMENT

Constitutions and laws are often regarded as government; however, constitutions and laws only set out the form and scope of government operation. People who fill the positions and perform the tasks as set out by these legal requirements are in reality the government. In the United States there are less than 500 elected Federal officials. There are over 2 million nonelected employees. These people are the government. Their competence, ability, and efficiency is the competence, ability, and efficiency of the government.

Quite obviously the government can only be as good as the individuals who perform its functions. It is by constantly raising the standards which these individuals must observe that the civil service system, for 75 years, has been improving the government. The merit system makes it possible for individuals who are dedicated to public service to devote themselves to public service rather than to political servitude. There are many who feel a sincere desire to serve the people, and it has been the civil service system which has allowed these men and women to enter the field by closing the public service to

political hacks, ward heelers, and campaign managers. As those who are in government gain higher standards and proficiency, as they become more efficient, and as more dedicated persons enter the government, the government itself improves.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Benefits gained by civil service employees appear to be very obvious. Tenure has been tremendously improved by placing it on a performance basis, rather than on political affiliation; civil service employees can no longer be forced to make contributions to political campaigns; hiring is based on ability, not political activity; salaries have improved greatly; and working conditions are better than in former years. These are some of the obvious improvements in Government employment brought about by the Civil Service Act. There are others just as important. The prestige of governmental workers has risen greatly. No longer does Federal employment bring the charge of "parasite." An employee's coworkers are pleasant to work with and have qualifications at least equal to his own. His superiors must meet high requirements of proficiency and ability and demonstrate these abilities in order to obtain and hold their positions of authority. As an individual gains more experience and training he can qualify himself for higher positions, with the realization that he will be allowed to compete fairly for promotions.

Such improvements lead to a higher level of morale, to a great esprit de corps within the Government service. This attracts even more highly qualified persons into competition for Government positions. Such improvement brings recognition to a highly qualified civil service and pride in the service motivates employees to even better performance.

The civil service system has upgraded the civil servant in the eyes of the public as a whole and has had a special effect in other instances. A young person wishing to enter Government employment can now attend colleges and universities that offer courses in public administration, courses which are designed to train outstanding young people for years of high quality service in the Government. This condition is one which tends to perpetuate and improve itself once started.

Another advantage to the public servant which has come to be realized through the Civil Service Act is the operation of governmental job classification systems. Wages paid by the Government may leave something to be desired when compared to those paid by private industry, but they have improved greatly. There is no longer an unfair wage spread among those who are performing the same or equal jobs. All employees of equal rank receive an equal salary. The more experienced ones are paid for their extra ability on an equal basis. The qualifications necessary for obtaining promotions are known and if met the employee will be promoted on the basis of his ability. Wage levels and promotions are no longer determined by political contacts. They are set according to ability on a competitive basis. Even if Government wages are regarded as low the fact that they are based according to ability demonstrates improvement already gained and indicates the possibility for future gains.

Once again space permits enumerating only a few instances of the advantages and benefits of civil service in this category. The above list is intended as only a partial sample.

CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS EMPLOYEES NOT UNDER ITS CONTROL

Civil service has proven itself in the last 75 years as a workable, desirable way of selecting and holding good governmental employees. It has set high standards and conditions which can be compared to governmental units not using an accepted merit

system. If an exempt unit does not measure up properly or suffers abuses in any way, then the public may, and with pressure, effectively demand that the concerned group of employees be brought under a civil service program.

Under these circumstances any agency wanting to avoid being placed under the civil service system must maintain comparable standards of fair employment and, above all, employ competent, able people. While such units may be able to avoid meeting some of the standards imposed by civil service their overall level has been raised simply by the existence of the civil service system. Therefore many of the benefits of the Civil Service Act have been passed on to most Government employees.

CIVIL SERVICE AND THE FUTURE

Civil service has undoubtedly improved public employment. It has not done so to the extent that there are not more improvements to be made. The job the Civil Service Act was designed to do is done. A great deal more has been done. There are still many jobs remaining for the civil service system to do. The problem of raising public wages to compete with private industry has been mentioned, as has the fact that there are still many employees not covered by the system. The accusation that merit system employees are slow, that it is impossible to fire them must be met and resolved. Many levels of local government lack comprehensive, functioning civil service systems and this situation demands improvement. Looking back over 75 years of civil service it is next to impossible to measure the full extent of the impact of the merit system on American government. Perhaps the nearest measurement is to state simply that it has been too great to value. But the benefits of civil service are not set in the past, they are not enumerated and forgotten. They are hard won gains which have to be defended each day, and which demand continuing improvement and expansion. The current strength of the civil service program, its public support, its past accomplishments are the basis for another 75 years of continuing and expanding benefits. The past is gone and the future belongs to those who make it. Civil service can aid America in making that future a good and a full one.

Constructive Change Versus Destructive Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the phrase "changing times" is heard again and again on the floor of the Senate. Except for the need, or in some instances the alleged need, for changes in the Nation's laws, there would not be a need for the Congress to meet.

A recent editorial in the Edgefield (S.C.) Advertiser, entitled "Constructive Change Versus Destructive Change," philosophizes on the subject, pointing out that change that does not hold to the fundamentally sound values in our way of life will be destructive. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE CHANGE VERSUS DESTRUCTIVE CHANGE

There is more marked attention to the element of time, to the coming of new years and to the significance of time with relation to change. Everyone is expecting something new to happen. There are so many new things in the offing it is natural that a new year excites the imagination more than it used to.

The principal issues are between constructive change and destructive change, between two different worlds competing for supremacy.

Constructive change will still hold to certain fundamentals, and at the start of another year the Advertiser reaffirms its faith in American religious ideals and in its human values—appreciation of industriousness, of fair play, of independence, of individual freedom; respect for the rights and entitlements of others; righteous indignation, keen discernment and persevering protest against public wrongs; a willingness to accept personal responsibility and to apply the best one has to meeting the daily problems of life independent of dishonest gain and sensitive to the perils and snares of false charity.

Changes are the order of the times, but change that does not hold to the fundamentally sound values in our way of life will be destructive, not constructive. They will be changes fostered by the ill-intentioned, by the iconoclasts.

It is up to the individual whether the next year will find us nearer the fulfillment of a universal desire for peace, not only among nations, but nearer the ideal of the perfect friendship, the perfect harmony of human relations, that is the ultimate goal, or whether led further along the road of tempting but empty promises.

In the numbers of individuals who demand only constructive change as against destructive change is to be found the barometer of progress. All other manifestations are illusions.

The most embattled citizen now is he or she who is committed by natural impulse and by training to the nobler and sturdier features of our country's traditions, who looks upon change as not bad in itself but recognizes an influence of destructive intent as threatening dominance.

If there are greater numbers of people who have been induced to follow the destructive side in recent years, it has made the challenge of constructive change the most courageous that any generation of Americans has yet faced.

Governor Brown Sets Forth a Program of Responsible Liberalism for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, California's 32d Governor, Edmund G. Brown, took office at Sacramento on January 5. In his inaugural address Governor Brown set forth a program of responsible liberalism for our growing State. The Public Printer estimates that the text will make 2½ pages of the

RECORD at a cost of \$202.50. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Brown's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Governor and Mrs. Knight, members of the legislature, and my fellow Californians, where democracy lives, free people speak in strong voices. Last November, a free people called for a new vision for California. We begin today the solemn duty and high privilege of translating that vision into public policy and into law.

The election reaffirms our conviction that the people of California are resolved to move forward with courage and confidence. Ordered reaction by the radical right, the voters emphatically declined. Offered government by retreat, the people preferred progress. Clearly then, our duty is to bring to California the forward force of responsible liberalism.

RESPECT FOR PEOPLE

The essence of liberalism is a genuine concern and deep respect for all the people. Not monuments or institutions or associations, but people. Not one race, or one creed, or one nationality, but all the people. When people come first and special privilege is scorned, government is truly liberal.

In a liberal atmosphere, the individual stands secure against invasion of his dignity or intrusion on his conscience. He has the right to require justice and fair play, the right to demand protection from economic abuse and selfish threats to his security. At the same time, government must not, in naive good intention, stifle his initiative or smother his growth. Men must indeed have freedom to breathe the air of self respect.

A liberal program must also be a responsible program, a reasonable, rational, realistic program. We must know how much it will cost and where the money is coming from. Benefits must be measured against burdens. A program which pampers the people or threatens our solvency is as irresponsible as the one which ignores a vital need. But we will always remember that there is a difference between responsibility and timidity, and we are resolved to be governed more by our hopes than by our fears.

IN WARREN'S PATH

In the path of responsible liberalism, we walk in the giant footsteps of such memorable Governors as Hughes and Roosevelt in New York, Wilson in New Jersey, La Follette in Wisconsin, Altgeld and Stevenson in Illinois, and Johnson and Warren in California. Let us mark their example and set our sights to match their achievements.

Here in California the explosive growth of our population and economy strains the fabric of government. Between election and inauguration, our population increased by 75,000 people. We must accept both the perils and the promise of this magnificent growth. No longer can we afford to stay on dead center, unresponsive and inert. I pledge a confident, pioneering leadership, ready to welcome growth, pursue its promise, and prepare for tomorrow.

A liberal's duty to be responsible has a special meaning in view of the grim crisis we face in the budget. From last year's budget, our bleak legacy is a \$100 million deficit. For several years, our State has spent more than it has taken in, and now almost all of our reserves and special funds are exhausted.

ECONOMY BUDGET

I am resolved that our new administration will face our financial responsibilities without flinching. Before the end of the month, I will recommend an economy minded

budget, and a courageous and fair program to obtain new revenues. I pledge, however, that we will not sacrifice essential services or narrow our vision for California.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

Throughout the world, the cynical creed of communism slanders democracy with the charge that men are too greedy, too ignorant, or too lazy to govern themselves. Let us, in our respect and concern for all the people, resolve to prove anew that representative government is the best government. Let us forge a program which will liberate our human resources and demonstrate the renewed vigor of American society. In this way, we will answer the slanders of communism and expose its evil design.

DEMOCRATIC PRIDE

This is a day of proper pride as well as earnest dedication for California Democrats. Not for 20 years, and only once before in this century, has a Democratic governor made the inaugural address to the legislature. And not since 1889 has there been a majority of Democrats in both houses of the legislature.

The job of government, however, is not a narrowly partisan undertaking. I pledge my full cooperation to Democrats and Republicans alike. I know most of you personally, and I consider this to be one of the ablest legislative bodies in the United States. My door will always be open so that we can consider together our common problems of State government. We must understand each other, trust each other, and work together in harmony. Where the good of the people is involved, I will expect the support of the distinguished members of both parties, and I hope by my actions to merit it.

THANKS KNIGHT

In this connection, I express my deep appreciation to Governor Knight, to Mrs. Knight, and to the entire executive family for the genuine cooperation afforded me in the transfer of the functions and duties of this high office.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM

In obedience to the constitution, I turn now to specific recommendations. I lay before you a program which in my considered judgment meets the test of being both liberal and responsible.

1. Guarantee equal job opportunities.

Discrimination in employment is a stain upon the image of California. We must recognize that conduct which degrades any member of society degrades society as a whole. Every man must finally see the necessity of protecting the rights of others as the most effective security for his own.

I therefore urge you to enact legislation to bar discrimination by an employer or a labor union on grounds of race, creed, national origin, or age. We should provide the means for conciliation, public education, and enforcement to insure that there are no arbitrary barriers to useful and productive employment. In truth we are, and in practice we must be, one people, equal in privilege and opportunity. This is our moral duty.

2. Protect the consumer.

We are all consumers. Yet, we have never been able to speak in a single voice because we are disorganized and our needs are so diverse. Without a forceful spokesman in government, we have little defense against highly organized special interests. I therefore recommend legislation providing for the appointment of a consumers' advocate, who should be empowered to advance the consumers' interests by public education and by representation before government agencies.

I also urge you to enact legislation to protect people from installment racketeers. Every year thousands of Californians are deceived into signing sales contracts which contain unfair provisions and result in outrageous carrying charges. We need new laws

to wipe out these vicious practices. We need them fair, strong, and soon.

3. Encourage economic development.

To keep our economy strong, we need new industries, new payrolls, and new jobs for our expanding population. Accordingly, I recommend legislation for the establishment of an agency for economic development to launch a vigorous program to bring business here. By augmenting private efforts to attract new industries, this agency will invigorate our economy and enrich our lives.

LABOR PROGRAM

4. Safeguard workers' rights.

The voters have firmly rejected the so-called right to work law. In a new and objective atmosphere, let us move forward to strengthen the integrity of the collective-bargaining process. I will soon send you a special message outlining my legislative proposals in detail. May I say now, however, that I intend to recommend:

Legislation under which employees in intrastate commerce can choose a bargaining representation;

Legislation specifically outlawing bribes to union officials;

Legislation setting up safeguards concerning union meetings and elections and providing for the recall of union officers for misconduct;

Legislation preventing loans by unions to their officers, and requiring union officers and management consultants to file financial statements; and

Legislation governing the relationship between a local union and its parent organization.

Such laws would be safeguards against the irresponsible minority whose conduct damages all of labor. But there must be no punitive measures against free and responsible unions which have brought untold progress and improved living conditions to our State. Cripple the responsible union and all of the people will suffer. Strengthen the responsible union and labor can contribute its full energy to the new vision for California.

AID TO PEOPLE

5. Increase social insurance and public welfare.

In the stern judgment of history, our greatness as a state will largely depend on our sense of responsibility to the elderly, the sick, the needy, the injured, and the unemployed. I reject the outdated notion that concern for these people is not the business of government.

I believe that the level of unemployment insurance benefits clearly should be raised. At 1959 prices, no family can meet its basic needs on the \$40 per week maximum. In the last year, there has been forceful evidence that thousands of workers are left stranded if benefit payments are limited to 26 weeks when recessions last longer. We should lengthen the period of coverage, at least whenever unemployment has reached a given percentage of the work force.

Turning to the workmen's compensation law, I recommend that we take prompt action to correct the striking inadequacy in the vocational rehabilitation provisions for injured workers. In addition, the amount and duration of benefits may well need to be increased. The same is true of disability benefits.

In the field of public welfare, we should improve the operation of the 1957 medical care program and insure that it fulfills its important purpose. One obvious shortcoming in the program is its failure to extend to persons now enrolled in the aid to disabled program. For the disabled person, the need for medical care is especially great and compelling.

Our new laws in the field of social insurance and public welfare must be responsible as well as liberal. Thus, we must stop short of an extreme, isolated position which

would discourage the entry of new wealth and industry and thus injure our economy and our people alike. But short of this extreme, we will remember that social insurance and public welfare benefits go directly into our life stream and that we serve our economy as well as our humanitarian principles by making California a leader in this field.

6. Establish a minimum wage.

I urge you to enact legislation which will establish \$1.25 an hour as the minimum wage for California workers not covered by the Federal law. Minimum wage laws assure a worker that he will be paid enough to maintain himself in health and decency. Elementary fairness dictates that this protection should not be denied a person because of the happenstance that he is employed in a local business. Moreover, a minimum wage law will protect ethical employers from the unfair competition of those who would pay substandard wages.

ELECTION REFORM

7. Reform election practices.

Because elections are the strong heartbeat of democracy, the reform of election practices deserves a top priority. I urge you to abolish crossfiling in primary elections, and thus strengthen representative government by making our parties more responsible and more responsive to the will of the people.

I also urge you to strengthen our laws providing for disclosure of campaign funds. The gaps in the present law threaten the integrity of our democratic processes.

In this electronic age, we continue to count ballots by primitive methods. I recommend that existing statutes be broadened to encourage electronic tabulation of votes in all counties of the State. We must also find a way to shorten our political campaign and stop every election from being an endurance contest, both for the candidates and the voters. When we improve the election process, we strengthen democracy.

8. Promote efficiency in government.

I urge you to adopt legislation to enable us to reorganize and streamline State government. Specifically, I believe that the Governor should be authorized to prepare and transmit to the legislature plans for the reorganization of the executive branch of the State government. I also pledge my wholehearted support for your efforts to improve the organization and operation of State agencies.

Not since 1928 have we made a thorough and penetrating analysis of the structure of our State government. Today each citizen pays the price of a government which has developed haphazardly in a piecemeal response to the pressure of growth. We are burdened by layer upon layer of patchwork agencies, and confusing lines of authority. The time has come for us to modernize State government and improve its services to our people.

TO FIGHT CRIME

9. Control crime.

Crime and narcotics are ugly companions. Driven by fear and guilt, the criminal seeks escape through the use of narcotics; in turn, the addict steals to support his costly habit.

As a new approach to this complex problem, I urge you to authorize the department of corrections to establish pilot units for narcotic treatment and control in key areas of the State. This program would provide diagnostic testing and psychiatric aid for addicts released on parole or probation. By providing these new tools for control and rehabilitation, we take a promising and pioneering step toward narcotics control. We only endorse futility if we do no more in this field than renew procedures which time has already proven unsuccessful.

Our prisons are dangerously overcrowded. This not only magnifies the hazards of riots and breakouts, but inevitably produces the frustration of idleness. In meeting this

problem, our first responsibility is the protection of society. We must initiate new studies to identify those prisoners who should never be released to prey again on an innocent public. We should also determine whether some prisoners are now kept confined after punishment has served its purpose. In addition, we should establish new forestry camps and industrial training programs so that after release, every man can offer society an effective skill and regular work habits.

Today's prisoners were yesterday's delinquents. The California Youth Authority has pioneered in the field of youth correction, but now we must press forward in the prevention of delinquency. To that end, I will immediately take personal leadership of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth to study the early causes of one of society's most difficult problems. If we can find a way to reach the promise and the core of goodness in our emotionally disturbed children, we strike at the roots of crime.

SCHOOL CHALLENGE

10. Improve quality in education.

Both our Constitution and our conscience enjoin us to invest money in young minds, our greatest natural resources. Specifically, our growth requires us to meet these needs in public education: 18,000 new teachers a year, when we now graduated 11,000; 5,000 new classrooms a year, when we now build 2,500; facilities for 400,000 college and university students in 1970, when we now have space and equipment for but 100,000.

These needs are the challenge of growth. Let us meet them with adult dedication and ingenuity. We can attract and retain good teachers, if we offer practical training, adequate professional salaries, and new levels of community confidence and respect. We must also find the means to provide the physical plants as well as the intellectual climate for learning.

In turn, we have the right to require that our schools shall provide genuine education in a well taught, disciplined curriculum. Every child deserves the chance to grow in fundamental knowledge, in special and technical skills, and in insight. I am determined that California will have the best public schools in the United States. I am persuaded, as I am confident you are, that whatever we invest in free public education is returned, manifold, to our economy and to the strength of our democratic government.

ANTISMOG FIGHT

11. Protect public health.

We live in an era marked by new cures for old diseases and by dramatic new dangers to our health. Air pollution is a statewide menace. It threatens the health of people not only in Los Angeles, but in every heavily populated region of the State. We must recognize that our attack on smog cannot stop at county lines.

I therefore ask that you supply additional funds for concentrated research on the dangerous effects of smog on people. I call upon the automobile industry to expand and accelerate its research on smog prevention. I want to serve notice on every industry and every person involved that my administration will take effective action to protect the people of the State. People are more important than dollars.

Exposure to radiation from nuclear fallout and industrial accidents now threatens all of us. We should provide funds for the State department of public health to maintain a constant guard against dangerous levels of radioactivity in air, water, food, and sewage.

In addition, I urge that California follow the example of other alert States and establish a coordinator of the many phases of atomic energy development now in process in several existing State agencies. Failure to act and plan in atomic matters which are so promising to our progress and so crit-

ical for our safety, would be both irresponsible and dangerous.

I also recommend that the legislature provide funds for the continuation of the department of public health's program to combat alcoholism and promote temperance.

Fifteen years as a law enforcement officer have convinced me that although other problems may be better publicized, none causes more suffering and despair than alcoholism.

COURT IMPROVEMENT

12. Improve the administration of justice.

There is a log jam in our California courts. In Los Angeles County alone, the backlog of civil cases climbed to nearly 18,000 in 1958. Each case has to wait in line well over a year after it is ready for trial. In other counties, the situation is even worse. Last October when Chief Justice Warren called attention to this crisis in the courts, we were forcefully reminded that justice delayed frequently is justice denied.

Automobile accidents spawn a major portion of the congestion in our courts. For the accident victims, the net result is a grave social loss. After years of delay and uncertainty, the majority will recover nothing, and financial distress will be added to their pain and suffering. Those who eventually win their cases may not be able to collect their judgments, and what they do recover will have to be shared with others.

Three decades ago, California pioneered in establishing an expert commission to handle industrial accidents. Now, the time has come for us to weigh the wisdom of an automobile accident commission to hear and determine claims arising out of auto accidents. If a commission modeled after our industrial accident commission could provide a prompt remedy and fair compensation for the accident victim, we would reduce suffering and hardship. If the commission could gain an insight into the causes of accidents and issue safety orders, we would cut down the carnage on the highways. If, through the creation of such a commission, we could enable our courts to keep abreast of their dockets, we would take a long step toward our goal of equal justice under law.

MORE ARE DUE

The limits of this inaugural occasion do not permit a detailed statement of all that is in my mind and heart today. During the course of this session, I will bring you recommendations on traffic safety, billboards, the redevelopment law, improvements in our recreational program, and other matters.

WATER PROGRAM

Before the end of January, I will send you a major message on water. Development of our water resources is crucial to every segment of our State—the ranchers in our mountain areas, the farmers who make California the Nation's leading agricultural producer, and the homeowners in our population which will grow to 20 million by 1970. No problem has occupied more of my time in the weeks since election than water. Striking progress has been made. I can tell you now that I will soon present a water program which is rational, realistic, and responsive to the needs of all the people of the State.

URBAN PROBLEMS

I will also soon announce appointment of a Governor's commission on metropolitan problems. For the 85 percent of our people who live in urban communities, local government is often inefficient, costly, and confusing because the necessary services are rendered by overlapping and competing agencies. The congestion of our streets symbolizes the necessity for a new and coordinated approach to the pressing problems in our cities. Any approach to these problems must respect our tradition of community responsibility and the high quality of our local officials, but I am convinced that

we should make a concerted attack on these acute and chronic problems.

RESEARCH PROGRAM

Looking beyond these specific matters, let us recall the warning of the Bible that where there is no vision, the people perish. Today we see successful industries accepting this judgment. They search out their most creative minds and put them to work studying distant horizons.

I propose that California follow industry's example and become the first State in the Nation to set up a specific research and development program. I propose that we seek out our most creative minds both in and out of State government and put them to work on a wide range of long-term problems, such as our crowded airways, the plight of workers frozen in their jobs by pensions which cannot be transferred, discrimination in housing, the defects of the present health insurance program, and on to new problems on the frontiers of space.

As I conclude, I would observe that providence seems intent on making us a great people in a great State. This destiny of greatness requires of us our best laws and fairest administration. Let us lead with confidence and compassion as we draw the lines for the new vision for California. May we pray to God that our virtues grow with California and be durable, and that our vision for California be liberal and responsible.

Veterans' Day Address by Stuart A. Lindman, Commander, Minnesota Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address by Mr. Stuart A. Lindman, commander of the Minnesota Disabled American Veterans, and a well-known radio and television personality in the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I commend to my colleagues in the Senate Mr. Lindman's address, which was delivered at the Veterans' Day ceremonies at the St. Paul, Minn., State capitol building, on November 11, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Pastor Anderson, distinguished guests, veterans, and friends, this is Veterans Day, 1958, the fifth national Veterans Day.

Our permanent theme of these ceremonies in the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month is "Peace with honor."

Peace with honor.

Peace with dignity and courage.

Peace with integrity and uprightness.

And who personifies the peace with courage more than America's wartime defenders—her veterans of military service? Within the memory of living American war veterans today are the ferocities of San Juan, Santiago, Chateau Thierry, the Meuse Argonne, Guadalcanal, the Battle of the Bulge, Okinawa, Korea. These are the men, who—more than once—have saved America. These are the men who fought and bought peace with their courage. Is it not truly meet, right,

and salutary, then, that we pay honor to the men, who—more than once—have saved America?

And who personifies the peace with uprightness more than our veterans whose leadership guards America's security in peace? I would remind you: Today there are more than 22 million living American war veterans in the United States. One out of every eight persons is a war veteran. Currently guarding America's security in peace are these war veterans: The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, six of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court, and more than half of our Congressmen and Senators. And we must further name the thousands serving on State and local levels, and those of us who also stand and wait. Is it not truly meet, right, and salutary that we pay honor to the men who guard our security in peace?

It's been said that no one will care for you if you care not for yourself. This we can apply to our large family in veteranhood.

What we have done, as veterans, will fade from America's memory if we, as veterans, allow it to fade. That is exactly what is happening.

Therefore, as veterans, we should resolve that:

It is our responsibility to let not America forget who we are and what we have done.

It is our responsibility to teach young America who we are and what we have done.

It is our responsibility to keep other world powers fearfully—and I use the word advisedly—aware of who we are and what we have done.

And because it is true that the memory of our accomplishments is fading it would seem that it is once again the veterans' responsibility to spell out how honor can be paid the victors of war, the defenders of peace, the guardians of security.

There are two major avenues:

America must adequately—adequately—care for her disabled and indigent veterans.

And America must heed the veterans' warning to keep this country bristling with defense so that there will never again be any military aggression against us.

Let's be flag wavers. Let's be flag wavers.

Former President Herbert Hoover back in 1954 said: "We must realize the vitality of a great spiritual force which we call nationalism. The fuzzy-minded intellectuals have sought to brand nationalism as a sin against mankind. They seem to think that infamy is attached to the word nationalist." The spirit of nationalism springs from the deepest of human emotions. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice, and pride in national achievement. In our own country, does not the word "America" stir something deeper within us than mere geography? Does not the suffering and the sacrifice of our forebears who fought for our independence flash in our minds with every mention of the word?

I say: Let's be nationalists. Let's be flag wavers.

Of the 20 some civilizations this world has known, only 1 was crushed by outside aggression; the others have decayed from within. I am sure there were no flags waving as the decadence grew.

A bristling defense will keep other world powers fearfully aware of who we are and what we have done.

Care of the wars' disabled and indigent will teach young America that their country properly and adequately cares for its defenders. So should the call to war ever come again young America will be steadfast in service, knowing full well and rightly so, that they, in their turn, will be rightly cared for.

And as our veterans' care and our sure defense increase so will also grow the Amer-

ican consciousness of the heroics of our wartime veterans and the honor due them.

Of America's care to disabled and indigent veterans:

Today there are nearly 3 million veterans on Veterans' Administration rolls receiving relief of one kind or another. Let me mention but some of the recompense due and paid our disabled and indigent:

Six hundred and sixty thousand veterans have been given vocational rehabilitation; 95 percent of these are gainfully employed. A grateful Government has built 172 veterans' hospitals; admissions to these installations number nearly half a million every year. There are grants for wheelchair homes, automobiles for the severely handicapped, prosthetic appliances. There are monetary benefits in the forms of compensations and pensions. Yes, a grateful Nation attempts to care for a grateful veteranhood.

But to mention just two of many concurrent thoughts in this hour of honor to our veterans: (1) the majority of our veteran population is young men. What will be their needs in old age? Will our veterans' benefits keep pace? Will America's care for aged veterans be adequate? And (2) there is a current review being conducted of ratings for disabled veterans. Articulate, let me ask: Is this not simply an economy drive again at the expense of our disabled veterans? I am told that instructions have been received by the Veterans' Administration centers across the country that the review must be completed by January 1 of 1960. At this time half of the claims folders still remain to be reviewed.

I suggest this time directive means a hurried, haphazard handling of a very delicate trust.

I suggest such activity is neither adequate or accurate.

I suggest honor to our veterans through care for the disabled must be a continuing honor in all hours and not to be firted with at any arbitrarily fixed calendar date.

As veterans we must realize that our mission is not fulfilled until all of our disabled comrades—our fellow veterans in need—their dependents and widows are adequately cared for.

As veterans we must not allow America to forget who we are and what we have done.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

There is no such thing now as a return to normalcy.

We are living within a time area wherein we are threatened with immediate annihilation.

We must prepare for any contingencies.

We are determined that our defense be maintained.

We cannot afford the luxury of not paying the defense bill.

Or, more positively, we can afford any expense in the cause of national defense.

A heavy expenditure for defense will not lead to economic collapse.

But most assuredly a heavy defense expenditure does call for the most efficient management in our Defense Department.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

America will never strike the first military blow at any time or place. So if we do not get in the first blow then we must be prepared to roll with any attack against us and make a comeback. Therefore, we need previous preparations, the capability of restoring a smashed economy, and military forces of all magnitude in being. Previous preparations call for research and development. Which things in themselves serve as deterrents to war; through advanced research can we render obsolete potential enemy weapons.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

Military forces of all magnitude in being call for many, many choices:

Should our biggest expenditure go for civil defense, conventional ground forces, guided missiles, conquest of outer space?

Note the possible clash of choices:

If too much is spent on conquest of outer-space, then would we be able to provide the mobile ground forces needed to contain and handle a local war?

If we defer dollars from civil defense and an enemy does strike, we would not lose millions of people, potential ground forces?

If we spend less on missile research might not an aggressor pass us by? If we shift from mass production of jet bombers, for example, to more advanced research, just what good would missiles on drawing boards do us in the event of an attack?

But we can be sure of this: the less we spend the fewer choices we can make, the fewer the contingencies against which we can be prepared.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

The Defense Department must be pressured from time to time to spend moneys in unacceptable ways. It might well be that local pressures prevent the services from abandoning obsolete military centers simply to relieve financially distressed areas. It might well be that local pressures dictate that the services stockpile nearly obsolete material simply to sustain particular industries.

Of America's bristling defense, we can be sure:

Duplication of efforts must be avoided among the services, but not at the expense of healthy rivalry.

Finally and positively:

Let's make military service more attractive as a career.

Let's bring more community respect to the researcher and the educator.

Let's transfer to civilian agencies, contractors, and individual workers the work areas that are better performed by civilians, and relieve the military to serve strictly military purposes.

As veterans I am sure we are all for keeping the peace at any cost or expense.

A moment ago I said there is no such thing now as a return to normalcy. Right now I want to quote from Harper's magazine, October 10. Listen:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not in the lifetime of any man who reads this paper has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so dark and incalculable. In France, the political cauldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty. England and the English Empire is being sorely tried and exhausted in a social and economic struggle with turmoil at home and uprising in her teeming millions in her far-flung empire. The United States is beset with racial, industrial, and commercial chaos, drifting we know not where. Russia hangs like a storm cloud on the horizon of Europe, dark and silent. It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel indifference, which happily no man pretends to feel in the issue of events."

That is a pretty sobering excerpt from a long time accepted and respected publication, and it was written October 10—October 10, 1847—111 years ago. Things haven't changed much, have they? And how many wars has the world had in those 111 years? And what have those wars proved or decided? The utter uselessness, the folly of war. I'm for maintaining peace with honor at any cost or expense. Peace with honor is wonderful.

This day is a solemn occasion in which all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the peace for which we fought and for which so many of our comrades died. And while we look back to great sacrifices, we must at the same time look forward to the goals we all desire. If we can demonstrate to ourselves that our children and grandchildren will live to know

the honorable peace for which we all struggled, only then can we feel assured that we merit a Veterans Day salute.

Unless we have and guard and maintain peace with honor, all will have been in vain.

If you take away anything of what I have said today, make it this: In our homes the spirit of patriotism should be implanted in our children; in our schools the spirit of patriotism should be so highly and strongly developed as to give our country high type individuals who will not only guard our country against decadence (of which I spoke) but will also align it with God's plan of development and of progress.

"Three things I know must always be,

To keep a nation strong and free.

One is a hearthstone bright and dear,

With busy, happy loved ones near.

One is a strong and ready hand,

To have and serve and keep the land.

One is a worn and beaten way,

To where people go to pray.

So long as these are kept alive,

Nation and people will survive.

God keep them always everywhere.

The home, the flag, the place of prayer."

A Fine Example of Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, advocates of big Government spending frequently allege that only the Government is capable of financing huge projects, that the private investors are not willing to take the chance or spend the money. Many of these big Government advocates would have us turn to socialism, with the central government running everything in a bureaucratic method.

David Lawrence, in a column appearing in the January 8 edition of the Greenville (S. C.) News, comments at length on the recent financial story concerning the split in three parts of American Telephone and Telegraph Co. stock. Pointing out that this passed, no doubt, as a routine item in Socialist- and Communist-dominated countries, Mr. Lawrence goes on to show how A.T. & T. is the world's finest example of the superb job done by people's capitalism in the realm of economics. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's column, entitled "A Fine Example of Enterprise System," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINE EXAMPLE OF ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes we overlook the obvious—the things for which we ought to be thankful as we come to a new year. One thing we often overlook is the success of what might be called people's capitalism.

The other day the financial tickers told the world that the stock of the A.T. & T.—the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.—had been split in three parts. It promptly rose in value on the stock exchanges. Maybe the newspapers in Moscow thought it only

a routine item in the press of a country where capitalism prevails. But, actually, it was a powerful counterargument to communism, and it's unfortunate that the people of the Soviet Union can't be told what it really means.

For, without a single dollar put up by the Government of the United States, the people themselves have invested their money in and become owners of the largest and most successful single private business in the whole world. Although the vast majority of telephone systems in other countries are owned and operated by the government, the United States has more telephones than the rest of the world put together. There is no clearer or clearer example of private enterprise than A.T. & T.

With transcontinental and overseas connections in a matter of minutes, the United States owes much to this rapid system of communication. Its efficiency of operation is a tribute to American private enterprise and private management.

True, the Government must approve the rates charged the customers and also takes a hand if any improper practices toward competitors should emerge, but basically the telephone business is a private business. Its investment in plant and equipment totals more than \$23 billion, and it employs 700,000 persons. Its owners are more than 1,564,000 individuals and 61,000 institutions. This total includes more than 250,000 employees in the industry itself. No financial group owns any controlling interest. The stockholders elect their directors who, in turn, select the management. Nothing like it of such size exists anywhere else in the world.

The A.T. & T. and its affiliates comprise 23 companies, serving 55,800,000 phones. There are 3,900 independent companies. These serve about 9,700,000 phones—or nearly three times as many as in the whole of the Soviet Union. They, too, do an efficient job in the private enterprise system that provides the United States with 54 percent of all the telephones in the world.

To appreciate the great value of the modern telephone service to business, one must travel in many other countries where communication is almost primitive. The number of telephones in the entire Soviet Union is about 3,558,000 as of January 1958. This is less than New York City's 4,204,000. Moscow has 450,000 phones for its nearly 5 million population, compared with Washington's 582,000 phones for 830,000 residents.

Business moves faster in America than than anywhere else because a multiplicity of transactions is made possible through telephone communication.

Not long ago the late Robert Lincoln O'Brien, who was personal secretary to President Cleveland, was telling this correspondent how the engagements were made with persons invited by Mr. Cleveland to come to the White House for conferences and how the President gave him important messages to other Government officials to be delivered orally. Mr. O'Brien said he actually spent whole days at this task. For he had to get into a carriage and drive around the National Capital going from office to office. There was no telephone service then.

What does the telephone business mean to the American economy? The payroll and other payments to employees of the A.T. & T. totaled more than \$3 billion in the first 9 months of 1958.

Here, therefore, is an enterprise managed and owned privately which is bigger than any single business in the Soviet Union and, in fact, bigger than many of the collectivist enterprises of the Soviets put together.

Who gets the benefit of this enormous investment? The people of America and some investors from abroad. For annually the A.T. & T. pays out big sums in dividends on its stock and interest on its bonds—over \$600 million to shareholders in 1958. These

stockholders are for the most part persons of modest means—the vast majority are not rich people. Owners of stock include about 344,000 men and 723,000 women, with 498,000 joint account ownerships. Institutions hold only about one-fifth of the company's shares.

Plainly here is something for the American system of people's capitalism to crow about. It is an example to hold up not only to the people of the Soviet Union but to other Communist countries. Indeed, it is a lesson in economics that ought never to be brushed aside by the socialistically inclined politicians within the western countries. For private initiative is in the long run better for the worker, better for the investor and better for the people as a whole.

The Financial Institutions Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last year, as the culmination of 2 years of effort to modernize and codify the laws dealing with financial institutions, the Senate passed a bill designated as the Financial Institutions Act of 1957. Efforts to obtain action on that bill in the other body were unsuccessful, however, and it died with the 85th Congress.

Because of questions which I have been asked about the possibility of reviving that bill, and because of other indications of interest in what happened to it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Thomas W. Miles, an experienced and well-informed writer on financial topics. This article, entitled "Reexamining the Financial Institutions Bill," was published in the December 1958 issue of the Burroughs Clearing House magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REEXAMINING THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS BILL

(By Thomas W. Miles, Washington, D.C.)

The legacy of the ill-fated financial institutions bill in the last Congress is a public image so blurred by charges that its real job of modernizing banking and credit legislation has been lost sight of. Unless this image can be corrected, it will jeopardize any general overhauling of financial legislation in the forthcoming 86th Congress. For that reason some of the more serious charges might well be reexamined in this lull between engagements to see what substance there is to them.

There were no real problems in the Financial Institutions Bill that Congress could not have resolved in the last session. It has come up with answers to many tougher problems in shorter time. But the things that were said about the bill confused many Members of Congress and resulted in the bill being stymied in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The charges came so thick and so fast that the answers went unheeded, crowded out of public interest by still newer charges. The net effect of this organized campaign of charges and alarms was to create a doubt—which was exactly what was intended. And

when the opposition of organized labor was enlisted, that doubt took on new proportions. Added to all this was the fact that the financial community was divided over certain features. This in itself was a serious impediment.

Two themes ran through the attacks on the financial institutions bill in the House, both appealing to historic American fears and prejudices. The first exploited our deeply ingrained fear of power, in this case the alleged threat of the concentration of economic power in large financial institutions. The second capitalized on the political appeal of the consumer and small business.

Two quotations from the many in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD aptly illustrate the play on these themes. In one it was charged that provisions in the bill "will weaken the smaller banks and lead to more centralized control over banking."

And the other contended: "Many hidden booby traps against consumers, against the laboring man, against the small banks, against the Federal credit unions, against legitimate insurance agents and salesmen and against the public interest." That takes in the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker in a political wrapup.

Before looking more closely at the imagery in the charges we might review briefly the history of the financial institutions bill to get a better perspective. The need for codifying and up-dating banking and credit laws is generally conceded.

Recognizing that need, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia proposed in the summer of 1956 to meet it. Subsequently, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, named Senator ROBERTSON to make a study for the committee of all Federal statutes governing banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions. This was a formidable undertaking and one that other less intrepid members of Congress than Senator ROBERTSON had shied away from for years. Senator ROBERTSON was acting in the tradition of his predecessor, the great Carter Glass.

Senator Robertson's first step was to invite all of the Federal supervisory agencies to recommend amendments for changes in the statutes under which they function. These included the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. Recommendations were also requested of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office.

Then, to complete the picture in accordance with the practice on Capitol Hill in such matters, Senator ROBERTSON sought the views of a fair cross section of the financial community. He set up an advisory committee to which each of the 15 Senators on the Senate Banking Committee named 1 appointee. He appointed the other 12 to insure adequate representation of the various groups involved. This became known as the Cravens committee, so named for its chairman, Kenton R. Cravens, president, Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.

There was lots of work to be done. The task was described by Lee P. Miller, recently elected president of the American Bankers Association, as monumental. Senator ROBERTSON spelled it out for the record in these words:

"The study of existing statutes of necessity will be a technical one rather than a broad inquiry into financial and economic theories. The major objective will be to formulate a new banking code with obsolete provisions eliminated and new authority added in areas where need is clearly demonstrated."

The Government agencies turned in more than 180 amendments on which the Robertson subcommittee held hearings that November (1956) and the next month the Advisory Committee reported 200 recommendations. Out of all this basic material Senator ROBERTSON and his counsel, Donald L. Rogers, drew up a tentative 252-page bill which was published as a committee print. Senator ROBERTSON made this comment about the bill:

"I deliberately eliminated from the tentative bill new policy issues and limited the controversial issues as far as practical to those which had previously been considered either by the Senate or the House but on which no final action had been taken."

On this bill the Robertson subcommittee held 14 days of hearings (January 28 through February 18, 1957) and heard 39 witnesses discuss the changes proposed in the laws. In addition, 114 written statements, letters, etc., were submitted, bringing to 1,073 the number of pages in the printed record of the Senate hearings.

After that the Senate Banking Committee met in executive session and drafted the financial institutions bill, S. 1451, which it reported to the Senate March 4. The Senate debated that bill 5 days, fought over a number of amendments and in the end was content to pass it by voice vote. From the recital of the bare facts of this report of the progress of the bill it is abundantly evident that the Senate was fully aware of the controversial features of this legislation.

But if the bill ran a gamut of controversy and compromise in the Senate, it jammed smack into devastating tactics in the House. These involved delay and what was virtually a filibuster in the executive sessions of the House Banking Committee. These tactics were surprising only in the sense that they proved to be insurmountable.

Even before the bill was introduced by Representative PAUL BROWN of Georgia in the House as H.R. 7026, its proponents were on notice that it was in for trouble. Mounting the attack against the bill in the House Banking Committee were Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas and ABRAHAM J. MULDER of New York. Behind their opposition lay years of sharp criticism of banking laws. They were supported silently, for the most part, by colleagues responsive to labor criticism. Unless this is understood, it would appear that Mr. PATMAN and Mr. MULDER carried off the show alone—which was not the case.

There was another factor in their favor that is not understood very well except in Washington. And that is that Congress does not have occasion to deal with banking legislation very often—the last big banking bill was the Banking Act of 1935—and, accordingly, Congress is not so accustomed to handling this legislation as it would be in the case of a tax measure or a public works proposal. There is no ready frame of reference in which the Members of Congress can relate the technical features involved in an overhaul of banking laws. This might explain why doubts about the bill were relatively easy to raise.

The House Banking Committee fight was long, and exceedingly tedious because many of the members found so much of it repetitious. Throughout, Chairman BRENT SPENCE of Kentucky handled the sessions with judicial consideration, fairness, and restraint. He had the support of many long-suffering members of the committee but time was of the essence and time was against the bill. Indeed, many of the charges against the bill went unanswered in the record only because proponents of the financial institutions bill hesitated to do anything that might be used as a pretext for dragging the hearings on further.

There were 20 days of public hearings in July and August of 1957 and 15 more days

in January and February of this year. Promptly upon their conclusion the committee went into executive consideration of the bill. This took 15 more days and then ran out of time at Easter recess.

Because Mr. SPENCE expected his committee to finish its consideration and report out the financial institutions bill to the House, he had scheduled hearings on three antirecession bills immediately upon the return of Congress. This means that his committee had to put the financial institutions bill aside. In the pressures that developed as the session went on Mr. SPENCE never did find the time to take up the financial institutions bill again and it died with the 85th Congress.

In view of this legislative history the charge that the bill did not have adequate consideration is patent nonsense. And so was the charge that substantive changes in law were slipped into the legislation by bankers who then attempted to pass the bill off as a codification only. The record of the Senate hearings is concerned with the examination of the substantive changes. This bill was to be a recodification which would modernize the laws governing banking and credit. This meant deleting some, rewriting others and writing wholly new provisions to meet the changes that have occurred. There were no bones made about that in the Senate—which takes away the element of surprise in Mr. PATMAN's discovery of substantive changes having been made in the financial institutions bill.

Discounting those as opening plays in a political chess game, what were some of Mr. PATMAN's and Mr. MULDER's more serious charges?

They boil down to two. The others involve legislative histrionics and are couched in words, phrases and, in some cases, Biblical invective that were calculated to make the charge sufficient unto itself. An answer to such rhetoric was hardly expected. Curiously enough, neither Mr. PATMAN nor Mr. MULDER concerned himself too much with some of the controversial features of the bill which the financial community was at such pains to resolve, such issues as bank mergers, savings and loan branch offices and liberalized lending authority. They completely ignored, of course, the reforms that the bill would have brought about. That angle did not fit in with their contention that this was a big bankers' bill.

To organized labor Mr. PATMAN's most rousing charge involved one sentence in one section, namely 35(a) of title 1, which, he contended, would place a "major loophole" in Federal usury laws for conditional sales contracts and certain types of installment paper. He talked about it as a "gimmick" surreptitiously inserted by bankers to thwart Federal usury statutes.

Mr. PATMAN submitted a number of questions about it to Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board who presented his answers in the record of the House Banking Committee hearings. Let's look at what the Fed said was its understanding of these matters.

The Fed agreed that the new sentence would change the Federal law established by a decision of the Supreme Court back in 1881 in the case of *National Bank v. Johnson*. In that case the Court held that the acquisition by a national bank of outstanding promissory notes from the owner was a "loan or discount" and therefore subject to the limitations on the rate of interest a national bank may charge.

Then the Fed commented: "Broadly speaking, it appears that the proposed amendment would place a national bank on a basis of equality with other lenders in its State, whereas under the doctrine of the *Johnson* case national banks are subject to more severe restrictions in this respect, at least in some jurisdictions."

Mr. PATMAN said the 35(a) sentence would also change another more recent court decision involving conditional sales contracts. Not so, said the Fed. Here it is from the record of the public hearings:

"In *Daniel v. First National Bank of Birmingham* ((C.A. 5, 1955), 227 F. 2d 353), the court interpreted the transactions, as a factual matter, to have been loans by the national bank to the purchasers of certain motor vehicles, even though in form the transactions were conditional sales at a 'time price,' the conditional sales contracts then being sold by the dealer to the bank. Under the court's interpretation of the facts, in such cases there is no 'purchase of obligations' * * * from the actual owner thereof," which is the subject matter of the proposed new sentence in section 35(a). Accordingly, the statutory change that would be effected by enactment of section 35(a) apparently would not change the law as pronounced and applied by the court of appeals in the *Daniel* case."

The Fed commented on a number of other points in the handling of conditional sales contracts and then added:

"Apart from such exceptional situations, however, it is believed that the proposed amendment would place each national bank on a basis of equality, in this respect, with other lenders in its State, including State banks."

Mr. PATMAN continued to fight section 35(a) for months after March 18 when the House Banking Committee, rather than delay with more argument on the point, voted in executive session to strike it out.

Another doubt was created about the possibility of so-called sleeper provisions, to discredit this bill. This one was supposed to lie in section 45 of title 1 which authorized national banks located in communities of fewer than 5,000 inhabitants to act as insurance agents and real estate brokers. It was contended that this was an authorization that was repealed 40 years ago; that it is not law any more. And it was duly noted, of course, that the Senate report on the bill overlooked an alleged substantive change in law by describing the section as continuing the provisions of existing law.

Comptroller of the Currency Ray M. Gidney had no doubts about the law being in effect. His Office has regulations for administering it and has been enforcing it for years. He held that the 1916 insurance authorization was not subsequently repealed at all. The Federal Reserve Board saw it the same way. And so too did counsel for the Senate and House Banking Committees, Mr. Rogers and Robert L. Cardon.

Mr. PATMAN saw dangerous possibilities in the situation even though only 77 national banks, 1.6 percent of all of them, were engaging in this business. But the House Banking Committee was not stampeded. In executive session it agreed to permit those banks which were providing this service to continue, subject to compliance with State license requirements.

There were impassioned pleas all on behalf of the plight of the little man, so beloved politically, in such issues as cumulative voting, mergers, etc. But there was little opposition attention to the provisions that strengthen the powers of the banks' supervisory authorities.

These included such features as the prohibition against conflict of interest by supervisory agency employees; the requirement for the disclosure of the identity of major stockholders; the authority to limit dividend payments by national banks; the strengthening of the procedure for the removal of bank officers and directors for unsafe and unsound practices; the strengthening of the procedure to terminate FDIC insurance; the prohibition against political contributions by insured banks; and others.

"Who Killed Cock Robin" is a murder story, but not a mystery. It is also a record—and a written one—of tactics that could be used again and again against legislation important to the banking community and the general public.

Statement of Policy and Legislative Program of the National Consumers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Congress and the Nation benefit when a group of thoughtful and public-spirited citizens makes known to us their views on what legislation they believe necessary. This is especially true when the group has a long and distinguished record of supporting, and even of originating, vital laws which now form a very important part of our way of life.

Such an organization is the National Consumers League. Since its founding in 1899, it has aroused consumer interest in, and concern with, the conditions under which goods are manufactured and distributed. It has used the three-point technique of making investigations, marshaling public opinion, and seeking remedial legislation to promote public health, public welfare, and fair-labor standards.

The National Consumers League has been closely associated with the major social reforms of the past six decades. For example, it introduced to the United States the idea of minimum wage and maximum hours legislation, and fought for its enactment. It was one of the foremost supporters of the pure food and drug law, when that legislation was before Congress. It pioneered in the fight for legislation prohibiting child labor. And it was among the first supporters of social security legislation.

To help the underdog and the needy, the National Consumers League pioneered with a number of techniques and institutions which now are widely accepted in America. For example, it promoted the idea of the Children's Bureau, in the Federal Government, to protect child health and welfare. It introduced the idea of a consumer label to indicate fair labor standards in production industries. It introduced "shop early" campaigns as a means of cutting down staggering Christmas season work hours and providing steadier employment for workers.

The list of National Consumers League officers, directors, and members of both the past and present reads like a "Who's Who" of important Americans. They include Felix Frankfurter and the late Louis D. Brandeis, U.S. Supreme Court Justices; Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor; Benjamin V. Cohen, former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations; Sumner Slichter, economist; Sarah Gibson Blanding, presi-

dent of Vassar College; Frank P. Graham, former U.S. Senator, now an important U.N. official; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian; and Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral.

Present officers include: President, Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Berkeley, Calif.; treasurer, Hyman Schroeder, Washington, D.C.; board chairman, Mrs. Richard A. Zwemer, Westfield, N.J.; board vice chairmen: Walter Frank, New York, N.Y.; Louise Stitt, Washington, D.C.; and Eleanor Hadley, Northampton, Mass.

The vice presidents are: Elizabeth Brandeis, Madison, Wis.; Mary Dewson, Penobscot, Maine; Mrs. Thomas Fleming, Pasadena, Calif.; Pauline Goldmark, Hartsdale, N.Y.; Alice Hamilton, M.D., Hadlyme, Conn.; John Haynes Holmes, New York, N.Y.; Alice W. Hunt, Providence, R.I.; Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, San Antonio, Tex.; Frances Perkins, Washington, D.C.; Josephine Roche, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hyde Park, N.Y.; Bishop William Scarlett, Castine, Maine; and Robert Szold, New York, N.Y.

Mr. President, at its most recent annual meeting, held in Washington on December 5, 1958, this great organization adopted an excellent "Statement of Policy and Legislative Program." This statement is, in my opinion, a forward-looking and comprehensive program of vital legislation. It is very much in the tradition of National Consumers League.

I believe the league is to be commended for this program, as well as for its activities for the common good. I, for one, am proud to be a member and honorary vice president of this organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "Statement of Policy and Legislative Program of the National Consumers League."

There being no objection, the statement and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE STATEMENT OF POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, 58TH ANNUAL MEETING, DECEMBER 5, 1958

In the 60 years, during which the National Consumers League has worked for the improvement of labor standards in America, the greatest economic development and some of the most remarkable social changes in our national history have taken place. We have moved from the extreme individualism and peaceful complacency of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, through two world wars, a decade of devastating economic depression, to the present era of struggle for global supremacy between two conflicting philosophies in a world of threatening unrest.

The National Consumers League was born of the industrial evils of that complacent society at the turn of the century, when the thinking, not only of economists, but of statesmen, businessmen, and jurists was dominated by the laissez-faire theory of economics. Not the State but free competition must control the economic society, and widespread poverty was believed to be inevitable. The sweatshop, child labor, long hours, unsafe and unsanitary work places were the natural outgrowth of such a society.

To combat these evils was the purpose of Florence Kelley and her small but influential band of followers who in 1899 organized the National Consumers League. The accom-

plishments of those early years are truly phenomenal. State by State, citizens had to be awakened to the corrupting social consequences of poverty, ignorance, and exploitation of human beings, and to their responsibilities for reforms. State by State, legislators had to be persuaded to enact the first inadequate, but important, regulations of the industrial conditions—long hours, low wages, child labor—that caused such human suffering. When laws were passed, the league worked for proper enforcement.

NCL FOUGHT IN COURTS

When unfriendly courts declared unconstitutional these modest restrictions on employers' freedoms, holding that workers were being deprived of their property without due process of law, members of the Consumers League buried their disappointments and determinedly set out to educate the courts. Cases were appealed, the aid of the best lawyers of the land was solicited.

The first brief presenting economic, scientific, and social facts in defense of a labor law ever to be presented to the U.S. Supreme Court was prepared by the National Consumers League in 1908. The case was the famous *Miller v. Oregon*, in which Mr. Louis Brandeis defended the constitutionality of the Oregon 10-hour law for women and the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a favorable unanimous decision. By 1915 a law restricting the employment of women to 8 hours a day was approved by the Supreme Court. But only after 23 years of litigation was the constitutionality of State minimum wage legislation for women upheld by the highest Federal Court in 1937.

The great depression of the 1930's brought unspeakable suffering to the American people. It also wrought revolutionary changes in men's and women's thinking about government responsibilities. In so major an economic disaster the Federal Government could not escape its obligation to aid its citizens to recovery and to take measures to prevent similar future catastrophes. By the end of that fateful decade, Congress had enacted a Federal wage and hour law (the Fair Labor Standards Act) which also provides restrictions on the employment of children in interstate commerce.

A sound foundation for a comprehensive Federal social insurance system was laid when the Federal Social Security Act was passed. By 1937, as a result of Federal grants to States for administrative purposes, every State in the Union had passed an unemployment compensation law. At least a principle for which the National Consumers League for nearly 40 years had endeavored to gain acceptance was established. That is the responsibility of government in a democracy, to protect its citizens against the economic consequences, over which as individuals they have no control, of a highly industrialized society.

We are holding our 58th annual meeting in a national and world atmosphere quite different from that in which the Consumers League began its work in 1899. The United States emerged from World War II, militarily strong, rich, and the leader of the free world. The consequent national responsibilities are staggering. Democracy represents a way of life in sharp contrast to that of other powerful nations. The success or failure of our experiment is of vital concern to people throughout the world, and is being watched for signs of strength or weakness by many anxious millions. Probably nothing since the founding of our Nation has done so much to force the thoughtful among us to reexamine the real meaning of democracy and the extent to which it is reflected in our personal and national lives.

Of much, which this self-examination reveals, we are proud: our great free industrial enterprise, our freedom as citizens to speak our minds, our scientific advancement in the control of disease and natural forces. It is

our weaknesses that give us grave concern: our intolerable prejudices against our colored citizens, our niggardliness toward education, our false economic values, poverty in the midst of plenty, indifference to culture, our shameful neglect of our duties as citizens, and tolerance of corruption in high places.

BREAK ECONOMIC BARRIERS

These are serious charges against the leaders of the free world, and a challenge to us all to work through every available channel to bring the true meaning of democracy to every American citizen. To those of us in the National Consumers League the way is clear. We will continue to work, as we have in the past to remove the economic barriers to the full participation of millions of our people in the freedoms of which our country boasts.

There is evidence on the enormity of the task that lies ahead. In spite of our tremendous wealth, millions of our people live in poverty. In 1957 almost 3 million families, or approximately 6½ percent, had an annual income of less than \$1,000. The income of almost 4 million families, or 8½ percent, was less than \$2,000. President George Meany of the AFL-CIO has estimated that as many as one-fifth of the workers in our Nation are being paid less than \$40 a week. Twenty million workers are unprotected by the wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The cost of adequate medical care is prohibitive for the great majority of the American people. We need a broad plan of national health insurance which would make the full services of doctors and hospitals financially available to everybody. Voluntary health insurance, even after 25 years of promotion, has brought comprehensive services to only about 3 percent of our people, has failed to reach at all a third of the people, and for the remainder covers only about half the hospitals' costs and less than a third of the physicians' bills.

The protection of workers laid off their jobs is woefully inadequate under our present unemployment compensation laws. In the winter of 1958, when more than 5 million workers were unemployed the insurance payments replaced less than 20 percent of the wage lost. Hundreds of thousands of workers drew no benefits at all either because they were not covered by the laws, or had been disqualified by State eligibility requirements, or had exhausted their benefit rights.

FARM WORKERS SUFFER

The most depressed group in the American labor force today are the migrant farm workers and their families. Estimates of their number vary from 500,000 to 2 million. They move with the crops, which they harvest, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border, working for substandard wages, sleeping in shacks and sometimes on the ground. Their children have less opportunity for education than those of any other group in the country. They are shifted from school to school, commonly missing major portions of the school year. The employment of migrants is irregular and made worse by the importation of foreign agricultural workers. Often they are exploited by unscrupulous crew leaders, at whose mercy they travel the highways in uncomfortable and frequently unsafe trucks.

They are not covered by State and Federal wage and hour laws. Their irregular periods of employment disqualify most of them for unemployment compensation and old-age benefits. Although the Fair Labor Standards Act prohibits the employment of children under 16 in agriculture during school hours, there is no minimum age requirement for the employment of these children outside school hours. Because of residence requirements migrant workers and their families are denied relief.

Adequate shelter is another of man's prime necessities which is not provided for all

American citizens today. One quarter of all housing units in the United States are substandard. Of the 13½ million substandard units, 7 million need replacement; the remaining 6½ million should be rehabilitated. In addition, we have an acute housing shortage estimated at well over 3½ million units, resulting in much overcrowding. Overall housing construction is proceeding at about half the needed rate. Replacement is failing to keep pace with obsolescence. Substandard housing blights family life, injures health, retards education, breeds crime and juvenile delinquency.

SCHOOL AID NEEDED

Probably the most serious offense of our modern society is to our schoolchildren—children who should be prepared today for the responsibilities and leadership which they must assume in the complex world of tomorrow. What do we find? Approximately 2 million schoolchildren are deprived of adequate housing in our public schools today.

According to the U.S. Office of Education estimates, in the fall of 1957, the shortage of classrooms in the United States amounted to 142,300. A shortage of 132,200 qualified teachers existed at the beginning of the 1958 school year. Of the 1¼ million people teaching in the Nation's public schools last year, 91,538 or 7 percent were teaching with substandard credentials. Seven and a half percent of the qualified teachers in the United States leave the teaching profession every year. Can we win the race for our way of life on such a record?

On the basis of the kind of evidence just presented, showing the urgent social need for greater economic well-being, increased health facilities, and improved educational opportunities for our citizens, the National Consumers League proposes the following legislative program for the ensuing year:

STRENGTHENING FLSA, STATE MINIMUM WAGE AND WAGE PAYMENT LEGISLATION

We will support amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which will so extend coverage that the employees of all establishments which operate across State lines will be protected by the provisions of the act. Specifically, coverage should be extended to include chain service industries such as retail establishments, hotels, laundries and dry cleaning establishments, and industrialized agricultural workers. Some of the lowest paid workers in the Nation are found in these groups. We also will support amendments to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour.

We believe that renewed effort must be made to secure minimum wage laws in all the States, to protect those workers in local service trades who cannot be covered by the Federal act. Wage payment laws also should be enacted in each State.

EXPANDING AND STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

We should continue moving toward our goal of an adequate system of social security. In spite of recent progress, benefit levels are too low and many persons fail to receive sufficient protection to permit adequate standards of living.

(a) Old age, survivors and disability insurance: Congress this year will be giving serious attention to the health benefits for beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance. A program for paying for the cost of hospital, nursing, and certain medical services can both protect people currently and advance constructive development of such needed facilities. Our ultimate goal is a broad plan of national insurance which will make the full services of doctors and hospitals financially available to everyone.

Other urgent needs are the removal of the requirement of age 50 for the receipt of disability benefits and extension of OASDI coverage to low income groups now partly or

entirely excluded, especially migrant farm workers.

(b) Unemployment compensation: The Federal-State system of unemployment insurance is far too limited. Immediate Federal action is required to assure that every State extends coverage, increases benefit amounts, pays for longer periods, and avoids overharsh provisions on eligibility and disqualifications. In addition, Federal grants should be available to assist States with high unemployment rates, and States should be permitted to adjust taxes on a statewide basis as well as on an individual rating basis.

(c) Workmen's compensation: Workmen's compensation is likewise failing seriously in meeting its purpose. Present laws, with their emphasis on blame and litigation, neglect the main objective which is rehabilitation of the injured. Weekly benefits are too low. Full medical and hospital care is too seldom provided. Thousands of workers are unprotected by any workmen's compensation law. Safety programs and preventive measures against such industrial hazards as radiation exposure are quite inadequate. Some States fail even to provide insurance against many of the diseases caused by modern industrial processes.

Our workmen's compensation program needs drastic overhauling. Whether or not State laws should be replaced by a Federal Workmen's Compensation Act or an exclusive State fund should be substituted for private carriers, it is certain new remedies must be applied to correct the basic problem, namely the present emphasis on blame for the accident instead of on rehabilitation of the injured workman, which should be the real purpose of workmen's compensation legislation.

Legislation that would provide for the improvements in our social insurance laws, which the above statement shows are so urgently needed, will be supported by the National Consumers League.

RAISING WORKING AND LIVING STANDARDS OF FARM WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Coverage of migratory and other agricultural labor by a Federal minimum wage law will be a primary goal for 1959.

Other legislative objectives for improving the plight of agricultural workers will be: 1. Inclusion of agricultural workers in the Labor-Management Relations Act; 2. the establishment of a minimum age for the employment of children in agriculture outside school hours; 3. more adequate coverage of agricultural workers by workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance; 4. Federal licensing and regulation of crew leaders; 5. State and National measures to improve housing and transportation standards; 6. further, we stress the importance of laws and programs to provide more health, welfare, education, and other community services for migrants.

ESTABLISHING A COMPREHENSIVE HOUSING PROGRAM

Low income families are hardest hit by the housing problem. The difficulty of finding housing at rents or prices they can afford is growing.

The National Consumers League will support legislation that will expand the urban renewal and slum clearance programs, provide housing for the elderly and include feasible measures for assuring comfortable and sanitary shelter for migratory farmworkers and their families.

ASSISTING THE DEPRESSED AREAS TO ECONOMIC HEALTH

We will support legislation designed to aid those urban and rural areas, throughout the country, that suffer from chronic unemployment and underemployment. A bill authorizing loans for new and expanded business and commercial enterprise, loans and grants

for public facilities which will help these re-development areas to help themselves, and such a bill containing in addition, provisions for technical assistance, retraining facilities, retraining subsistence payments, procurement contract aids and industrial rebuilding in urban renewal areas would have our enthusiastic support. However, great care needs to be exercised in assisting the relocation of establishments from one area to another to prevent increasing unemployment in the original location.

PROVIDING NEEDED FINANCIAL AID TO EDUCATION

The extent to which the democratic ideal is realized depends on the ethical and intellectual capacity of citizens to make wise decisions and choices in all human relationships. Children should be assured the opportunity to secure the kind of education which will challenge their intellectual abilities to the full.

Therefore, we will support those legislative measures which will furnish such Federal financial aid to the States as is necessary: (1) To provide programs of education for children of migratory agricultural workers; (2) to provide the number of public schools required to house adequately all children within the respective States (current estimates of need are between 140,000 and 150,000 classrooms); (3) to employ a sufficient number of qualified public schoolteachers to assure maximum effectiveness in teaching in reasonably sized classes (25 pupils to a teacher in elementary schools); and (4) to establish training programs for teachers that will qualify them to develop to his full capacity each child who comes under their instruction.

IMPROVING THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RIGHT TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

We believe that the so-called right-to-work laws which have been adopted in a number of States impede organization and the development of good industrial relations and therefore seriously handicap unions in bargaining collectively for better wages and working conditions. We deplore the attempts to secure such laws in other States.

We will support amendment of section 14b of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 that will give to the Federal Government prior jurisdiction on this issue.

Boyce House on Alaska: Texas Invented Eskimo Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an exhaustive study into the status of Texas in folklore since the admission of Alaska to the Union has been conducted by one of the most noted authorities on the Lone Star State, Mr. Boyce House. The admission of the 49th State has caused Texas to relinquish its title as the largest State in area and, as Mr. House points out, this has given rise to some comments and questions as to Texas' status in the life and legend of the United States.

Boyce House has written 14 books and made almost 1,000 speeches about Texas, more than any other one man. He is known as "Mr. Texas" in his home State, and is noted and honored by his fellow

citizens as a much-sought-after humorist, an afterdinner speaker, and as a chronicler of the tales of Texas, both tall and true. He is, in addition, a respected author and an able news reporter. More copies of his books have been sold than those of any other Texas author. Boyce House is also an astute observer of governmental institutions, has served in public office, and has been, himself, a candidate for statewide office.

Following his study of this problem confronting Texas' new status, he has noted his findings, including the fact that the inventor of the Eskimo Pie was a Texan, in an article for the press.

Mr. House's interesting article on Texas' attitude on Alaska was recently published in the Port Lavaca Wave, an excellent weekly newspaper serving the people in one of Texas' fastest-growing areas, in the gulf coastal area.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the feature column which appeared in the Port Lavaca Wave of Thursday, January 1, 1959, under the heading "Boyce House Explains Texas' New Attitude."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOYCE HOUSE EXPLAINS TEXAS, NEW ATTITUDE
(By Boyce House)

"What are you Texans going to do about Alaska?"

This is the question that citizens of the Lone Star State have heard many times from their friends over the Nation in the last few months.

The answer is, "Nothing—it won't be necessary."

Texas long ago became synonymous with size—and, once an idea finds lodgement in the human mind, it is next to impossible to uproot it.

If you wear a Panama, chances are that it didn't come from Panama but Ecuador; St. Patrick was not an Irishman; chili is not a Mexican food, as any Mexican will tell you, with considerable fire; no witches were burned in New England—they were hanged; Mount Olympus, the home of the gods, would be a foothill in the Rockies; the grass in Kentucky isn't really blue and the composer of "My Old Kentucky Home" was not a Kentuckian; the Trojan War was only a minor disturbance in Asia Minor.

Billy Rose says the Venus de Milo couldn't get a job as a Broadway showgirl; and the Scotch bagpipe was invented by the Irish, who then wished it off on the Scots.

But try to convince the public of these things.

Similarly, Texas has come to be synonymous with bigness. When someone asked Dr. Wernher von Braun if there was a likelihood that two manmade satellites would collide, he replied that such a happening was highly improbable, adding, "You must remember that space is large; it is even larger than Texas."

As a matter of mere statistics, Texas never really has been the biggest. Not only is Australia larger but Canada has two territories and three provinces, each of which is bigger than Texas. But who cares?

I have made a personal investigation since statehood was conferred on Alaska and have found that Texas is just as huge as it ever was; it's still 801 miles in a straight line north and south and 773 miles east and west; and it still has 256 counties, one of which lacks only two square miles of being twice as large as Rhode Island and Delaware

combined, with the District of Columbia thrown in.

But Texas is more, much more, than so many thousands of square miles. Texas has cowboys, mavericks, longhorns, mirages, horned frogs that live 31 years sealed up in a courthouse cornerstones without air, food, or water; and Texas Rangers, as all TV viewers and moviegoers throughout the world know. Texas produces more oil, cotton, and sulfur than any other State; also more sheep, though there is nothing sheepish about Texas; and more salt, which is taken by visitors—a few grains at a time—with our tall tales.

Texans, mainly new arrivals from Southern States, it is true, but Texans nonetheless, won their own independence in 1836, set up a republic and sent ambassadors to foreign countries, including the United States; then, in 1846, entered the Union of their own free will. Yes, they did, later on, try to leave the Union but, after 4 years in which to reflect, reconsidered. Even so, the last battle of the Civil War was fought in Texas, weeks after Appomattox and, of course, the Texans won it.

Texas A. & M. College contributed more officers to the Army in World War II than West Point did. Texas has the Alamo. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate is from Texas. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is from Texas. And the President of the United States is from Texas. The San Jacinto Monument is taller than the Washington Monument and the Texas Capitol is higher than the National Capitol.

And it is my understanding that the inventor of the Eskimo Pie was from Texas.

Among the 49 States, Texas is what the forward pass is to football and what the slide trombone is to the band. Texas is tradition, history, courage, energy, vision, friendliness, achievement, hospitality, and humor that is good humored.

Ask the man on the street who the present world's heavyweight titleholder is and it's better than even that he can't tell you but speak of the champ and he knows you mean the greatest of 'em all, Jack Dempsey.

So, whatever the statistical tables show, Texas will always be the champ.

A Proposal for World Peace in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a very active group of citizens from my home district in Oakland County, Mich., have taken a close look at the problems our Nation faces around the world. They have come up with some conclusions in their studies which I would urge my colleagues to consider and study very carefully.

The membership of this group is varied and represents almost every facet of our community. There are members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Methodist Church, the Detroit and Oakland County Committees for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and the Ferndale Cooperative. They are not speaking officially for these organizations but are offering their own approach to our world problems. May I compliment the members of this group

for their forthright and fearless approach.

Their views follow:

A PROPOSAL FOR WORLD PEACE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Tremendous strides in scientific progress in recent decades have created a potentially tragic imbalance between the technical and political growth of man. The consequence of this imbalance is that man has uncovered destructive forces of genocidal magnitude, while at the same time he is, as yet, politically inadequate to control these forces.

This political inadequacy arises from the nationalistic efforts of nations to cope with a problem of international scope; namely, the military ramifications of nuclear energy. The situation is analogous to the efforts of our original 13 colonies in meeting a common problem. Just as that situation forged new political concepts which resulted in unity around a common goal, so, too, today's dilemma is forcing new concepts on heretofore nationalistic man. Recognition and acceptance of national differences and national aspirations, as components of the larger world community, are the core features of these new concepts.

Acceptance of the concept of allegiance to the world community is a prerequisite for any nation aspiring to world leadership. It follows from this that such a nation must exhibit positive initiative in peaceful endeavors and show sincere deemphasis of military aspects.

It is our sincere concern that the United States shall show initiative and leadership in the cause of world peace, and it is to this end that we hereby submit the following studied proposals for securing world peace:

1. It is crucially important that we give full support to the work of the Geneva conference on international cessation of nuclear weapons testing. We commend the example set by our Government of banning further bomb tests and urge that this moral initiative not be lost by our resumption of tests.

2. Recognizing that at least two nations possess the power to destroy other nations (and themselves), we feel that continued expansion of the military does not increase our national security and that continued competition in the nuclear arms race is tragically illogical. The strength and security of any nation lies, in the final analysis, not in its illusory military "defensive" or "retaliatory" powers, but in its technical, economic, and moral strength. We therefore urge a continuing and progressive reduction in our military budget and a corresponding increase in the emphasis placed on education, social welfare, and peaceful research. This constructive reemphasis will, we believe, not only make a greater long-range contribution to the security of the United States, but also serve to allay the all-too-justified suspicions of the "neutral" world and reaffirm their faith in the United States as a leader in the cause of world peace.

3. A realistic recognition of the world as it exists is a vital step in alleviating cold war tensions. Diplomatic recognition and acceptance of all nations into the United Nations will place each within the framework, and subject to the discipline of an international body. This has now become a logical and necessary alternative to military settlements of international disputes. Measures which will facilitate the principle of peaceful coexistence should be encouraged. These include east-west trade and greater communication such as travel and exchange of students, educators, scientists, and other prominent sections of our respective societies. Greater emphasis on mutually beneficial economic competition and deemphasis of nonconstructive military competition and arms races will substantially ease dangerous international tensions.

In summary, we submit to you that a distinct need for a new concept in the international political arena has arisen. The concept involves recognition of the worldwide, rather than nationalist, character of the problems of modern man, and therefore the international solution to these problems. Acceptance of this concept is a prerequisite to leadership in the peace-desiring world. It behooves us in the United States to embrace this realistic philosophy for the future, and with characteristic foresight, exhibit sincere initiative in this area.

E. Julius Davis, Detroit, Methodist Minister, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Morris Goodman, Ph. D., Oak Park, Chairman, Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; A. Albert Johnson, Oak Park, President, Ferndale Cooperative, Inc., Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Isadore I. Kolman, M.D., Huntington Woods, Oakland County Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Warner Van Hala, Royal Oak, Detroit Fellowship of Reconciliation, Detroit Sane Nuclear Policy Committee; Clifford E. Walter, Jr., Roseville, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Detroit Sane Nuclear Policy Committee; Robert Z. Willson, Ferndale, Ferndale Cooperative, Inc., Public Relations, Ferndale Kiwanis Club, Public Affairs Committee Chairman, Member of Baha'i World Faith.

Earl Warren and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, December 23, 1958, there was published in the Christian Science Monitor an article which expresses what I think is one of the finest of what might be called legal opinions in relation to what this Government of ours is. The article is written by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School. He takes a careful and stimulating look in this article at Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the United States, and the context in which the 1954 decision was made, outlawing segregation in the public schools. One may not agree with this logical statement, but I suggest that one cannot fail to read it with profit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARL WARREN AND THE SUPREME COURT (By Erwin N. Griswold) WARREN'S BACKGROUND

Earl Warren came to the Court with a remarkable background. He was 62 years old when he was appointed. He had been a lawyer for 39 years. He spent several years in private practice, and a period as a deputy city attorney.

After that he was, in succession, district attorney of Alameda County, Calif., for 14 years, where he made a distinguished record, and appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States on several occasions; then

Attorney General of California for 4 years, and Governor of California for 10 years.

While Governor he was the Republican nominee for Vice President in 1948. All of these offices gave him intimate opportunities to observe the problems of government in action, to deal with people, and to participate in the administration and, as Governor, in the making of laws.

During his tenure as Governor the population of California increased explosively. He consistently proved himself equal to the tasks which this presented. By common consent, Mr. Warren was a first-class Governor, one of the most distinguished Governors this country has had. In the latter years of his tenure of the office he received the nominations of both major parties.

In a sense his experience was largely political. He had never been a judge, but neither had Marshall or Taney or Fuller or Hughes or Stone when they were first appointed to the Supreme Court. He had been a governor, as had Hughes just before he had been appointed to the Court as an Associate Justice. And Taft, though he had had judicial experience, had been Governor of the Philippine Islands and then President of the United States.

The task of judging in the Supreme Court is not, for the most part, like that in other courts in the country, and experience has shown in many cases that a record of high achievement in political office is excellent background for a Supreme Court post.

CONTROVERSIAL YEARS

This was an auspicious beginning. What can we say about the Chief Justice's first 5 years in office? We can surely say that they have been filled with controversy.

Speeches have been made about "Storm over the Supreme Court," and much has been written and said about "The Supreme Court Crisis." Often Chief Justice Warren has been the special object of attack, both as a symbol of the Court, and in his own right.

Are these attacks justified? What is the state of the Supreme Court today? What is the place which Earl Warren has established for himself among our Chief Justices?

Before these questions can be properly considered, it is necessary to clear away a large amount of misconception which has been evident in many of the criticisms of the Supreme Court.

1. The United States is not a democracy, except in the special sense in which that term is used in this country. It is not even a representative democracy. The earmark of the great American plan, the contribution of the Founding Fathers to the science of government, the things that has kept us going as a great Nation over a period of more than a century and a half of dynamic and constant growth, is that our Government is one of checks and balances.

We do not have a single legislature. We have both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Even if both Houses agree on a measure, it does not become a law without the President's approval, unless there is a two-thirds vote of both Houses after his veto. Even Congress and the President together, even by unanimous vote, cannot pass laws on many subjects. Our Congress is one of limited powers.

The States, too, have limited powers, limited by what they have given up to the Federal Government, and limited by many other parts of the Constitution, notably the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments.

CLASHES INEVITABLE

Under the Constitution, the judicial power of the United States is given to the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. It is inevitable that the Supreme Court in exercising this judicial power will come into clash with one branch of the Government or another—with the President, when it in-

validated the steel seizure in 1952, for example; with Congress, when it passes a statute beyond constitutional bounds; or with a State, as in the school-segregation cases.

But what the Court does is to decide the cases that come before it, brought there by human beings, making claims to "equal justice under the law," to use the phrase which is carved over the portal of the Supreme Court's building in Washington.

The Supreme Court does not sit to count votes. It is not its function to carry out the will of the majority. It is a fundamental basis of our governmental system that there are many things which a majority cannot do, and that there are many things on which the people of a State must yield to a greater national interest, as expressed in the Constitution. The Court interprets and applies the Constitution.

In doing so, its very purpose is, occasionally, to thwart the will of the majority of the people, either national or local. Without the Court our Government structure would surely collapse. This is a task of the highest order. And it is obviously one which cannot be carried out with universal agreement or wholly in an atmosphere of sweetness and light.

PRECISION AMID IMPRECISION

2. Many laymen have the view that the law is somewhat like mathematics, a precise subject, where everything follows inevitably from premise to conclusion if one only has the capacity or the character to think straight.

Of course, mathematics is not like that, in many of its aspects. And that is surely not the way with the law. There are many principles, rules, and standards in the law. Legal training involves an understanding of these. It also involves considerable experience with the way the law has grown and developed over a period of many years.

This is obtained by the study of cases, the record of past decisions of courts, and of statutes and other legal materials such as treaties, and administrative regulations, and decisions.

One of the great things about our law, derived from the English common-law tradition, is that the judges of appellate courts are expected to formulate the reasons for their decisions in writing. This is a great stimulus to careful thinking and expression, because the judge knows that his effort is going to be subject to the scrutiny of contemporary members of his profession and of history. It also provides an important means by which students learn the law and lawyers are enabled to advise their clients and other judges may guide themselves in coming to a decision.

But typically, and especially in cases that come before the Supreme Court, there is no one decision that is logically required.

Once I heard a Lord Chancellor of Great Britain say, at a meeting in Australia, that the function of the judge is to "follow loyally the decision which has already been come to."

QUESTIONS LEFT AMBIGUOUS

A judge of the high court of Australia who was sitting beside me turned and said, somewhat impatiently: "That's no help to me. The cases that come to my court are there because there is no case in point, or in many cases because there are two or more lines of decisions which are claimed to be controlling. The judge's function is to choose. He doesn't give me any help in doing that."

So it is with our Supreme Court. Very rarely is decision there a simple matter of finding and following precedent. We would not need great men for judges if that were the case.

Sometimes questions are left deliberately ambiguous by the legislator, so that the

Court is left to make the choice. Legislation is often a matter of compromise, and sometimes a compromise can be arrived at only if issues are not too sharply drawn.

For example, the basic question of whether or not the Supreme Court has power to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional is not specifically resolved in the Constitution itself. Yet it is clear that the problem was known to those at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and must have been discussed by them.

To have attempted to make this matter specific might have wrecked the embryonic Constitution. Thus they left the question to the Supreme Court itself. When the Court decided the matter, left wholly open on the face of the Constitution, it was not legislating; it was performing the function that was assigned to it by the Constitution. Neither result was inevitable. The Court had to make a conscious choice. As Judge Learned Hand has pointed out in his recent Holmes lectures, the result was practically, though not legally, a necessary one.

The Court has similar problems to consider in many other areas under the Constitution. No State can pass any "law impairing the obligation of contracts." What is a contract for this purpose? Does it include a grant or charter? What sort of action constitutes an impairment?

Or, Congress has power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." What is commerce? Is the power of Congress exclusive, or do the States have residual powers, at least until Congress has acted?

These, and many other questions like them, have occupied much of the time of the Court over a period of many years.

QUESTION OF DOUBT

Then there are the great and vague constitutional phrases like "due process of law," "privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States," and "equal protection of the laws." All of these phrases present ambiguities, questions of doubt and choice. It is the function of all courts to construe and apply these constitutional terms when they are involved in cases which come before them. But, in the nature of things, it is preeminently the functions of the Supreme Court to speak the controlling word.

And the fact that that word when spoken is not pleasing to one or more of the parties, or to a majority of the people of a State, or even to a majority of the people of the United States, is wholly irrelevant. The very purpose of a constitution is to restrict majorities, either national or local.

3. Finally, we may make reference to the problem which lies back of much of the present controversy about the Supreme Court. This is the decision first announced in 1954 through Chief Justice Warren, speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court in what are called the school-segregation cases.

Much of the criticism of the Court in connection with this decision has been on the assumption that the Court came to its conclusion out of the blue, that it willfully and suddenly made up its mind to change what had always been the law, and that it thus needlessly and unwarrantedly upset the peace of the United States.

But law is not like that; and Supreme Court Justices are not like that. They have all taken an oath to administer justice according to law, and that is an oath which they take very seriously. The Justices are confronted with many problems, in each of which there is an area of choice. But they make their choice according to law, that is, in the light of the legal materials which are available.

PROCESS OF CHANGE

One of the things that one learns about law as he studies it and works with it is

that law is a process. Decisional law, in particular, grows and develops, becomes more precise, or encounters change. The judges decide each case as it comes before them, doing the best, most thoughtful, and conscientious job they can in the light of the facts and their understanding of the law applicable to that case.

As individual cases are decided, it becomes apparent that the law has changed, or is in the process of changing. When this is clear enough, an earlier decision may be expressly overruled, either on the ground that it now appears that it was mistakenly decided in the first place, or that subsequent decisions have so undermined the premises on which it was based that it can no longer stand.

This process is the essence of the common law. It involves making law in a sense, but it is not legislating. It is an essentially judicial process, an important function which courts have always carried out, and without which our legal system could not effectively function. To some extent it is a matter of trial and error.

To an even greater extent it is an illustration of the finest functioning of the human mind in the field of government, the constant searching process of striving to reach sound decisions through reason under law.

This is just what happened in the segregation cases. It is true that the Supreme Court in 1896 decided a case called *Plessy v. Ferguson*. This case did not involve schools but did uphold segregation in railroad trains; it gave rise to the separate but equal doctrine. A case in 1899, and one in 1925, applied this to schools.

But *Plessy v. Ferguson* evoked a notable dissent by the first Mr. Justice Harlan; and it sorely troubled the conscience of much of the Nation for more than 50 years. Even prior to that decision the court had held that there could not be discrimination against Negroes on juries and grand juries. And slowly, as the 20th century progressed, other cases came to be decided which marked out a pattern hardly consistent with the *Plessy* case.

PATTERN OF EVOLUTION

It is not possible to go through all the cases here, but an indication may be made. In 1917, a unanimous court, including Chief Justice White, who was a Confederate veteran, held that a Kentucky city could not enforce segregation in housing through a zoning ordinance. In 1938, the court held that a State must provide a Negro a legal education within the State, and could not send him out to another State.

In later cases, in 1948 and 1950, the Court held that Negro law students could not be excluded from State university law schools. Negro students have been going to the law schools of the Universities of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Virginia, and North Carolina, among others, under these decisions for many years—and for years before the cases involving the common schools were decided.

At the same time, a number of cases in the field of voting rights were decided, and the Court held, in several cases, that Negroes could not be excluded from primaries, even when this was sought to be done by various subterfuges and artifices.

In 1948, it was decided that private restrictive covenants, by which a purchaser of land agreed not to sell to a Negro, were unenforceable.

In the early 1950's a number of cases decided that segregation in Pullman cars, in dining cars, and finally in any way on an interstate journey, was invalid.

All of this developed over a period of a good many years. Anyone who chose to look could readily see that in the normal process of development of the law *Plessy v. Ferguson* had already been thoroughly discredited, and was clearly on the way out—as has happened

to many other cases, including constitutional cases, in the history of the Supreme Court.

A TIME OF DELIBERATION

This was the situation when the school segregation cases came before the Supreme Court. The Court was aware of the problems and exerted extraordinary care and patience in coming to its conclusion.

The cases came to the Court in 1952, while Mr. Vinson was Chief Justice. They were argued extensively on December 9, 1952. Then the Court set them down for reargument, and put certain specific questions on which it asked the assistance of counsel. The cases were reargued on December 8, 1953.

It was at this point that Earl Warren had his first official contact with the problem. The Attorney General of the United States joined in a brief filed with the Court, and the Solicitor General participated in both arguments.

Finally, the cases were decided on May 17, 1954, nearly 2 years after they had been brought to the Court.

Even that was not the end of the Court's consideration. For the cases were set down for further consideration as to the decree which should be entered, and the decision on this, following the traditional equity practice of all deliberate speed, was not announced until May 31, 1955.

All this indicated great deliberation, wise administration, and well-considered judicial conduct. But in the light of the decisions of the Court as they stood when the cases got there, the result was virtually inevitable. The Constitution prescribes "equal protection of the laws."

After some preliminary hesitation, notably in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the cases had come to hold with great consistency that equal protection means equal protection. These decisions left the Court in 1954 with very little area of choice. To judges committed under oath to render equal justice under law, it was evident that *Plessy v. Ferguson* had had a shaky foundation from the beginning, and that it had already collapsed from the effect of the many other cases which had been decided in more recent times.

REVOLUTION RECOGNIZED

All of this may seem quite far removed from Chief Justice Earl Warren, and yet it is, of course, extremely close—as he would presumably testify with some eloquence if he were free to do so.

It was the function of the Court to declare the demise of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, and it fell to Earl Warren as the Chief Justice to be the Court's spokesman.

The opinion he wrote was short, simple, straightforward, calm, and clear. It did not make a revolution. It recognized that one had already occurred during the past half century of American national and legal growth. The opinion received the unanimous support of all eight of the Chief Justice's colleagues.

Anyone who was Chief Justice in 1954 would have been subject to intense criticism. Earl Warren had sustained this with dignity, grace, good humor, and with a certain distinction, which, though less Jovian, is reminiscent of Chief Justice Hughes.

For Chief Justice Warren is a warm, human man. He is friendly, genial, kindly. He has devoted most of his active life to the service of his fellow men in one capacity or another, and there are millions who have benefited by his actions, though most of them do not know it.

Even on the Court, Chief Justice Warren gives freely of his time and energy to public activities relating to the law and the administration of justice. He has brought about a reorganization of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and seeks to turn over to it supervision of some of the rulemaking

functions of the Supreme Court. He has spoken at many gatherings of lawyers and others, and many of his speeches have been of real excellence, making a contribution to public thought which is much more than routine.

Justice Frankfurter has said that Chief Justice Hughes ran a taut Court, while things were much looser under Chief Justice Stone. The situation under Chief Justice Warren may be halfway between.

Chief Justice Warren is gracious and easy-going in Court, and one may assume that he is the same in the Court's conferences. He makes lawyers feel comfortable and at ease, makes them feel that they are really welcome, and that the Court is glad—indeed anxious—to listen to them. Yet he keeps things going. No one trifles with him.

Perhaps some might think that as a lawyer he is still feeling his way. Of course, a good lawyer is always feeling his way. Any lawyer or judge who is sure he knows the answers is pretty sure to be wrong.

Resolutions of Rural Electric Cooperative Leaders From Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on September 28, 29, and 30, 1958, some 538 rural leaders met in my home State at Madison for the annual region 5 meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. They represented the 113 rural electric cooperatives which serve 346,763 consumer-members in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD some important resolutions on the rural electrification program which were passed at this meeting.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE LEADERS FROM WISCONSIN, IOWA, AND ILLINOIS

REA REORGANIZATION

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar

to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed.

INTEREST RATES

Whereas a number of bills and proposals were presented to the 85th Congress to increase REA interest rates; and

Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act in 1944, and fixing the interest rate of 2 percent, therein made a covenant with the rural electric cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable retail rates; and

Whereas both REA Administrator David Hamil and Director of Agriculture Credit Services Kenneth Scott testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations this year that increased rates would have a detrimental effect on telephone loans and electric loans to systems in sparsely settled areas; and

Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2 percent interest rate is necessary to enable the rural electric systems to complete the task of providing full, efficient, and reasonably priced electric service on an area coverage basis; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law, the effects of which would increase REA interest rates.

REA LOAN SOURCE

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture last February sent to the Congress a proposed bill which provided that the cooperatives secure their financing in Wall Street—for which no legislator would act as sponsor; and

Whereas such bill would double or triple interest rates to the rural electric systems; and

Whereas such bill would virtually kill the generating and transmission program and bankrupt many distribution cooperatives; and

Whereas the Congress has always evidenced its wholehearted support of the REA program by consistently providing sufficient loan funds; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to oppose any and all proposals which would send the rural electric systems into the private money market for their financing, and we urge Congress to continue its fine support of the rural electric program which means so much to the people of rural America and to the country as a whole.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S RULING

Whereas a ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States on a loan made by REA to the Central Iowa Power Cooperative of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to service Greene County Rural Electric Cooperative of Jefferson, Iowa, imperils the entire lending program of REA; and

Whereas by this ruling the Comptroller General has usurped and attempted to nullify the declared will and intent of Congress; and

Whereas under this ruling loans amounting to millions of dollars made by REA in conformity with the Rural Electrification Act would be held illegal; and

Whereas this ruling is a complete misinterpretation of the REA Act; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we approve and commend the counsel for the Iowa Cooperative, William Wisdom and L. F. Wilcox; the special counsel of NRECA, Wise and Potamkin; the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, E. F. Mynatt, for their fine briefs pointing out the defects of this ruling; be it further

Resolved, That the cooperatives respectfully request the Comptroller General to rescind this ruling; and be it further

Resolved, That if the Comptroller General does not rescind this ruling, the Secretary of Agriculture and the REA Administrator be requested to actively resist the ruling and Congress be requested to nullify it.

SELLOUT PROTECTION

Whereas forces opposing the rural electrification program are moving in on cooperatives in various parts of the country, i.g., the New Jersey and Arizona cases, for the expressed purpose of buying them out; and

Whereas it is evident that the power companies instituting sellouts are being directed by executives hired and maintained by their holding companies; and

Whereas electric consumers in and outside the program will pay more for electricity if these sellouts become more widespread; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in keeping with the key-note set by our General Manager Clyde T. Ellis, we launch a counter-offensive; be it further

Resolved, That we urge REA to provide more aggressive assistance to cooperatives needing its help to continue their existence—such as was the case of cooperatives in New Jersey and Arizona; be it further

Resolved, That we urge our State legislatures to provide us with the machinery to function as public agencies or utility districts where such a step is necessary to preserve consumer ownership; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to make all large transmission lines common carriers as a means of helping to advance the objectives of abundant, low-cost power to consumers; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to protect rural electric and all electric consumers by abolishing the electric holding companies; be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to investigate and expose the apparent master plan to cripple and destroy the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Congress to thoroughly investigate the sellout cases that have now occurred in order that the Rural Electrification Act may be strengthened as a means of protecting the interests of consumers and all Americans who are concerned about the contributions rural electric are making.

ADMINISTRATION OF REA

Whereas David A. Hamil, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, has for 2 years administered the rural electrification program in an excellent manner and has gained the admiration and respect of the cooperatives throughout America; and

Whereas Mr. Hamil has carried out the duties and responsibilities of his office in the face of great difficulties; and

Whereas the rural electric cooperatives undertook the electrification of rural areas including the byways and backroads on an area-coverage basis upon the congressional assurance that adequate loan funds would be available at 2 percent interest under the Pace Act; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, President Eisenhower, and others, are advocating changes in the Rural Electrification Act which would increase the interest rate and send us to the Wall Street money market for at least a substantial portion of our funds; and

Whereas such changes would make it impossible to serve the remaining unserved rural people and would curtail the expansion of service to our present consumers; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Benson in a letter dated August 28, 1958, to NRECA President John George, pledged that the Department of Agriculture would not try "to pressure any REA borrower into any course of action"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we heartily commend the Administrator of the Rural Electrification

Administration for the manner in which he has technically administered the program; and, be it further

Resolved, That we protest the actions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, and the President of the United States in using the power and prestige of their respective offices to advance changes that would be detrimental to the rural electrification program.

THE TRIMBLE BILL

Whereas the divergent methods of allocating costs to power being applied by the various bureaus and agencies will render the future construction of many multiple purpose projects economically impossible and will affect adversely the orderly development of our national water resources; and

Whereas the Trimble bill introduced in the 85th Congress set forth an equitable formula by which cost allocations should be determined, and would fix the responsibility for making the determination in the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the introduction and early passage in the 86th Congress of a bill identical or substantially similar to the Trimble bill.

TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority after 25 years of exemplary service to its region and Nation is the sole supplier of power at wholesale to 50 cooperatives whose yardstick resale rates influence power rates throughout the country; and

Whereas without the prompt construction of additional generating capacity TVA will lack sufficient power to meet the needs of its distributors by 1960, or 1961 at the latest; and

Whereas in addition to the normal and steadily increasing demand for power in its area TVA also is called upon to deliver vast blocks of power, amounting to over half its production, to national defense installations in which all of us as citizens are interested; and

Whereas in the past 5 years TVA has received no appropriations for starting additional generating stations, and construction capital from this source is not in sight; and

Whereas a plan approved by the TVA Board for financing new capacity by revenue bonds to be sold in the open market has been before Congress and will be renewed before Congress at the opening of the next session; and

Whereas we believe this plan is the best proposition ever made by a region to the Nation and would in effect wither the widely cultivated claim that TVA power is subsidized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, recognizing the supply crisis with which TVA is faced, we urge upon Congress, and upon our several Representatives individually, passage without delay early in the 86th Congress of TVA self-financing legislation on the order of the Kerr bill previously approved by the Senate and of the Davis-Jones bill favorably reported at the past session by the Public Works Committee of the House, the welfare of the 50 cooperatives that distribute TVA power and of the Nation as a whole requiring it.

PREFERENCE CLAUSE

Whereas for more than 50 years the preference clause in Federal power laws, giving preference to nonprofit public and rural electric systems, has been an important influence in insuring the continuation of a healthy competition in the electric industry; and

Whereas over four hundred of the rural electric systems are dependent either directly or indirectly upon Federal power projects for their power supply; and

Whereas constant attempts are being made to weaken the preference clause by such devices as the Case amendment and the Niagara limitations enacted in the 85th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to re-

affirm its support for the preference rights of nonprofit, consumer-owned electric systems and to oppose any repeal, watering down or evasion of the preference clause; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge Congress to enact legislation to remove the effects of the Case amendment to the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Authorization Act of 1958.

ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Whereas the rural electric systems have urged that the Congress provide for acceleration of the atomic energy program; and

Whereas the rural electric systems have also urged that the Congress provide the opportunity for adequate participation by rural electric and other nonprofit electric systems; and

Whereas the atomic energy program belongs to all of the people and should be protected from monopolistic abuse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the 86th Congress to provide an atomic energy power program that will be for the benefit of all of the people and in particular will provide for Federal construction of atomic power generating plants as proposed in the Gore bill of the 85th Congress, with preference in the sale of any power therefrom being accorded to cooperatives, municipalities, and other nonprofit, consumer-owned agencies.

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the demands for increased power supply for the rural electric systems pose a continuing problem for the rural electric systems; and

Whereas the cost of power to the systems has always been favorably influenced by our right and opportunity to generate and transmit our own power where this would result in lower costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the REA Administrator upon his making of the recent Mississippi and Texas generation and transmission loan and we urge him to continue to lend funds for generation and transmission when such loans are feasible; and be it further

Resolved, That the REA Administrator be urged to finance interconnections where mutually advantageous, but we oppose any return to the policy requiring the partnership arrangement with the private power companies; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to continue to provide adequate funds for this purpose.

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION

Whereas the electric cooperatives object strenuously to the gross misrepresentations and unfair propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association; and

Whereas the NRECA board of directors has recently voted to support the suit of National Milk Producers Federation to recover damages from the NTEA: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we give our wholehearted support of the action of the NRECA board in this matter.

RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Whereas participation by cooperative organizations in the rural telephone program is at a standstill; and

Whereas the loss of this competitive element in the program can only be detrimental to the whole program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge REA to actively promote the formation and growth of rural telephone cooperatives consistent with both the language and the spirit contained in the Senate Appropriations Committee report recommending appropriations for fiscal 1959; and be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the National Telephone Cooperative Association and encourage all telephone cooperatives to join this organization for their mutual benefit.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the islands of Hawaii were an independent monarchy in 1854 when they first requested status as a State in our Nation. In 1900, when Hawaii became a Territory, it was with the promise that statehood would eventually follow.

To help the United States keep this promise, and principally because I believe the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State would benefit both Hawaii and the entire Nation, I have coauthored a bill providing for Hawaiian statehood.

These islands have been training for statehood since 1900. They have had a constitutional government for more than 60 years, and more than 87 percent of the electorate—far above the national average—voted in the recent elections. Hawaiians pay more in per capita taxes than the national average, and the per capita income in the islands is ahead of that of 23 present States. The Territory contains 6,423 square miles of land, which would make it larger than three present States, and a population of 575,771, which is larger than the present population in each of 5 States.

The House of Representatives has voted three times to admit Hawaii, but the proposal has not been passed by the Senate. I believe the Hawaiian statehood bill should be seriously considered and passed by the 86th Congress. Mr. President, to support this belief, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Sid Ross and Ed Klester, which appeared in Parade magazine for January 11, 1959, under the heading "Hawaii Wants Statehood Now."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HAWAII WANTS STATEHOOD NOW

(By Sid Ross and Ed Klester)

HONOLULU, T. H.—Film Actress Dorothy Lamour turned up here last month. Newspapermen asked routinely about sarongs and Hollywood, but what they really wanted to know was more important: how did she feel about Hawaiian statehood?

Miss Lamour, not one to disappoint an audience announced she would send statehood plugs to every Congressman and to 700 personal friends. She will also, she said, make tape-recorded interviews on statehood for NBC-Radio.

Hawaiians could not have been more gratified. From Waikiki to Mauna Loa, the Territory is off on one of the great courtships of history. Plans for mustering support for statehood from other visitors include a sampling of visitor opinion and a "straw vote" set up at Waikiki hotels.

The question of statehood is on every tongue, in every newspaper. Last year, the half-million Americans here watched, astonished and perplexed, as Alaska became the 49th State. Their emotions were those of the bridesmaid: happiness at a friend's good fortune, frustration at their own smashed

hopes, determination never again to let love pass them by.

Hawaii wants statehood now. And this month, with Congress back in session, the campaign to win friends and influence votes begins in earnest. Here are highlights of that campaign:

A battery of guest speakers will fan out to mainland luncheon clubs, chambers of commerce, fraternal groups.

The Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce is trying for the support of 3,600 mainland "Jaycee" chapters.

Many places of mail leaving the Islands will be postmarked with a plug for statehood.

A new film on Hawaii and its history is being prepared for civic groups and women's clubs.

Students are planning "pen-pal" campaigns to line up young people's support on the mainland.

A hometown newspaper service will furnish free photos of visitors, with their views on statehood.

Wide circulation will be given endorsements of statehood by President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Vice President Nixon, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the State Department, the Defense Department, the AFL-CIO, and Dorothy Lamour.

The aim of the campaign is to whip up mainland support and thus bring indirect pressure on Congress. (A recent Gallup poll showed mainlanders eight to one for statehood.) But the real showdown, as Lorrin P. Thurston, chairman of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, points out, will come on Capitol Hill.

"Our problem," says Thurston, "is to get Hawaiian statehood before both Houses of Congress in the same session. This has never happened in the past. We feel that if a Hawaiian statehood bill is presented on the floors of both Houses, the vote will favor us."

In 1947, in 1950, and in 1953, statehood passed the House, but died in Senate committee. Thus, perhaps the most important bit of persuasion on the Hawaiian program is to coax Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON to allow the bill to reach the Senate floor.

Some Hawaiians fear all the drum beating may antagonize, instead of winning over, congressional support. (Last summer, Alaska's admission touched off a 3 week's high-pressure campaign for a vote on Hawaii; one influential Senator reportedly complained, "This pressure has got to ease up.") But others say this is Hawaii's make-or-break year.

Hawaii, then an independent monarchy, made its first try for statehood back in 1854; became a Territory in 1900 with the promise of eventual statehood; and for 20-odd years has made statehood the big issue. "You can't keep people at fever heat forever," says one observer here.

And Hawaii is at fever heat. Of more than 200 persons interviewed, three-fourths favored statehood; 20 were opposed, and the rest had no opinion.

Says Thurston: "Who is for statehood? Over 80 percent of our sugar and pineapple executives, all our public utilities, all our transportation companies, the majority of bankers and small businessmen, all our newspapers, radio and television stations, both national political parties and the great bulk of the Hawaiian people."

Why do Hawaiians want statehood? The benefits, Hawaiians say, would run in both directions. And there's the matter of simple justice. Additionally, you hear these six reasons again and again:

Second-class citizenship: Administered from Washington, Hawaii is at the mercy of Washington, cannot completely control its own affairs.

Taxation without representation: Hawaiians now pay Federal income tax but have no vote in House or Senate on how tax money is spent; they cannot vote for President, Vice President, or even their own Governor and judges.

The cold war: Statehood for Hawaii would have a tremendous propaganda value, particularly among the former colonial nations of Asia, proving that the United States does not hold Hawaii as a colonial possession.

Foreign affairs: The Pacific is becoming increasingly important in global politics, and Hawaii is Uncle Sam's most important Pacific outpost.

War record: Hawaiian units have run up an enviable record of bravery in World War II and in Korea. World War II's most-decorated outfit, the Japanese-American 442d regimental combat team, was recruited in Hawaii from volunteers.

Island development: Statehood should attract new industry to the islands, lead to development of resources such as bauxite.

In 24 separate investigations by congressional committees, these arguments have been duly weighed. (One recent committee report called statehood "of highest importance" to the United States.) But Hawaii has lost out on other grounds.

Alaska's admission shattered two objections to Hawaii—that it was "too far away" and that its admission would upset the political alignment in Congress. More damaging to Hawaii's case, however, is the claim that the islands are menaced by communism.

Sea-locked Hawaii depends on shipping, and the labor on docks—and the plantations, too—is controlled by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. This powerful union repeatedly has been accused of a Red taint. Its local leader, Jack Hall, was convicted, then freed, under the Smith Act; its international leader, Harry Bridges, has been a Government target for years.

Hawaiian officials, from the Republican Governor down, claim the Red threat has been overblown. ("At most," said one official, "there are 35 Communists in Hawaii—shorn of all influence.")

Less discussed, but another important objection, is Hawaii's melting pot. By one count the islands have 184,732 residents of Japanese descent; 90,079 of Polynesian-Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian; 81,911 of various Caucasian; 61,040 of Filipino ancestry; 30,566 of Chinese; 10,351 of Puerto Rican and 7,624 Korean.

Recently, an editorial in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier asked: "These islanders may be very friendly and polite people. But how many of them know or care about the political faith of Jefferson, respect States rights, or appreciate the struggle for liberty? We suspect there are very few to understand and believe in the kind of government our forefathers created." Another newspaper was more blunt: "Do we Americans want to put a couple of Japs in the Senate?"

This argument raises hackles all over the islands. Says Gov. William F. Quinn: "They're all good Americans and have proved it in peace and war."

There still is, however, a small undercurrent of opposition to statehood. Some native Hawaiians feel statehood will mean the Japanese will take over. Another group, led by former Governor, now Hawaii Supreme Court Justice, Ingram Stainback, favors a Commonwealth system, such as Puerto Rico has. Under Commonwealth, Justice Stainback says, Federal income tax would be eliminated and thus industry might be attracted.

A small fringe group also wants to keep Hawaii as it is, an incorporated Territory. Rumors claim this group is backed by big

business—"then they can run the islands as a closed corporation." The statehood commission, which includes big business members, denies that the status quo has more than a small fraction of business support. And finally, a few descendants of the original Hawaiians like the status quo because they fear losing homesteading privileges.

But these are views of only a small minority. As Parade's poll shows—and as virtually every other poll shows, too—the vast majority of Hawaiians want statehood. They want it badly—and want it now.

Riley Allen, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, summed up the "No. 50 in 1959" this way recently: "If Hawaii is not ready for statehood now, after many years of Territorial, city and county government on American lines, after writing an outstanding war record in the blood of its young men, after proving its willingness and ability to combat communism, after demonstrating its industry potentials, if it is not ready for statehood now, it never will be."

You'll be hearing a lot about statehood for Hawaii in the next few months. A half-million Americans here are working constantly to see that you do.

Growth of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, each year our Federal Government grows bigger, and with this bigness freedom of the individual diminishes almost proportionately.

How ironic all this is, for it was a not-so-centralized U.S. Government which led the people to victory in World War I and World War II over regimented dictatorships, and it was largely because of individual initiative and nonregimentation that the United States achieved the world's highest standard of living.

Recently the editors of two nondaily newspapers in Camden, S.C., expressed their concern about the unfortunate trend in the United States away from a decentralized government and away from the theory of individual freedom. They do not paint a pretty picture with their words; yet, their editorials deserve the attention of all thinking men. I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials—the first, which appeared in the January 7 edition of the Camden News, entitled "A Great Nation Dying," and the second, which appeared in the January 7 edition of the Camden Chronicle, entitled "The Question Mark"—be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Camden News, Jan. 7, 1959]

A GREAT NATION DYING

"It's heartbreaking to see a great nation dying when you know that it could have been saved."

That statement was made to the editor of the Camden News just last week by a man of national prominence, who has a thorough grasp of the situation which exists in this country today.

He had no sooner made the remark than he checked himself and asked that, because of his farflung connections, his name not be used if we quoted him.

But there was no mistaking his feelings. He spoke in solemn tone and the quiver in his voice indicated that he meant what he said and that he felt it very deeply.

He said that this was the saddest New Year in his life. He felt that progress had been made last year by those seeking to destroy a free America and make it a regimented State, and that they will make even greater headway in the year which lies ahead.

He listed as some of the reasons for feeling so hopeless:

Some of the forces which have been fighting to save the Nation have become confused and demoralized. The opposition has succeeded in dividing them on minor issues.

Political ties hold them to their parties. They lack the moral courage to make the breakaway and to form a new alliance which could save the day. He blames the politicians for this and says they are clinging desperately to their jobs and fear that any breakaway might possibly endanger their positions. If the country is going to go down, they figure they will at least hold their jobs until this happens.

Businessmen will not get out and fight because of the fear that they might lose a few dollars if they do. They don't seem to realize that in the end they may lose everything if they don't get out and fight now.

The vast majority of the people are either unaware of the dangers confronting the Nation or are unconcerned about them. If you try to point out the dangers to some of them, they shrug their shoulders, say you are an alarmist, that "things are not that bad" and then run off to chase another dollar or to go to a cocktail party. Some may sense the danger but want to leave it to others to do the fighting—and the worrying. They don't want to get mixed up in it.

The other side is united, is working day and night with a crusading spirit, individuals are giving most liberally of their time and means, taking advantage of every opportunity to confuse and divide us and are running rings around us in putting out propaganda.

And so the leak in the dam gets bigger and bigger and unless something happens quickly to awaken the masses from their lethargy and to unite those of us, who want to save this as a free America, into a band of steel, it is but a question of time until the dam breaks. Let us hope and pray that this something may happen before it is everlastingly too late.

We have often quoted the remarks made by Daniel Webster on an historic occasion and we are going to quote them again in the hope that his words may burn their way into the hearts of some who are so indifferent now:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall they will not be raised again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be designed to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional liberty."

[From the Camden Chronicle, Jan. 7, 1959]

THE QUESTION MARK

Just about everything in this country has been getting bigger.

This trend, the economists confidently tell us with hardly a dissenting voice, is not only sure to continue but to accelerate. They blueprint a future of ever-increasing incomes, ever-improving living standards, the mass enjoyment of luxuries which would have been beyond the imagination of man not long ago.

We are on the verge of explosive breakthroughs in physical sciences. The age-old mysteries of space are being fathomed, and soon will be mysteries no more. The miracles of nuclear physics are at hand. Longer, healthier, happier lives for all are promised. And we are not alone. All over the world, peoples and nations are swept along, to varying degrees, in the same tide.

This is fine. Almost everyone wants more money, more of the things that money can buy, more of what we know by the word "progress."

Yet a nagging question arises, the biggest unanswered question that confronts the changing world. While just about everything is getting bigger, is the greatest resource of all getting smaller? That resource is the individual. Not just people in the mass, but individual people—each different, each unique, each a spirit as well as an appetite. Is the individual in very real danger of being dwarfed by the bigness around him, and of being reduced to a statistic?

It's easy enough to say that it can't happen here, even though we have all seen it happen in vast reaches of the earth. Easy enough, but untrue. This Nation was founded on certain concepts: the fullest freedom for all, an unflagging sense of the spiritual nature of man, a passionate regard for the worth of every individual human being. But these, like all other concepts and philosophies, will wither away to nothingness unless they are eternally prized beyond all else and faithfully protected. They must be supported in absolutely specific ways. They demand the highest degree of individual independence and responsibility. If, for instance, we give to government the initiative and the power to regulate and dominate our lives in the name of security, the ultimate end will be the security of the penitentiary. Power once granted to government must always be balanced against a greater power in the hands of the people.

We pride ourselves on our material achievements. But pride can result in a deadly blindness. Other nations, whose concepts are utterly opposed to ours, are producing their own wonders. Communist Russia and Communist China are, so to speak, moving mountains. The whip and the chain, used with dedicated ruthlessness, can also get out the gods, while the soul of man dies.

It took centuries of turmoil, war and revolution to establish the rights of man, the rights of the individual. They can be lost overnight by sins of omission no less than sins of commission. A people whose eyes and minds are fixed on material ends alone will not long remain a free people. They will become merely instruments of power.

There is no foreseeable limit to what we, through our economic, social and political organizations can achieve. It will be the

ultimate irony if, in the light of this, we surrender the individual to material bigness, whether in government or anywhere else. We never had a more urgent need to uphold age-old principles and convictions that make for the only worthwhile kind of progress—confidence in something, faith in ideals, fairness, the determination to defend what one believes to be right.

Walt Whitman wrote, a century ago: "The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual; namely, to you." Man in the mass must never hide the face of the individual man.

Science and Freedom: The Continuing Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the November 1958 Conference of NATO Parliamentarians in Paris, important recommendations were unanimously agreed upon to further improve the State of science in the NATO Community.

These recommendations are embodied in the report of the Scientific and Technical Committee entitled "Science and Freedom: The Continuing Challenge."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which I delivered as Chairman of the NATO Scientific and Technical Committee in presenting the report to the Conference on November 17, 1958, together with the text of the report itself.

There being no objection, the address and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON, PRESENTING THE REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE ON NOVEMBER 17, 1958

Only one out of every seven people in the world is a member of our North Atlantic Community. We occupy only a small fraction of the lands of the earth. Our Community's soils are not uniquely fertile. Our mineral wealth is not uniquely great. Yet our Community, small in size and numbers, has created the civilization which has dominated world history for the past thousand years.

All other societies and cultures of the past have been parochial. Their imprint has fallen on only one race, one religious group, or one limited geographical area. But the influence of the Old World Community has spread to every continent. We in North America are actively aware of this influence in our progress.

All civilizations of the past have grown and flowered, and then withered. But our own Community has so far escaped dissolution and decay.

There is only one common denominator to societies which have perished—their failure to adapt to change. The root cause of dissolution is never found in material things; it is found in matters of the mind. Nations or communities which meet new problems with new solutions and new ideas endure. Those which do not go under.

Think back to 13th-century China. The China of Marco Polo was more prosperous than the Europe of Chaucer. It had a magnificent educational system, which produced superb scholars and civil servants. But that system was based on the notion of an unchanging and already perfectly ordered society. It found its perfect expression in the Great Wall of China.

Yet the Great Wall could not keep out the ideas of the scientific and industrial revolution. Unable to resist Western technology, unwilling to adapt to it, the China of old slowly disintegrated.

In the meanwhile, our Atlantic world was eagerly embracing the revolutionary ideas of the new science. It was translating the ideas into machines which let 1 man do the work of 10. It was exporting science and technology to every corner of the earth. Science and the Atlantic world became almost synonymous.

More than any other single factor, it is the scientific leadership of our community which has created our world political and economic leadership. Through science, we have attained the world's highest standard of life. Through it also, we have built armaments which have canceled out our weakness in numbers.

But today, the very science which has made our community prosperous and strong threatens us mortally.

Once, because of our head start, our Atlantic world possessed a near monopoly of science and technology. While we did, our world leadership was almost guaranteed. But our monopoly of scientific and technical knowledge is over.

The two overriding challenges of our time are the tremendous growth of science and technology in the Soviet Union and the determination of the economically underdeveloped areas to raise their standards of life. We must find new solutions for these new problems.

The Soviets are resolved to surpass us scientifically, because in so doing they could surpass us industrially and politically as well. The Soviet Union continues to graduate scientists and engineers at a rate twice our own. It continues to raise its industrial output twice as fast as ours. It continues to close the gap in advanced weapons systems. Make no mistake: we are locked in a stern competition.

The peoples of Asia and Africa are spectators to this contest. They are determined to secure, as quickly as possible, the fruits of science—industrial progress, lightened burdens, and richer lives. They are told by Moscow that their only chance to industrialize quickly lies in following the Soviet example. Moscow is consciously and deliberately wooing the uncommitted peoples with trade and aid—ready to snap the trap shut when the time comes.

Since long before Sputnik, wise men have warned that science and technology in our Atlantic world are moving forward too slowly to keep pace with the challenges of our time. The danger is present and clear, and our problem is three-fold. We are not graduating enough scientists and engineers. We are not producing enough uniquely gifted talents—the great scientific pathbreakers. And we are wasting precious talent by not employing it efficiently. As a result, it hangs in the balance whether we can continue our dynamic economic growth, meet the Soviet challenge, and convince Asia and Africa through help and example that economic progress is in harmony with freedom.

In 1956, almost a full year before the first Sputnik, this conference acted. We established a special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel; it was my honor to be appointed chairman.

The committee was asked to report to the third annual conference on ways and means

of improving the state of science within our community.

When our conference met in Paris last November, the committee made specific recommendations for positive action by the member governments and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself. The committee report was adopted by the third conference, and forwarded to the North Atlantic Council, the member governments, and other interested bodies including the OEEC.

A year has passed since we made our report. This has been a period of solid accomplishment. New drive has been given to our scientific effort. We are now on the right road, and traveling in the right direction.

One year ago, the general public scarcely knew there was a scientific manpower problem. Today, our citizens, acting through the civic and community organizations, are helping solve it.

A year ago, the member states were just beginning to grapple with the problem. Today, for the most part, they have programs of remedial action well underway.

A year ago, consideration of the problem within NATO was still in the study stage. Today, NATO possesses new and unprecedented regional machinery in this field. A full-time science adviser and a Science Advisory Committee are now hard at work, helping the NATO Council.

Finally, these past 12 months have seen heartening progress in translating key recommendations of last year's Parliamentary Conference into effective action.

The report now before you gives the details of what has been done concerning these recommendations; permit me to summarize the highlights of the story.

Last year's conference recommended that NATO sponsor and finance a talent development program which would produce annually at least 500 researchers with advanced training in fields of maximum importance for the defense and welfare of our Community. The NATO Council has approved a NATO science fellowship program, based on the recommendation of our Conference.

Last year's conference recommended an immediate increase in the number and the variety of advanced summer study institutes within the NATO Community. The NATO Council has just approved a program for partial financial support of advanced study institutes.

Last year, we recommended that NATO sponsor and finance additional important cooperative training and research projects, which particularly lend themselves to international action. The NATO Science Committee is now actively considering new cooperative projects which might merit NATO support.

Last year we recommended that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center be established. Reinforced by this recommendation, AGARD, in cooperation with SHAPE, has conducted a study of available training range areas and initial steps have been taken to budget funds.

Last year's conference proposed an Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies to conduct operations research on a NATO-wide basis. Since then AGARD and SHAPE have sponsored operations research conferences. We hope these will help point the way to a permanent and broad defense studies institute.

Mr. President, every member of this conference should feel proud that so many of our recommendations have been favorably acted upon, by the NATO Council and by the member governments.

The task now is to build on the solid foundation already laid—to speed up and broaden corrective programs already started, and to find new areas for useful action.

Ever since last year, my colleagues on the Scientific and Technical Committee have

continued to give close attention to this problem.

Our recommendations for further action are contained in the committee's report at your desk. This report reflects discussions and correspondence with officials of NATO, SHAPE, and the OEEC. It reflects the valuable counsel of the executive agencies of our countries and of distinguished private citizens, including many of the greatest scientists in the world.

Above all, it reflects a great deal of hard work on the part of my committee colleagues.

Let me summarize our new recommendations:

First, we recommend that the NATO Council look forward to increasing the Science Fellowship program. We believe this program is full of promise, and we are thankful it is underway. Considering the scope of the challenge, however, we think the present plan is too modest.

If the NATO fellowships discover one new giant in the scientific field, or if they give us one new revolutionary scientific idea, they will more than pay their way. We believe a reasonable annual budget would be \$8 million, when the program is in full operation.

Second, we recommend that the NATO Science Committee place high on its agenda the formulation of a basic long-range policy to guide NATO research and development efforts.

As NATO gets further into the business of scientific cooperation, we must be sure our resources are not dissipated in too many directions. To achieve decisive results, we need to focus on a few urgent objectives.

The logical group to define these objectives is the NATO Science Committee.

Third, we recommend that, in launching projects for cooperative research, the NATO Council give particular attention to joint programs in three fields: materials research, oceanography and upper atmosphere and space.

In the materials field, our knowledge has been strained to the limit by recent technological advances. Unless we can achieve early breakthroughs in basic and applied metallurgy, vital peacetime and military projects will be stalled. Much excellent work on materials problems is now underway in Europe and America, but we need a joint program to make the best use of available talent.

In oceanography, the research demands far exceed the skills now available in any one or two of the NATO nations. Despite the fact that the Atlantic Community is essentially a maritime confederation, our understanding of the ocean is still primitive. For example, we have roughly accurate maps for only about two percent of the deep-sea floor. The advent of nuclear-missile firing submarines and the prospect of nuclear commercial transport underline the need for a bold program of oceanographic research—capitalizing on the most expert talent our Community can provide.

Mr. President, almost five centuries ago, the great voyagers of discovery of the Old World found and explored the New World of the Americas. But the greatest voyages of discovery are yet to come. They lie in the upper atmosphere and outer space.

Your old world, Mr. President, and my new world should now join forces for this greatest adventure of all. We should now explore the world of space together.

Specifically, my colleagues and I recommend that the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization now undertake a program of peaceful scientific and technical cooperation in upper atmosphere and outer space research, development, and exploration.

The first goal: A satellite for peaceful outer space research, bearing the emblem of the

Atlantic Community and circling the earth by 1960.

The scientific problems involved in space technology are enormously difficult and enormously expensive. Only a few members of our Community have been able to afford the great outlays of money and manpower needed to develop and build launching vehicles for satellites.

Yet this is only one part of the total space research problem. The total problem cuts across every scientific discipline. It involves theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, meteorology, chemistry, geology, geophysics, biology, and medicine.

Scientists from every one of our countries possess skills which are urgently needed in space research. Some of the smaller members of our Community, in fact, now lead the world in specialized research areas of crucial importance.

But our problem today is this: We have embarked upon independent and uncoordinated national programs for developing space technology. There is overlapping and duplication of effort. Precious scientific talent is thereby being wasted.

The obviously desirable solution is to establish a mechanism for pooling the talents of all our 15 nations. We already have a foundation for such a joint effort—Prof. Theodore von Karman's Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development. We are already cooperating in aeronautics; a logical next step is to cooperate in astronautics.

The way to start may be by inviting scientists from our entire Community to meet at an early date for the purpose of drafting a cooperative research effort.

As its first goal, this cooperative program might aim at designing an advanced peaceful research satellite which combines the best ideas of our entire scientific Community. This satellite could be sent into space with a launching vehicle supplied by a nation possessing a major missile program. I am informed that it is technically possible to design and launch such a satellite by 1960.

We are now partners on land. We are partners on the sea. We are partners in the air. It is time that we now become partners in outer space.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that these recommendations are constructive and timely. I trust they will provoke a lively discussion from the floor today.

I cannot close these remarks without sounding a note of warning.

It took sputnik to shock us into taking a fresh look at the state of science in our Community. But we cannot count on being alerted so well again. Our problem now is to stay on the job—day in and day out—even when we do not have providential warnings like sputnik to arouse us. We must not again commit the error of thinking that our community can remain preeminent in the affairs of men without remaining preeminent in science and technology.

But in avoiding that mistake, we must not err in the opposite direction.

In every generation, there is a passionate minority which thinks it has found a magic solution for the great problems of its time. Think back to Hiram Maxim, the inventor of the machinegun, who said, "It will make war impossible." Think of our libraries, filled with thousands of dusty and now-forgotten treatises, each of which had marvelous formulas for permanent prosperity, and perfect and final harmony among all men.

Suppose our Community remains preeminent in science and technology, suppose we win all the races for discovery for advanced weapons? We can still fall in our quest for security. We may successfully bar the front door, yet if we leave the back door open our adversary can enter by that route.

As Khrushchev puts it: "We do not need

war. Peaceful competition is enough * * * we will bury you."

Today the Soviets challenge us across the boards, not only in science and industry, and in military strength, but in culture, languages, standard of living, trade, politics, and diplomacy.

The Science and Technical Committee of this Conference has tackled the immediate and urgent work of improving the scientific skills in our North Atlantic world. But this is only part one of the task confronting our Community. Indeed, in many ways it is the easier part of our job. A second part, and a far more difficult one, is the improvement of our skills in dealing with the most unscientific thing in the world; namely, people.

Take the problem of the underdeveloped nations which are now moving toward self rule and trying to raise their standards of life to western levels.

Our Community is well equipped to offer these regions the scientific tools they need to bring closer their dream of a decent standard of life. It is far less well equipped to convince these areas that their cause and our cause are in harmony, that their cause and our cause are both part of one larger common cause, dignity and justice for all men everywhere.

It is right and imperative to invigorate the study and pursuit of science and technology within our Atlantic Community. Yet all our cyclotrons, all our atomic reactors, all our wondrous space missiles, all our Nobel prize winners in science will avail us naught unless, at the same time, we invigorate also those skills and vocations which determine how the fruits of science will be used.

We cannot halt the onward sweep of science and technology. New and yet more momentous discoveries altering the face of our world continue to be made at an ever-accelerating rate. Any attempt to stop or slow the clock of science would be wrong, self-defeating, and hopeless.

There is only one solution which realistic men can entertain: To develop skills and wisdom in the social sciences and the humanities which equal the skills and wisdom of our scientists.

If our age is to become a blessing and not a curse we shall need prodigious talent in philosophy, in sociology, in political science, in law, in languages, and in economics. None of these disciplines can safely be left on the sidelines.

Let me cite an example:

Language—the words and phrases of everyday intercourse—has assumed immense symbolic significance in Asia and Africa. There is a great revival of native tongues, they are becoming the language of politics and of commerce.

Yet we are not assuring ourselves even the minimum language skills in working with the emerging nations. There are over 40 important languages of Asia alone for which even our teaching tools are sketchy or nonexistent.

By contrast, Russian universities have ambitious programs in the Asian languages, including Manchurian, Uigur, Telegu, and the Burmese, Vietnamese, Malayan, and Indonesian languages. Some of the Russian grade schools now even instruct 8- and 9-year-olds in Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, Parsi, and Urdu.

One can almost foretell what countries are next on the Soviet calendar of conquest—from their language curriculum.

Meanwhile, our Atlantic Community lumbars along emphasizing the colonial languages, English, French, German, and Dutch.

How unimaginative can we be to try to build a community of interest with the former colonial peoples while our peoples speak mainly the language of the former governing nations.

Or, take one other example; economics. Moscow has declared war on us on the economic front, and the opening battle has begun. Soviet production is sufficient to

support a huge arms budget, to meet the minimum demands of the civilian economy and to start major maneuvers in the markets of the world.

The Soviets doubtless desire to defeat our Community without war, if they can. They would prefer to inherit the world, rather than destroy it.

In Khrushchev's own words: "We will make war on you through peaceful trade to see which system is the best."

The Soviets can sell at a loss and buy at a premium when it suits their political purposes—concentrating their fire on the vulnerable economies in the Middle East, southern Asia, and Latin America.

Moscow has already upset world markets for timber, tin, and aluminum—by cut-rate sales. It aims to set ally against ally, friend against friend—its motto: "Divide and disrupt."

Despite the clear danger signals, our Community has barely begun to drag itself into action. Yet there is every prospect that Moscow's capacity for economic warfare will grow steadily in the future.

Obviously, the Soviets have the easier task. They accept no responsibility for making the present world economic system function smoothly and fairly.

How unwise can we be to continue discounting Russia's economic offensive, when it could prove more dangerous than its armaments build-up?

It is true that Europe is making good progress toward a freer trading area. However, in the wider Atlantic framework, article 2 of our treaty is practically forgotten.

The Atlantic Community should (1) affirm that an economic assault upon one of us, is an economic assault upon all of us; (2) rally our creative talents in economics and political science and put them to work on a joint economic strategy; and (3) use NATO-wide arrangements for economic consultations and economic diplomacy.

In conclusion, let me say:

Our conference should continue its energetic efforts to improve the scientific skills of our Community. In addition, this conference should now launch part 2 of its talent program. We should single out high priority needs in the humanities and the social sciences, such as Asian and African languages, and we should come forward with suggestions to remedy the deficiencies.

The great philosopher Whitehead once said it is the business of the future to be dangerous.

It is the business of our Community to welcome that future and to meet its new challenges successfully.

Our rivals pose as champions of the future, but they are in fact defenders of the discredited past. They advocate an outmoded idea which our Atlantic Community rejected centuries ago—that man must choose between material progress and individual freedom.

We are the real champions of the future. We are the bearers of the truly revolutionary idea of our time—that the quest for material abundance and the quest for human freedom are one and the same quest.

Ours is a privileged time. We have been given a historic opportunity to prove the superiority and power of freedom.

SCIENCE AND FREEDOM: THE CONTINUING CHALLENGE

(Report of the Committee on the Provisions of Scientific and Technical Personnel, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, prepared by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, United States of America, chairman, and Mr. C. L. Patijn, Netherlands, rapporteur)

INTRODUCTION

The Second Parliamentarians' Conference held in November 1956 established a special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel. This committee was requested to

submit to last years' conference their findings and recommendations concerning these three topics:

(a) The present situation with respect to the training of scientific and technological personnel in the NATO countries.

(b) The relationship between NATO utilization of the existing potential resources in this field and the utilization of similar resources by the Soviet bloc.

(c) The development of resources of scientific and technological personnel sufficient to enable the NATO countries to maintain their individual and collective capacities to resist armed attack and to continue their economic growth essential to their strength and well-being.

The committee report submitted to the third conference made these general findings:

(a) The scientific revolution has created an unprecedented demand for highly qualified scientists and engineers.

(b) The NATO community now faces a major problem in the form of serious shortages of skilled personnel, and in underemployment of available scientific and technical talent.

(c) There is a real danger that the Soviet bloc may surpass the NATO community in science and technology. This shift in the balance of scientific power could well upset the balance of military power.

(d) NATO would urgently need more trained manpower even if there were no Soviet Union and no defense effort. More and better skills will be needed if the Atlantic nations are to take full advantage of new opportunities for industrial progress and economic well-being, and if they are to continue to be the chief exporters of science and technology to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The committee report recognized that corrective action was primarily the responsibility of the member states. It found, however, that cooperative measures could also play an indispensable role. The report thereupon made specific recommendations for positive action to be undertaken both by national governments and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The committee report was adopted by the Third Annual Conference and forwarded to the North Atlantic Council, the member governments of NATO, and other interested bodies, including OEEC.

During the past year, the members of the Scientific and Technical Committee have continued to give close attention to this problem, focusing particular interest on progress being made in translating the recommendations of the third conference into positive action. The committee members have profited greatly from discussions and correspondence with officials of NATO, the OEEC, and SHAPE. They have also received invaluable counsel from the executive agencies of their own countries and from many private citizens.

Those who have taken part in the discussions of the Scientific and Technical Committee are:

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON (United States of America), Chairman.

Mr. C. L. Patijn (Netherlands), Rapporteur.

Mr. A. de Meerleer for Mr. Smet (Belgium).

Mr. A. G. Normann (Denmark).

Senator G. Portmann (France).

Dr. G. Klesing (Germany).

Mr. P. Yokas (Greece).

Mr. O. Watnebryn (Norway).

Viscount Goschen, O.B.E. (United Kingdom).

Brig. O. L. Prior-Palmer, D.S.O. (United Kingdom).

Congressman R. J. CORBETT (United States of America).

Adviser to committee: Mr. Kenneth Mansfield (United States of America).

The chairman wishes to thank his committee colleagues for their extremely valuable contributions to this report, and to acknowledge gratefully the assistance of the executive secretary and staff of the conference.

A YEAR OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Last year's Parliamentarians' Conference met less than 5 weeks after the first sputnik. The Soviet bloc, not the Atlantic Community, had taken man's first step into outer space. A country barely one generation into the industrial age had surpassed us.

A bewildered North Atlantic Community undertook a great reexamination of its course and destiny.

Much good came of this great appraisal in the realm of science and technology.

Over the past 12 months, significant progress has been made in improving the state of science within the NATO Community. Less has been done than might have been done, but we have made a good beginning.

First, there is now far greater public awareness of the importance of invigorating the study and pursuit of science. Twelve months ago, far too many of our citizens were scarcely aware of the existence of this problem. Over the long run it is our ordinary citizens, not experts, who will determine the success or failure of corrective measures. It is our citizens as parents who must encourage gifted young children to follow careers in science and engineering. It is our citizens as taxpayers who must provide the moneys needed to support remedial programs. We should therefore be immensely heartened by the fact that the general public, acting through civic and community organizations, is now beginning to participate actively in helping attack this problem.

Second, the member states of NATO have broadened the scope and accelerated the pace of national remedial programs.

Of particular importance are programs initiated to increase the supply and training of teachers in technical fields, and to invigorate the study of mathematics and science at the high school and secondary school level.

It has been apparent that the international activities this year have in many cases stimulated useful action at national and regional levels.

Third, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has set up new and unprecedented regional machinery in the science field. A science adviser and a representative Science Advisory Committee of 15 members are helping the NATO Council launch a scientific and technical program for the NATO area.

At the same time, the OEEC has strengthened its machinery in the scientific education and manpower field. A director of the new Office of Scientific and Technical Personnel and a new Governing Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel are sponsoring practical activities to improve the quality and raise the number of able men and women in the sciences.

Fourth, solid progress has been made in implementing key recommendations of the Third Parliamentarians' Conference, relating to the provision and utilization of scientific manpower.

(a) NATO science fellowship program: Last year's Conference recommended establishment of a NATO-sponsored and NATO-financed talent development program designed to produce annually at least 500 doctoral degree holders with research experience in the fields of maximum importance for the defense and economic well-being of the NATO Community.

This proposal recognized certain disciplines to be of prime importance, among them, applied mathematics, aero and fluid dynamics, basic electronics, nuclear physics, solid state physics, physical chemistry and metallurgy. The Conference believed that a relatively small number of additional

trained people of outstanding talent in these key disciplines would have a catalytic effect, accelerating the entire scientific and technological effort of the NATO Community. The suggested program would afford top-level students an opportunity to study abroad at leading centers for their particular disciplines.

The NATO Council has given final approval to a NATO science fellowship program based on the recommendation of the Parliamentarians' Conference and drawing its principal inspiration from that recommendation. (For details see Annex 1—NATO Council's Agreement on NATO Science Fellowship Program.)

The program would cost \$1 million for the first year. Tentative plans call for a budget of \$4 million annually when the program is in full operation in 4 years. Financial arrangements for the first year have been completed in time to publicize for 1959 fellowships.

(b) Advanced study institutes: Last year's Conference recommended that immediate steps be taken to increase the number and variety of advanced summer study institutes within the NATO Community, in order to extend the influence of outstanding scholarly talent in fields now hampered by a shortage of teachers.

The proposal called for a strong program of institutes in such fields as solid state physics, nuclear engineering, applied mathematics, high temperature metallurgy and medicine.

The proposal recognized that the summer study institute has been an important post-war educational development both in North America and in Europe.

These institutes serve various purposes: bring able students into contact with the latest and best thinking in their fields; bring together mature scholars for extended seminars in particular scientific problem areas, or offer refresher courses in science or mathematics to secondary school or college teachers.

Such institutes have distinct advantages: flexibility, inexpensiveness, administration by existing organizations, and an international character.

The OEEC has pioneered in holding summer institutes for high school teachers in the general sciences and mathematics. This year the OEEC sponsored three international institutes for secondary school science teachers; one in England; one in Germany; and one in France. These institutes brought together teachers and supervisors of science teacher courses to develop improved science teaching techniques.

The OEEC is now planning summer institutes during 1959 for science inspectors of high schools, for teachers of science in teacher training colleges, for representatives of high school science teacher organizations, and for science teachers from the small countries who confront special problems in shortages of equipment, etc.

Late last year, the Ford Foundation (United States of America), recognized the importance of the proposed advanced research institute program, and informed that no NATO financing would be available to support institutes as early as the summer of 1958, assisted in an experimental expansion of two already established and well known summer institutes—the French-sponsored summer school of physics at Les Houches, and the Italian-sponsored summer school of physics at Varenna.

In addition, assistance from the Ford Foundation made possible a new 1958 summer institute of solid state physics administered by the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris. A group of French, Italian and English physicists have agreed to operate this institute in turn, in successive years, if financing continues to be available.

The NATO Council has now fully approved a NATO program for partial financial

support of advanced study institutes, such as the ones at Les Houches and Varenna. (For details see Annex 2—North Atlantic Council's Agreement on NATO Advanced Study Institute program.)

The program would cost \$150,000 for the first year. Tentative plans call for an increased budget the following year. NATO financing of institutes will be available for the summer of 1959.

(c) Annual review of scientific and technical education and manpower: Last year the Conference asked the NATO Council to initiate the practice of annual reports from member countries on the adequacy of science education facilities, hoping thereby to encourage a speedup in national corrective programs.

This stock taking was proposed especially in view of the growth of population and the demand for education on the part of increasing numbers of people.

The OEEC, with the full concurrence of the NATO Council, is now conducting the first annual review of the country policies in the training of scientific and technical manpower. The review is being carried on in collaboration with the appropriate educational authorities in member countries.

No uniform set of questions is being used, rather each country is asked questions relevant to its special condition and need. It is hoped that this first year the review will discover the more glaring gaps in individual country programs and will identify the more obvious possibilities for practical improvement.

(d) Cooperative project research under NATO sponsorship: Last year the Conference recommended that NATO sponsor and finance additional important cooperative training and research projects which particularly lend themselves to international action. The Conference was impressed with the outstanding success of the NATO-supported training center for experimental aerodynamics in Brussels, and proposed that this precedent be extended to other areas where cooperative projects could be helpful.

The NATO Science Advisory Committee is now actively considering a number of new cooperative projects which might merit NATO contract support.

Meanwhile, during the last year both the Brussels Aerodynamic Center and the Air Defense Technical Center at The Hague have increased the effectiveness of their programs.

(e) The NATO Defense Missile Training Center: Last year the conference recommended that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center be established to assure the entire NATO community an opportunity for intensive and systematic training in the handling of defensive missiles.

Reinforced by this recommendation, AGARD, in cooperation with SHAPE, has conducted a study of available training range areas. Steps to budget funds for a missile training installation are in a preliminary stage.

Following the 1957 discussions, it became increasingly evident that any NATO missile center would also be useful for the education of the civilian scientific and technical personnel. Such a center might thereby aid our community in establishing a base for the science of astronautics in addition to the primary function of training NATO's defensive missile units.

(f) Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies: Last year the conference recommended the establishment of an Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies which would bring the techniques of modern science to bear on defense planning on a NATO-wide basis. It was suggested that this institute could be responsible to SHAPE.

This proposal recognized that effective defense planning can no longer be improvised. Today, with weapons systems and

defense problems becoming more complex, there is increasing need for comprehensive programs of operational research.

The potential benefits to be derived from operational research have become increasingly recognized since our 1957 session, particularly through AGARD and SHAPE efforts in their conduct of conferences on operational research, history and methods.

We are encouraged by AGARD's recent establishment of a summer study institute in operational research methods, in which all our NATO nations are being invited to enroll students. This first course we understand will begin in the summer of 1959 and will be open to both civilian and military students.

We hope that the experience thus gained will help speed an early decision by SHAPE on behalf of a broad and permanent institute of defense studies.

THE TASK AHEAD

The job before us is to build on the solid foundation laid in the past year—to bolster and expedite remedial programs already started, and to identify new areas where further action is needed.

We believe that the member governments should again be called on by the NATO Council to maintain and enlarge appropriate programs on the national level, looking both to the removal of barriers to talent and to the employment of trained manpower in the most efficient manner.

We believe also that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, the NATO Council, the member governments, and all nongovernmental bodies concerned should maintain and enlarge their programs for focusing public attention on the continuing importance of raising the level of scientific excellence within the Atlantic world.

Unless member states come squarely to grips with the problem and unless national programs receive widespread popular support, international measures, however desirable in principle, will be of little worth.

In addition, we make the following specific recommendations for strengthening existing programs and for initiating new programs during the coming year:

1. NATO science fellowship program: It is gratifying that this promising program is now underway, and that the first fellowships will be awarded next year. But we have to measure the size of this program against the challenge. The contemplated annual cost of \$4 million, when the program is in full operation, is only half the cost of one long-range bomber, and a tiny fraction of the cost of a single peace-time atomic powerplant.

Thousands of gifted students who could profit by training abroad at key centers for their particular discipline, do not now have the chance to go abroad. A \$4 million fellowship program will help immensely. Considering the need, however, a larger program seems justified so that even more of the really able students can obtain the best training available, and at a time in their careers when that training can be most useful.

If this program discovers one truly exceptional mind—a Maxwell, a Fermi, an Einstein, or a Bohr of the coming generation—then our investment will have more than paid off. If it gives the Atlantic community one path-breaking idea we would not otherwise get we will have struck an excellent bargain.

We think that money used to discover and nurture top-flight talent is money very well spent.

Therefore, we recommend that the NATO Council look forward to increasing the Science Fellowship Program. We believe a reasonable annual budget would be \$8 million, when the program is in full operation.

2. Cooperative research centers under NATO sponsorship: Here are three examples of cooperative research programs which are

specially needed at this time and which would particularly benefit from the joint action of NATO members.

(a) A NATO center of materials research: Technological advances since World War II, in both peacetime and military fields, have strained metallurgical knowledge to the limit. In many cases further progress cannot be made without major steps forward both in basic and applied metallurgy.

An example: Aluminum is an excellent structural material for subsonic and transonic aircraft, but it cannot withstand the high temperatures met by ultra-high-performance aircraft now being designed. The broader application of molybdenum and columbium is essential. Our knowledge of the properties and behavior of these materials is very meager.

Another example: The phenomenon of nuclear radiation has created an entirely new and crucially important field of metallurgical research. Nuclear powerplant design is now seriously inhibited by our failure to develop economical and practical materials capable of long-life use in the high-temperature, high-radiation environment of nuclear reactors.

Still another example: One of the major areas of concern in missile development and space research is the reentry problem, which revolves around finding materials which do not disintegrate when traveling through the atmosphere at hypersonic speeds.

Many universities and research centers, both in Europe and North America, now have excellent materials research programs under way. The OEEC is conducting a modest study in the metallurgical field. Yet no full-scale integrated program has been developed which would focus the best talents in the entire Atlantic Community on the really critical technical problems.

The possibilities of such a joint program might well be the subject of a study financed with NATO funds in 1959.

(b) An upper atmosphere and space research program: The technical problems confronting us in the new science of astronautics are immensely difficult. They will grow in magnitude and complexity as we reach further into space and as manned vehicles substitute for manned satellites. Space research and exploration will cut across every scientific discipline—theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, meteorology, chemistry, electronics, geology, biology, and medicine.

Designing and launching a carrier vehicle is an extremely complex undertaking. Large scale experiments in the upper atmosphere and outer space, in fact, might well be regarded as beyond the means of some of member states. As against this, there are numerous less costly but still critically important research projects which do lie within the competence of the smaller members of the community. Space medicine is an example. Fortunately we have among the European nations some of the world leaders in upper atmosphere studies.

Clearly, the scientific challenge in prospect far transcends the resources of even the most technically advanced members of NATO. There is work for all to do, and the job will go forward at maximum speed only if all take part. A cooperative effort in this area would seem eminently worthwhile.

(c) A NATO program for oceanographic research: Viewed in terms of political geography, the NATO Community is essentially a maritime confederation. Its survival depends upon the free transport of materials and peoples across the Atlantic basin and the littoral seas.

In time of peace, the ocean is a vast highway for commerce between the Old and the New World. In time of war, effective control of the ocean would be indispensable.

Although the continents are now giving up their last secrets, and although man has

already taken the first step into space, the knowledge of the oceans, which make up three-fourths of the earth's surface, is meager and fragmentary.

Even roughly accurate maps of the deep sea floor exist for only about 2 percent of the total ocean area. We know but little about the properties of the ocean's waters and its bottoms, including the nature of the deep sea currents, the acoustic properties of the water, and the acoustic and magnetic properties of the bottom.

Recently, the advent of nuclear submarines or submarine-launched missiles has exposed the NATO Community to the threat of devastating attack from the sea. An effective system of defense is contingent upon a thorough knowledge of the environment in which submarines operate—the ocean.

Here is another area which appears to be a natural for cooperative research.

We recommend that the NATO Council, in its consideration of projects for cooperative research, give particular attention to the desirability of establishing joint research programs or centers in one or more of these fields; in materials, in upper atmosphere and space, and in oceanography.

(3) NATO policy for scientific research and development: As the NATO Council launches programs of scientific cooperation, including fellowships and advanced research institutes, the need increases for a basic NATO policy of scientific research and development. Without such a policy there is danger that efforts will be dissipated in too many directions and on less critical programs.

It is also essential to avoid overlapping and duplicating research and development, both in peacetime and military fields. Our scientific talent is too limited to be wasted in this way.

It is important to focus on a few of the most urgent objectives to achieve decisive results. A clear overall policy established by the Science Committee would guide member states in the award of NATO fellowships. It would also guide the Science Committee in selecting subjects for advanced research institutes, and in identifying the most promising fields for NATO-sponsored research centers and research grants.

We believe that NATO funds for scientific cooperation should be used to support the healthy evolution of a carefully planned international program for research and development.

Therefore, we recommend that the Science Committee give prompt attention to the formulation of an integrated and long-range policy for scientific research and development in the NATO area.

4. A NATO program to promote the exchange of technical information: A system to facilitate the exchange of technical documentation is believed essential to an expeditious and economically sound NATO research and development effort.

It is recommended, therefore, that an appropriate mechanism be established by NATO to promote the exchange of technical information, studies, and so forth, between the member nations.

THE CONTINUING CHALLENGE

With each passing month and week, the memory of the first sputnik is receding. Yet the need for urgent action is as great as last year.

The Soviet world is determined to reach and overreach our community in scientific and industrial achievement and in advanced weapons. They are bidding for the role of chief exporter of science and technology to critical underdeveloped areas.

And Soviet policy is characterized by infinite patience.

Free nations commonly respond grandly and vigorously to the dramatic challenge, but too often they are weak on the follow-through.

Our problem now is to stay on the job even without the kind of psychological shot in the arm provided by the first sputnik.

But nothing could be more wrong than to believe that we should improve the state of science solely because of dangers from without. We live in an age when all our future hopes for economic well-being go back to successes or failures in our laboratories.

Almost two centuries ago, the industrial revolution which changed the face of the world, was born in our Atlantic Community. That revolution raised standards of life in the Atlantic world to an unprecedented new plateau.

Now we are in a new revolution—the scientific revolution. The destiny of our community in this and the coming centuries will depend upon our imagination and perseverance in devising new solutions to the new problems posed by the scientific age.

ANNEX 1

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL'S AGREEMENT ON NATO SCIENCE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Note by the science adviser: The accompanying document describes the NATO science fellowship program that has been agreed to by the North Atlantic Council. (N. F. Ramsey, Palais de Chaillot, Paris.)

NATO science fellowship program

The North Atlantic Council has agreed to establish a NATO science fellowship program with the joint purpose of stimulating the international exchange postgraduate and postdoctoral students of the pure and applied sciences between member countries and of increasing the scientific strength of the NATO alliance.

2. While the emphasis of the program should be on international exchange, it is appreciated that it may be necessary, and even desirable, for students or scientific workers of NATO countries who participate in this program to continue their studies in their countries of origin or in non-NATO countries. It is also appreciated that the stages of education which need to be encouraged may differ in different countries.

3. The fellowship program should be chiefly administered by the appropriate agencies within the member countries of NATO. The selection of students eligible for the program and determination of the magnitude of the stipends should be made nationally. The fellowships should be open to nationals of the participating countries and the selection of students should be made solely on the basis of scientific ability and merit. The recipient of the fellowship or his national group should arrange for the acceptance of fellowship holders.

4. The distribution of the funds by NATO is to be done by a simple formula, as given below. There will be a central organization of modest size in the office of the chairman of the science committee, to supervise the whole operation so that the chairman can report to the committee on the operation of the program. A panel of independent experts will be appointed as consultants to the science adviser to review each year the results of the program and to advise on the methods of operation of different countries. The central organization will assist the national agencies in the exchange of information about practice regarding stipends, standards, etc. Close liaison will be maintained with the AGARD and OEEC exchange and fellowship programs.

5. It is recommended that the distribution of the funds to the member countries should initially be proportionate to the population of the country concerned, with no nation receiving more than 15 percent of the total fellowship funds. This distribution formula should be subject to review by the science committee, which might at a later date recommend a different one to the North Atlantic Council.

6. The council has agreed that for the first year of the program the total amount should be for \$1 million.

7. With the above procedure the magnitude of the fellowship program in each country for the first year is as follows:

Belgium	\$26,900
Canada	48,300
Denmark	13,180
France	132,400
Germany	150,000
Greece	24,600
Iceland	480
Italy	149,800
Luxembourg	950
Netherlands	33,100
Norway	10,090
Portugal	26,000
Turkey	74,200
United Kingdom	150,000
USA	150,000

ANNEX 2

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL'S AGREEMENT ON NATO ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Note by the science adviser: The accompanying document describes the NATO advanced study institute program that has been agreed to by the North Atlantic Council. (N. F. Ramsey, Palais de Chaillot, Paris.)

Advanced study institute program

The North Atlantic Council has agreed that there should be a program for the support of scientific study institutes for advanced or special topics. The highly successful summer institutes at Les Houches and Varenna with intensive lectures and seminars extending over a 2-week to 2-month period are examples of such activities.

2. The council has agreed that during the first year the program will be for \$150,000. The distribution of the money is to be made by the office of the science adviser with the guidance of a panel of experts who will be representatives of various aspects of science rather than national representatives.

3. The money for the support of summer study institutes should be used both for direct grants to the institute, partially to cover teaching and administrative costs, and for living and travel expenses of participants from NATO countries. The grants to the summer study institutes should be made as unrestricted grants so as not to influence the policy of the institute nor its selection of students or staff.

4. The method of administration of this program will be reviewed annually.

Salute to the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the least appreciated branch of our uniformed forces is the Coast Guard. Its peacetime mission of saving lives does not compare in glamour with the more spectacular exploits of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, or the Air Force, and public recognition of its services is far less than it deserves. It is with pleasure and pride, therefore, that I call attention to the following editorial in the January 3, 1959, Daily Advance, of Elizabeth City, N.C., entitled "Salute to Coast Guard":

SALUTE TO COAST GUARD

Elizabeth City long has been the site of a Coast Guard Air Station and we have come to take the organization here for granted. That is bad because we lose sight of the outstanding work that is done with so little to work with and with so few people to do it.

A good insight into the activities of the Coast Guard, especially as it pertains to Elizabeth City, was provided earlier this week in a fine feature story written by Jack Williams, photographer-reporter for the *Daily Advance*. The story has been given wide circulation by the Associated Press. In his article Williams vividly pictured the various phases of the Coast Guard's program. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the Coast Guard, on the bottom of the list so far as appropriations are concerned, is called upon daily to go to the aid of people who are sick, or lost; to ships that are in trouble, or scores of other errands.

A good example of what the Coast Guard faces appeared in a front-page story on Tuesday, along with the feature article. That story revealed that 47 crewmen aboard a Liberian tanker which had broken in two off Chincoteague, Va., had been rescued safely. Mainly responsible for the rescue was the Coast Guard which rushed planes, helicopters, and boats to the scene as soon as the call for aid was received. The fact that weather conditions were not good and that the Coast Guard men on the mission were risking their own lives didn't matter. What did matter was that the Coast Guard always stands ready. One of these days our Congressmen are going to realize and appreciate that fact and come through with much-needed funds. That time cannot come too soon.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 14, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was happy to note that in the opening remarks of his State of the Union message, the President welcomed our distinguished colleagues from Alaska, and called for the addition of another new State—Hawaii—and a new star in the flag.

With Alaska safely in the fold, we should now proceed at the earliest possible moment to embrace Hawaii, and thus shore up our Pacific bastions, our democracy, and our ideological position in the eyes of the world.

Perhaps no individual has presented a more satisfactory brief for Hawaiian statehood than has James A. Michener, the noted author, in the December issue of the *Reader's Digest*.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the *Record* Mr. Michener's article entitled "Hawaii—The Case for Our 50th State."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

HAWAII: THE CASE FOR OUR 50TH STATE

(By James A. Michener)

If the next Congress decides to welcome Hawaii into the Union our existing States are going to get as a new partner one of the

loveliest spots on earth. Just barely inside the tropics, so that Hawaii will be the only place in the Union where the sun ever shines directly overhead, the islands are spectacularly beautiful. They boast great snow-covered mountains that rise abruptly from the sea to nearly 14,000 feet. They have dazzling beaches, marvelous cool forests, cliffs that drop thousands of feet sheer into the sea, areas where you can see 400 waterfalls within a short distance, and others where blazing red canyons cut deep into the earth.

But the islands are much more than a visual paradise. They are also a mature, civilized, sophisticated community, fully qualified for statehood. The best way to explain Hawaii's extraordinary accomplishments is to answer the questions which are most often asked throughout the United States. I think the replies may surprise mainlanders:

If Hawaii joins the Union won't it be a burden on the other 49 States? It's just the other way around. Americans like to think of Hawaii as a grass-skirted, ukulele-strumming poor relation. The fact is, as shown in one yearly report, that the average resident of Hawaii gets a cash income of \$1,821 per year—which is just \$206 less than the national average and more than the average of such wealthy States as Virginia, Texas, Kansas, or Iowa. Hawaii is really loaded.

The islands pay more actual cash—taxes—into the Federal Government than many existing States. Per capita, Hawaiians pay more to Uncle Sam than the national average from all the States. In short, these islands are a gold mine. Instead of draining money out of the economy, they pump it in. But because they are only a territory they have no representation. In spite of all the taxes they pay, the people of Hawaii are not able to elect their own Governor or judges; they cannot send Senators or Representatives to Congress; they cannot vote for President. That is why Hawaii wants to become a State.

What status does Hawaii now have in relation to the United States? In 1898 it was accepted firmly and forever as an integral part of the United States, its position being comparable to that of the former territories of Tennessee or Arizona. Since then Hawaii has used our currency, our stamps, our armed services, our FBI, and our educational system. Anyone born in Hawaii is automatically a full-fledged American citizen and may travel or live wherever he wishes in the 49 States. A boy born in Hawaii is eligible to become President of the United States.

Does Hawaii have enough people to make a State? It has 554,000 residents, which is more than the population of Alaska, or Delaware, or Nevada, or Vermont, or Wyoming. It contains more people than any previous territory gaining statehood, except Oklahoma, where the oil rush had crowded the land.

Does it have enough land? It consists of 7 major islands, and several dozen small ones, with a total land area of 6,423 square miles, which makes it larger than Delaware, Rhode Island, or Connecticut, and just a little smaller than New Jersey.

Are the people worthy of becoming American citizens? Most of them already are citizens. If you were to go down today to a Honolulu store—Sears, Roebuck, or Woolworth's—and if you were to meet 100 average islanders, they would look like this:

About three of the shoppers would be Hawaiians, tall handsome people, the original settlers of the islands and the same kind of people who now live in Tahiti and Samoa. Fifteen would be part-Hawaiian. Twenty would be ordinary-looking white people, mostly from mainland cities. Thirteen would be Filipinos, brought in to work the sugar fields. Seven would be Chinese, usually slim, attractive people with skilled jobs

or professions. There would be two Puerto Ricans, one Korean and one who might be from any part of the world.

So far you have met 62 of your 100 fellow American citizens. The other 38, and the largest single group in the islands, are Japanese, who were also imported to work the sugar fields but who now do practically everything else in the islands. We will have more to say about them later on.

Here are other things Hawaiians would like you to know about their islands. The literacy rate is very high. An enormous part of the budget is spent on education. Medical services are top-notch and the general health is the same. Hawaiians go to excellent movie houses, have fine radio stations, strong newspapers, a first-rate civil government. On the mainland an election turnout is considered high if 60 percent of the eligible people vote. In Hawaii over 90 percent of the people vote.

Is life as much fun in Hawaii as the advertisements say? It's really better. You won't be in Hawaii long before you hear people confess, "We came out here on a vacation and have never gone home." Entertaining is done on broad, open lanais that link the inside dining room with the green outdoors. Food is magnificent, with emphasis on fruit and salad. Much of the charm of Hawaii stems from the wonderful Polynesians who founded the islands. Handsome, lovable, carefree people, their manner of life infects everyone, and their songs fill the islands.

Only two things make local citizens boil. Don't joke about Waikiki. Where I swim, at one of the few really good beaches, the sandy area is only 40 feet wide and I have to wade more than 200 yards before the water gets over my head. But I'd be run out of the islands if I made a crack about it.

And never, never call the islands How-why-ya. The correct name is Huh-va'-ee, with a strong accent on the second syllable, but gradually the pronunciation has become Huh-wa'-ee.

How much American culture is there in Hawaii? The Americans who settled in Hawaii came from New England, and even today any family that can afford to sends its sons to Yale. Basically, Honolulu is a New England community. Its language, manner of doing business, legal system, religious pattern, and general family life are much closer to Boston than to San Francisco.

Young people in Hawaii speak only English. They go to American schools, a fine American university and on to mainland centers for graduate work. The entire cultural pattern of the islands is increasingly American. There is an excellent symphony orchestra and, to complete the picture, a set of libraries creaking with historical materials and people who know how to use them. No Territory that has sought admission to our Union ever did so with such an impressive cultural background.

Boasts former Gov. Oren E. Long, "We had the first good schools west of the Rockies, a printing press when California was a wilderness and the first golf links west of the Mississippi."

But isn't Hawaii awfully far away from the rest of the United States? When New Hampshire became one of the original 13 States, its Congressmen required more than a week to reach Congress in Philadelphia if they hurried by ship, as much as a month if they traveled overland. One day recently I had breakfast in New York, lunch in San Francisco and cocktails in Hawaii. With jets you'll have an early lunch in New York and dinner in Hawaii.

Wouldn't admission of Hawaii with two Senators mean that the representation of States like New York and California would be diluted? Absolutely. Today the 16,021,000 people in New York elect only 1/49

of the Senate, whereas in Nevada it takes only 257,000 to do the same thing. Thus one Nevada is worth 62 New Yorkers. Adding Hawaii would make matters worse.

Well, this inequity was foreseen by our founding fathers and it was upon their compromise between large and small States that our Union was built. Therefore, in the powerful House of Representatives, the big States would still reign supreme (New York 43 votes, Hawaii 1) as our founding fathers intended.

How will Hawaii vote if it becomes a State? From 1900, Hawaii enjoyed 54 unbroken years of Republican control. Citizens pointed out, "Everything good that has ever happened to these islands came when Republicans were in power in Washington." President Cleveland, a Democrat, refused to accept Hawaii as American territory; McKinley, a Republican, did. Many people in Hawaii could not recall ever having seen a Democrat.

Then, following World War II, thousands of young men came home determined to enter politics, but the fat and happy Republicans could find no place for them. So they became Democrats and, to the astonishment of the islands, proceeded to gain control of both House and Senate. The governor, of course, remained Republican, appointed by President Eisenhower.

A good many canny observers think this will probably be the pattern of future voting: For Governor, possibly a Republican; senior Senator, possibly Republican; junior Senator, probably Democrat; Representative, probably Democrat. In other words, Hawaii will probably split its vote the way States like Colorado and Massachusetts do.

What about the Japanese population? Sooner or later in any discussion of Hawaiian statehood, mainland people ask, "Would you want a Japanese sitting in Congress?" If democracy means what it says, and if Hawaii has so many Japanese voters—all American citizens—it is obvious that before long some Japanese will go to Washington.

My personal guess is that this won't happen during the first two congressional elections, because local Oriental politicians are not yet as far advanced as more experienced hands. But sooner or later, it will happen, and there should be no cause for alarm.

Can the Japanese in Hawaii be trusted? Before Pearl Harbor this was a sensible question, and Hawaii did not know the answer. There were over 100,000 Japanese in the islands, and by law many had been forbidden even to consider becoming American citizens. Ties with Japan were therefore strong and it is understandable that many cautious Americans questioned Japanese loyalty.

But Pearl Harbor gave the answer. The Japanese in Hawaii remained loyal to the United States. There was no sabotage, no dragging of the feet. The record of the Japanese was remarkable.

Their sons literally fought to get into uniform. When the Army announced, after understandable soul searching, that it would accept 1,500 Japanese boys on a trial basis, 10,000 rushed forward in the first 3 days, 15,000 by the end of the week. In Italy these young men rolled up an unparalleled record for bravery. For every 1,000 of the original Japanese soldiers, they and their replacements accumulated 3,146 battle wounds. Their unit picked up 18,143 individual decorations, 7 Presidential citations for the outfit and a nickname that will live in Hawaiian history: "The Purple Heart Battalion." If you count all the Hawaiian men who died on all battlefronts, Hawaii lost on a percentage basis $4\frac{1}{2}$ times more men killed in action than any State in the Union. An appalling number of the dead were Japanese, and there are places in the United States where their valor is not forgotten.

Not long ago Toah Sovetani, a Hawaiian veteran, was speeding through Texas, trying to keep an appointment in Amarillo. A Texas trooper whistled him to the side of the road and started tearing him apart. "What the hell is a Jap doing speeding across Texas?" The veteran took it for a moment, then got mad and ripped out his wallet.

Showing a treasured card into the policeman's face, he said, "Don't yell at me. I'm a Texan."

The traffic officer looked at the card and stammered, "Are you from Hawaii? Are you one of the Japanese that saved us Texans at the Rapido?"

"I am," the veteran said.

"Mister, I'm proud to meet you." And the officer took off his cap, bowed, handed back the card and said proudly, "You follow me, son. I'm indebted to you." Then he escorted the visitor into Amarillo. By proclamation any Hawaiian Japanese who served in Italy is an honorary Texan.

Has Hawaii solved the problem of interracial tension? In a world troubled by racial worries, Hawaii proves that people of many diverse backgrounds can exist in reasonable harmony. But anyone who claimed that Hawaii had licked the problem would be naive. The three top clubs in the islands admit no Orientals and many of the better families who have always had Japanese servants would find it embarrassing to have other Japanese as guests. The Chinese maintain their own chamber of commerce, and so do the Japanese. Only this year the latter completely broke up because an Okinawan was proposed as president, and some Japanese refuse to recognize Okinawans.

Hawaii has no Fair Employment Practices Commission because we like things as they are and don't want to upset any apple carts. Newspapers are free to advertise openly: "Haoles (whites) Only," or "Japanese Only." The islands permit racial discrimination in housing in a way no northern city would because Chinese and Japanese real estate men make more money if areas are kept segregated. Socially, each race keeps pretty much to itself, but new patterns are developing slowly. Hawaii, more than any other place in the world, is trying to lick this difficult problem. Maybe an Oriental can't join the golf club or live where he wants. But he can get elected to government, or become principal of a fine high school, or make a million dollars running a supermarket. He is free where it matters, and that is what counts. The other freedoms will come later.

Now for the biggest question: Do Communists run Hawaii? Hawaii lives on four industries: sugar, pineapple, tourists, and the military. All require shipping. Also, Hawaii, like England, cannot grow enough food to feed itself, or produce enough timber to build homes. It imports these things from the mainland. Therefore, anyone who controls the waterfront controls Hawaii.

For some years the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has controlled the harbors. And Harry Bridges, aided by a gang of supersmart associates, has controlled the ILWU; some ILWU leaders have been confessed Communists; others have been identified by their associates as such.

The problem goes one step further. Because in the old days unions were ruggedly kept out of Hawaii, when the ILWU did arrive it captured not only the harbors but also swept like a raging flood through the plantations, which it now also controls. When an ILWU man threatens, "Give us what we want, or we'll tie these islands up completely," he isn't kidding. He can do it. In fact, he did it in 1949, and the islands almost collapsed.

Two further facts demonstrate the sinister power of communism in Hawaii. When Sen-

ator JAMES O. EASTLAND led an investigating committee to Honolulu in 1956, the ILWU conducted a mass parade against the hearing. In 1955 the islands were shocked when the speaker of the house in Hawaii actually sent Harry Bridges an honorary gavel, which was interpreted locally as encouraging Bridges to take over the legislature as well as the docks and the plantations.

It was events like these that led Congressman James B. Utt of California to cry, "Hawaii is a Communist-dominated province."

Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Baltimore—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area. The big question is, "What's being done about it?" In Hawaii, plenty.

In 1958 the ILWU campaigned bitterly against a proposed charter form of government for Honolulu. They threatened and begged the voters: "Reject the charter!" but when the votes were in, the charter was accepted by 4 to 1.

There is one law, above all others, that the ILWU is determined to repeal. It is the one that will prevent a recurrence of the 1949 tie-up, for it gives government the right to take over the docks and operate them during an emergency. Against this law the ILWU has thrown all its massive power—and there are many local citizens in no way subservient to the ILWU who also want to see the law changed—but when the last test came the Senate voted 13 to 2 in favor of the law and the House voted 24 to 6. Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive.

Will Hawaii get statehood in 1959? Hawaii is like Brooklyn used to be before the Dodgers moved west. At the end of each disappointing year someone shouts, "Boy, wait'll next year!" When Alaska astonished the locals by gaining statehood, Hawaiians began chanting, "Next year for sure!"

Things do look better. The psychological attachment to the happy phrase "48 States" has been removed. The fair play of the American people can be counted on to support Hawaii, while both parties and most newspapers have come out in favor of statehood.

I am not hopeful. I fear there will be a strong temptation to sidetrack Hawaii. The honest fears of the South, arising from Little Rock, may encourage southern Senators once more to kill Hawaii's chances. A completely new House of Representatives and many new Senators will need to be indoctrinated with facts in the case. Attention to overseas problems will obscure Hawaii's claim. And with Russia kicking up on all fronts, it will be easy to focus on the communism issue.

I would not be surprised if Hawaii is again denied statehood. But if it is, I can say this with certainty: It will be interpreted throughout the world as an act of supreme unfairness. To deny Hawaii statehood now will injure the United States greatly.

Why is statehood important? In Asia, Hawaii has become a symbol of the fair and just manner in which we treat Orientals. Quietly, the word has circulated that in Hawaii Chinese do well, that Japanese get elected to office, that Filipinos get a fair shake. If now we slap Hawaii in the face and say, "You cannot have statehood," the slap will reverberate.

In recent years I have spent a lot of time in the former Dutch territory of Indonesia and in the former French territory of Indochina. I am really afraid that the United States will make the same mistakes the Dutch and the French made. There was a time when the people of Indonesia and Indochina dreamed only of full participation in national life, of escape from second-class citizenship and from taxation without representation. But those natural desires were

frustrated and the territories were lost in bitterness and defeat. Today Hawaii can be bound forever to the United States. To refuse to do so is to invite the dangers that overcame Indonesia and Indochina.

The specific danger is this. No one can foresee what is going to happen in Asia. Perhaps Japan and China will unite into one great empire. Or Russia may establish leadership over the entire area. Or China and India may combine. Surely, present arrangements will not continue permanently. When the new face of Asia appears, it will be very inconvenient for the United States if we hold in the mid-Pacific a paradise of islands which we have refused either to accept or to turn loose. At that time, and I think it will come before 1990, whoever rules Asia is going to say, "If you don't want Hawaii, we'll accept it." Then there will be real trouble.

But if Hawaii, like Alaska, is bound indissolubly to America, we will have transformed a source of potential trouble into one of strength. That is the major reason why I am for Hawaiian statehood now.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Time To Come to Our Senses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a masterful sermon delivered a short time ago by my good friend, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, of Temple Beth Am, which I feel has a message for each one of us. I commend it to my colleagues:

TIME TO COME TO OUR SENSES

Thirteen years ago 125,000 human beings perished in the flame of a new, manmade hell on earth, when the most devastating toy man has ever played with was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Today, 13 years later, the survivors are still regarded with fear and suspicion, as a greater and greater number fall prey to the "white sickness", leukemia, sicken and die. Ah, but progress did not stop there, 13 years ago. We have since harnessed the very heat of the sun and can unleash it with devastation which makes the original blasts seem like firecrackers by comparison. Stockpiled in many secret places all over the world, these blind engines of destruction await only the gentle application of civilized man's hand to blow his civilization to smithereens and poison his flesh, the soil, the very air he breathes, for an unknown length of time into the distant future. Not even when his life is at stake is man able to stop playing.

These facts, known to you and me, charge with new urgency the words most characteristic of this season, the words of the "U'nsaneh Tokef" prayer:

"We will observe the mighty holiness of this day, for it is full of awe and anxiety.

"On New Year's Day the decree is inscribed and on Yom Kippur it is sealed, how many shall pass away and how many shall be born; who shall live and who shall die; who shall attain the measure of man's days and who shall not attain it."

Was there ever a time in the history of man when these questions were more real, more immediate, more terrifying? The stage has already been set for what will happen in the next 12 months, and it would take only the eruption of one of the many volcanic trouble-spots dotting the earth—Berlin, the Middle East, Formosa, the polar regions—the unleashing of the inferno in which humanity would writhe in agony for its sins. If ever we read the U'nsaneh Tokef as a true expression of prayer coming from the very depths of our being, this is the year, and your Rabbi could no more ignore the world situation this Rosh Hashanah and refrain from troubling you with it than he could ignore the jaws of a mad dog gripping him by the throat. There is no more important matter confronting us than the question of life or death in the New Year.

How is it that in this age of enlightenment and progress, we have permitted ourselves to be pushed to the very brink of destruction? It is because of failure after failure, not so

much in the political, economic, military affairs of man, but in his moral life, where he has fallen so far behind his material advances. It is to the moral near-bankruptcy of man that we must address ourselves this Rosh Hashanah, and it is for God to forgive us and help us avoid that bankruptcy and its consequences that we must pray. That bankruptcy is evident in the conduct of the nations, in the conduct of these United States, and in the final analysis, in your conduct and mine.

What is the moral failure of the nations? I remember when the call came, also 13 years ago, for the formation of the United Nations, it seemed to me the realization of the hope expressed in the U'vchen ten Pachdechah prayer we read today:

"May all Thy children unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with wholeheartedness." There was a new hope born in the world in the very midst of the ashes of world war, that the sovereign states of the world would unite, and ultimately form a world government, to preserve the peace of the world and work for the improvement of every man's lot: "Agudah echas—one fellowship."

What a beautiful dream, the dream of the ancient Hebrew prophets, and the dream of our own prayers today, but it just did not happen. The nations were not and are not ready to relinquish their sovereignty to any world government or tribunal. Every nation considers itself wise enough to suggest what other nations should do, but too wise to be told what to do in return. Without a world government, in which all of God's children unite in one fellowship and wholeheartedly put self-interest second to the international good there will never be peace.

Instead of cultivating morality in international affairs in order to keep the peace, we have put our trust in the sword, once again, in the same bankrupt policies of racing to arms which have always resulted in war in the past and must again. Our Nation, Russia, China, England, and France, as well as many smaller nations, have rationalized their frantic massing of armaments by saying, "If you want peace, prepare for war." But that rationalization simply won't stand up. If we take it as a model, then we should be able to say, "If you want to be happily married, prepare for divorce; if you want to be honest, buy yourself a set of burglar tools, if you want to enjoy good health, put disease germs under your pillow." How many times will man be able to get away with ignoring the moral imperatives of international affairs? Is the truth so complicated, so abstruse that the common man, let alone the heads of states, cannot understand it? Little Mother Hannah, praying to God in the obscurity of the little village of Shiloh 3,000 years ago, in five words we just finished reading again, stated the truth that the nations of the world must yield, "For not by might shall man prevail."

The day must come, and soon, when not might, not bombs or missiles will hold the balance of power determining whether or not we live in peace, but submission to international law. The vision of Hannah, and Isaiah, and the author of "U'vchen ten pachdechah" was premature, impossible to realize in the ancient world, but possible to realize in our day of instantaneous communication of sight and sound and print when the world has shrunk to a neighbor-

hood, and will destroy itself unless it becomes a brotherhood. Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come, and believe me, the time is ripe for a world government, a world court, a world police force, and a world education and welfare program, when our anxious prayer of this day will be answered, "And all Thy children shall unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with wholeheartedness."

One of the principal supporters, financially and otherwise of the United Nations efforts, has been our own country, but we too, on this day of self-examination, must admit to having lost the moral leadership of the world. You and I want to think and tend to think of the United States as the leading nation of the world. Well, wherein lies its leadership? We are not the most populous; several countries have double or triple our population. We are not the largest in area by any means. We are not the richest in natural resources. Nor, and this accounts for the panic in American hearts, are we the most powerfully armed, compared with Russia's ships under the sea, her huge standing armies on land, and her spit-niks carrying heavier loads, farther and faster and first.

The greatness of our country has rested on its moral leadership in the world, the principles for which it stood, the refuge it represented for the oppressed, the hope it held out to small, underprivileged peoples, the enlightenment of its people through education, and the example of human equality and human freedom it symbolized. What has happened to these principles? One by one we have retreated from them. Did we once represent a refuge for the oppressed? Indeed we did, and the descendants of the Mayflower, and the huddled immigrants who came over in steerage in more recent decades, some of you and your parents and grandparents, are equally indebted to the great heart of liberty who lifted her lamp beside the golden door. But that door is shut, sealed by acts of Congress, so that you or your forebears would not be admitted if you were applying now. The other nations know it, and wonder at it, and are disillusioned by it.

Did we once hold out hope to the small, underprivileged peoples? We did, we who had our birth in a Revolutionary War which rebelled against colonialism and tyrannical and despotic dictatorship, once were the world's greatest symbol of hope for the victims of tyranny. We, who stepped in and supported the emergence of new republics, we who first defended then freed Cuba and the Philippines, we have of late been the mainstay of feudal Arab lords and desert sheiks, of dictators in the banana republics, of corrupt and reactionary government in China and Korea, and of dictator Franco in Spain. Here is the world's foremost democracy maintaining friendly relations with governments whose basic philosophy is repugnant to us, in order to counter a Soviet threat to the free world. But we have lost the faith of Spanish liberals, and Chinese, and African, no less anti-Communist, who are trying to establish governments based on democratic principles. Uncle Sam, once the benevolent friend of the underdog, has assumed the opposite role in the eyes of a heaving world, who will still accept his gifts, but do not look to him for moral leadership any longer.

Once we were the symbol of enlightenment, the proud examples of the benefits of a universally educated populace. Suddenly the world and we ourselves are shocked to discover that our leadership in this field too is challenged. When Russia's satellite took to the skies we pushed the panic button and found we were not preparing our youth as intensively. While in terms of numbers, our educational structure may still prove more universal, in terms of curriculum it is subject to reconsideration. We were shocked to learn that in Russian secondary schools, students get three years of chemistry, four of physics, five of mathematics, and six of foreign language. Ten million Russians are learning English—10 million. Four thousand Americans are learning Russian. The debate over the ultimate advantages of one educational system over another in terms of human happiness, is a debate which will rage for a long time to come, and need not be pursued here, but the fact remains that the eyes of the world are turning elsewhere for a shining example of educational practice, especially when it is for the morally doubtful purpose of achieving supremacy, military or otherwise. Nor do I believe that the answer lies in our current hysterical emphasis upon countering this threat with the grinding out of comparable students, also capable of creating great and costly engines of destruction and propulsion. It is not only electronic engineers the world needs, but men who can attack the real problems which face the common man in Africa, India, South America—poverty, disease, crowding. We need social engineers, and men of medical science to attack the real enemies of man—the plagues, the cancers, the malnutrition, the privation. Let whoever will stand for destruction of human life in the eyes of the world. Our country could capture the imagination and fire the hope of over half the world if tomorrow she identified herself as standing for the preservation, the healing, and the enrichment of human life.

Once these United States represented a symbol of human equality. Our Constitution emphasized what our Declaration of Independence proclaimed, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our 16th President spoke at Gettysburg of a Nation "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Today, almost exactly a century later, our land is being torn by the issue of segregation. Out across the world go the news and the pictures of hate-contorted white faces spitting at, jeering at, striking at darker faces; of threats to close schools rather than integrate them; of beatings and bombings and harassment of the Negro; of Jimmy Wilson, Alabama Negro, sentenced to die for stealing \$1.95 from a white woman; of violent verbal, legal, and physical resistance to upholding the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. What do we suppose this has done to the position of moral leadership we would occupy, when darker pigmented peoples, a billion and a half of them, all over the world read and listen and wonder? We cannot possibly overestimate the significance of what is taking place in Little Rock at this very moment, for while Little Rock is not the only troubled spot, it has become the testing ground of America's most cherished principles and could very well become the rock upon which our hopes of retaining the admiration and the friendship of colored peoples everywhere may be shipwrecked. This great land of ours is wrestling with its conscience with greater intensity and for greater stakes than any one of us has wit-

nessed in all his lifetime, and upon the outcome depends whether or not we shall lose or recapture the position of moral leadership we must hold in the eyes of the world's colored population in order to survive.

You and I believe in the greatness of our land, for we have experienced its privileges and understand its basic virtue, that is why we want to see it remain a land of refuge, of hope for the oppressed, of enlightenment, and of freedom. But, in the final analysis, whether or not it remains all these things depends upon us. And there is evident in our land these days a terrifying passiveness, an apathy which is incomprehensible in view of all that is at stake. Very few Americans seem to care whether or not we lose our role of moral leadership, or where or how our foreign policies are taking us. Some say this apathy is the result of a feeling of futility, a feeling that it doesn't matter what you or I say or do; the problems I have been describing are too tremendous, too overwhelming for the average man. Others say, and I among them, that this apathy is just a veneer, hiding the feeling of doom which immobilizes the little man, so that rather than go out of his mind in frustration, he just refuses to think about it.

Americanism will be as strong or as weak as you and I choose to make it. We are largely responsible for its quality and that quality will be poor only if we make it so. We elected its present leadership and by our votes approved their policies, not the citizenry of any other country. We might very well echo the words of Cassius in Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar," "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves, that we are underlings." In the final analysis, the blame rests within ourselves. How much are you and I prepared to sacrifice for peace and survival and morality, the things I have been talking about? How much does the principle of freedom mean to us, not in Little Rock about which we can be indignant because we are in Los Angeles—but in Los Angeles itself? You and I know we run as from a plague before the expanding Negro population, or Mexican, or oriental. The Jews deserted West Adams because of the Negro, Boyle Heights because of the Mexican, and Leimert Park because of the oriental. I am still wondering how you will react—how I will react—when the first Negro applies for conversion to Judaism and admission to this congregation, or any congregation. How much does the principle of freedom and equality, which did not begin with the American Revolution, but with the first chapter of our Bible, actually mean to you and me?

How much does learning mean to us, we who decry the lagging behind of the American school system? How many of us will permit our sons and daughters to become and remain Rabbis and teachers of the young? You all know the joke about the Rabbinate not being a proper profession for a Jewish boy. Well, it is no joke, because that is the way most parents express themselves, not only about the Rabbinate, but teaching and academic life. How many of us are encouraging our children to learn in order to be wise, to be cultured, to be sensitive? Not many. We tell them they must study, to get to college, to be a big success. How many of us will permit our children to become pure and maybe poor research scientists, nurses, case workers, philosophers, linguists, scholars?

Before we criticize our Government's coolness to new immigration, let us ask ourselves if we would sign affidavits wholesale and bring in, and house, and share our food and our money with ragged and oppressed refugees the way the last generation did, the way Jews in Israel have done? How much does America's image of welcome as

represented by the Statue of Liberty mean to us? And how well do we remember our Jewish tradition of hospitality as symbolized by the man of whom we read this morning, Abraham—Abraham, who saw three travelers and ran to greet them, and invited them into his tent, and washed their feet, and killed the fatted calf for them? What do these things mean to you and me, practically speaking?

How much does peace, and the end of atom bomb testing mean to us? There is talk of an end to the armaments race. Are we prepared to take the consequences? Forty billion dollars would be lopped off our Government's expenditures. Factories would close in the airplane, electronic, missile industries. Contracts would be canceled, profits cease, jobs disappear. At the very threat of the possibility that peace might break out we have just been experiencing a recession. What would we really do if it happened? Some of us would have to reduce our standard of living, lose our homes, change our life patterns. The synagogue would suffer . . . because our economy has been undergirded by anxiety. If we are not ready to suffer the consequences of shifting from a war economy to a peace economy, then we are hypocrites every time we bless God's name or even say "Shalom"; we are morally bankrupt. But if we are prepared to make any sacrifice in order to leave an unscarred, beautiful world to the generations to come, then we have the right to come before the Lord and our conscience and pray for life in the new year.

"On Rosh Hashanah the decree is inscribed and on Yom Kippur it is sealed . . . who shall live and who shall die." Is this a fatalistic approach to life? Does it mean, with regard to all that we have been saying, that there is absolutely nothing we can do about it? Not at all. The U'N'saneh Tokef prayer concludes with a remarkable statement:

"But repentance, prayer and righteousness avert the evil decree." Repentance means a change of conduct; prayer means an appeal for enlightenment and strength; and righteousness means a return to the high moral principles which are ours by the twin attributes of our American and Jewish heritage. Ominous as the current state of the world may be, it is not hopeless. What better time than Rosh Hashanah to meditate upon the road we are traveling, and to pray that the evil decree of strife may be averted, that the nations will submit themselves to righteous laws, that this Nation, which holds out the greatest hope and cherishes the greatest good will, may regain its primacy in the moral leadership of the nations; and that all these things may begin in our lives today, because we have examined ourselves honestly and determined that a better world, a world of peace, of freedom, and of enlightenment must begin with us, now, today, here.

I believe our Jewish sages stated the case for us when they taught that at this season each man should regard the world as "chatzi chayav, v'chatzi zakai—half guilty and deserving punishment and half innocent and deserving acquittal," and that he the individual, can swing the scale one way or the other. Without that faith in the significance of the individual, we shall abandon ourselves to despair and permit democracy and peace to be lost. With that faith, we can change ourselves, our land, our world, for that faith is our only hope in these days when the whole future hangs in the balance. So we pray,

Now, therefore, O Lord our God, let Thine awe be manifest in all Thy works, and a reverence for Thee fill all that Thou hast created. May all Thy children unite in one fellowship to do Thy will with a perfect heart, and let us say, "Amen."

Resolutions Adopted by the New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1: IN OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

The New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church, meeting in Collingswood, January 10, 1959, completely repudiates and denounces the letter of the fifth world order study conference of the National Council of Churches adopted in Cleveland, November 21, 1958, and sent down to the churches, calling for the recognition of Red China by the U.S. Government and the admission of Red China to the U.N.

This Presbytery would call attention to the fundamental principles of separation of church and state which enter into the preservation of our liberties. No church gathering presuming to speak for American people should attempt to direct or instruct our Government or its State Department in matters of national policy which are to be determined by the duly elected representatives and the democratic procedures under the order established in our State and national constitutions.

Moreover, for church leaders to call for the recognition of Communist China, with which we are still at war and which involves the assistance of atheistic, materialistic, godless communism, is a violation of Christian principles and subversion of sound morality.

Christian people in the United States who desire to influence their Government's actions may do so through the normal and proper channels of our representative form of government.

When church agencies or church bodies are constantly seeking to direct the affairs of government in its national and international decisions we are witnessing the development of a 20th century clericalism which the experience of history testifies can only bring mischief and disaster. A representative government cannot function when ecclesiastics attempt to intervene in behalf of their people whom they are not entitled to represent in government matters.

RESOLUTION 2: IN SUPPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The petition published in the public press and including among its signers prominent American clergymen, declaring "the Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished * * * and concluding "let us rid ourselves of this agent of weakness and folly," is an arrogant and insolent expression and completely misrepresents the position which God-fearing Christian people have always taken.

Among the church leaders signing the petition are Eugene Sarson Blake, chief administrative officer and stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; Dr. John A. Mackay, Princeton, N.J., president of the World Presbyterian Alliance; Dr. John C. Bennett, dean of Union Theological Seminary, New York City; and Dr. Rheinhold Niebuhr, renowned theologian of Union Theological Seminary, who represent top leadership in the ecumenical movement and

the National Council of Churches in this country. We call the attention of Christians to the fact that John C. Bennett is the author of the recent 5,000-word letter adopted by the Fifth World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches, calling for the recognition of Red China by the United States Government. When ecclesiastical leadership in this country espouses causes which give aid and comfort to the Communists in their cold war struggle, this presbytery feels that there should be strong opposition by the Lord's people.

This liberal leadership which has indeed departed from and compromised the historic position of the Christian faith is now seeking to influence the affairs of the Nation for the accomplishment of the very things the Communists at present are working for in relation to China and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This presbytery further assures the leaders of Congress and of this committee that they shall have our prayers as the committee continues faithfully to perform its functions of investigating and exposing Communist espionage, intrigue, and subversion, and recommends to our Congress legislation appropriate for the maintenance of the security of our country and the preservation of our religious liberty.

The presbytery further directs that copies of this action be directed to the chairman of the committee, FRANCIS C. WALTER, to the two Senators and the Congressmen from the State of New Jersey.

Ukrainian-Americans Commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Famine in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in Hamtramck, Mich., on October 11, 1958, a number of Americans of Ukrainian descent and representatives of Ukrainian-American organizations met to condemn one of the most vicious atrocities in the black record of Stalin, Lenin, and the Communists who have oppressed the Ukraine. At that meeting, attended by large numbers of Americans of Ukrainian descent, the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF A HEINOUS CRIME, PERPETRATED BY COMMUNIST MOSCOW IN UKRAINE

The Communist empire of the Moscow dictators came into being, grew, spread, gained power, existed and exists by terror, genocide, and injustice, violating God's commandments and trampling the rights of man, enslaving, subjugating, and destroying entire nations.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—different names, but the same rule; different persons, but the same methods of merciless dictatorship: an uninterrupted chain of crimes against mankind, based on relentless physical terror and mass murder.

The massacre of innocent population of the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, and her towns and villages in the spring of 1918—Lenin.

Mass deportations and murder of the population of Ukrainian villages in the fall of the thirties—Stalin.

The massacre of the population of Budapest and Hungarian towns and villages in the fall of 1956—Khrushchev.

Mass deportations of Ukrainian youth from their homeland to the deserts of Kazakhstan, now—Khrushchev.

A chain with innumerable links.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—merely stages of Moscow's Communist imperialism, moves toward ever more perfect methods of aggression, toward subjugation of the entire world.

Ukraine was first to experience Communist Moscow's aggression in its most deadly form. It paid for this experience with the loss of millions of people and its nationally independent existence.

This gathering is dedicated to the memory of one of the most horrible manifestations of Moscow's aggression: Twenty-five years ago Communist Moscow, in its role as occupant of Ukraine, committed a crime unprecedented in the history of mankind. It organized and fostered an artificial famine on the Ukrainian territories, thus destroying more than 6 million Ukrainians.

Today, we observe the 25th anniversary of this tragedy. We honor the memory of the dead, and call the attention of the world to this dreadful crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow, at a moment when contemporary Moscow became a constantly growing menace to the free world and this great country of ours.

We declare:

Whereas Moscow's aggression began 40 years ago when it first attacked the then free and independent Republic of the Ukrainian people;

Whereas the Ukrainians were the first to fight the aggressor and to defend their freedom and the right to their own territory;

Whereas the Ukrainian people, by rendering staunch resistance, kept Moscow from subjugating the countries of Europe still feeble after the war, thus enabling them to live in freedom for many more years;

Whereas Communist Moscow paralyzed the resistance of the Ukrainian population by means of terror and destruction and, in order to subdue the freedom-loving people, in 1932 and 1933 staged a man-made famine that exterminated more than 6 million Ukrainians;

Whereas Communist Moscow perpetrated genocide in Ukraine and for this crime should be condemned by the free world;

Whereas one of the accomplices in this crime and the organizer of the other criminal activities committed in Ukraine, is the present dictator and responsible leader of the Communist Moscow empire;

Whereas Communist Moscow, and especially its present dictators, used similar though less extensive methods of genocide after having occupied the territories of other nations;

Whereas Communist Moscow's aggressive aspirations have become an ever-growing menace to all nations of the free world, and also to the freedom-loving and independent people in this great country of liberty; and

Whereas the Ukrainian people who still struggle for freedom from captivity and for their own, independent state, should be rendered support and assistance by the free world;

Now, therefore, we Americans of Ukrainian descent, at our gathering in Hamtramck, Mich., on October 11, 1958, in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the famine in Ukraine—

1. Denounce before the free world and history this horrible crime, perpetrated by Communist Moscow on Ukrainian territory, in consequence of which more than 6 million of our brothers and sisters starved to death.

2. Pay our tribute to the memory of their sufferings, and join the Ukrainian people in mourning the victims of the famine;

3. Call on the nations of the free world, above all the people of our great Country

of Liberty, to condemn this crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow in Ukraine, and to do everything in their power to prevent Moscow from committing like crimes on their territories.

4. Request the Government of our country and all governments in the free world to direct their representatives at the United Nations to take action pertaining to the placement of the crime of genocide, committed by Communist Moscow in Ukraine in 1932-33, on the agenda for discussion and the adoption of appropriate resolutions.

5. Call on all countries in the free world to sign the Convention of Genocide.

HAMTRAMCK, October 11, 1958.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress will have an opportunity to perform a significant act of justice, equity, and diplomacy this coming year by granting Hawaii's request for statehood.

As a matter of justice, Hawaii meets every historical standard we have required for the admission of new States. Hawaiians have been immersed in American traditions since 1820. They have demonstrated their devotion to the principles of democracy and to the American form of government in numerous ways, including the adoption of a constitution, in 1950, which has been commended as a model among such instruments.

In 1950, about 84 percent of the Hawaiians were native-born American citizens. The record of island troops in combat is impressive testimony to their loyalty. Gen. Mark Clark described the Hawaiian organization as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They served with equal valor in Korea.

That the majority of Hawaiians desire statehood is unquestionable. In 1940 they voted two to one for admission. In 1950 they approved the proposed State constitution by more than three to one.

Hawaii has first-class qualifications insofar as population and resources are concerned. It has more people than five of the present States—more than twice as many as Alaska. It has a well-developed, prosperous economy. Its citizens support a per capita tax burden considerably higher than the national average—larger, in fact, than in 33 States.

Hawaii richly merits statehood as a matter of equity as well as justice. Permanent political inferiority for American citizens in American Territories is simply too foreign to our ideals to be tolerated for long. Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory not yet welcomed into the Union. It has been petitioning for entrance since 1903. It has more people and a better developed economy than Alaska, our newest State. Both political parties have, in their platforms,

approved Hawaiian statehood. Both President Eisenhower and former President Truman are for it. According to recent polls, the people of the United States are also for it by a ratio of more than 4½ to 1.

Finally, as an act of diplomacy, the admission of Hawaii would be of incalculable value. It would reverberate to our credit throughout the Far East. It would stand as an irrefutable proof that we really live by the principles of freedom and self-government we preach.

For these and many other reasons, I shall, in Congress, support passage of a Hawaiian statehood bill, which I am introducing today.

Up to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star of January 11, 1959, entitled "Up to Congress":

UP TO CONGRESS

President Eisenhower has hurled a challenge which the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress cannot sidestep. In his state of the Union message, he called upon Congress to face up to its responsibility in helping to overcome grave hazards which beset our national economy. The President reaffirmed his determination to use the full power of his office to hold inflation in check and to provide other safeguards in the economy, but he pointed out that Congress holds the purse strings and makes the laws.

The inference was clear in the President's address that if the Democratic Congress runs wild, it will be held accountable when the Nation chooses its leadership again in 1960.

The President urged Congress to help maintain the present forward thrust of the economy by cutting the costs of Government and adopting his forthcoming balanced budget. He insisted the balanced budget of \$77 billion he will submit to Congress January 19 is realistic and that its objectives are wholly attainable. The President's budget is balanced at a figure approximately \$3 billion under what had been anticipated.

Whether hope for tax reduction in the foreseeable future is to be kept alive depends upon the willingness of Congress to face up to the need for economy in government, the President said. If the growing menace of inflation is to be overcome, he reminded Congress, the Federal Government must begin now to live within its means, to meet current costs from current revenue. Every item of Government expense, he said, must be examined critically. To do otherwise would be to betray our Nation's future.

President Eisenhower said 60 percent of the budget is allocated to national security, an estimate covering the Armed Forces, the Atomic Energy Commission, and foreign military aid. But, he emphasized, it is possible to maintain a strong defense and still have less expensive Federal Government. We can have everything we need, he told Congress, but we can't afford one cent for waste. He cautioned against defense overemphasis and needless duplication of quickly outdated weapons.

The President also called upon Congress to enact corrective legislation in the labor field. He asked for prompt enactment of legislation to stop corruption, racketeering, and abuse of power in labor unions. The President has made it clear that he wants intelligent labor reform, not ineffective legislation such as that embodied in the phony Kennedy-Ives bill which the Democrats supported last year as a means of courting the favor of labor in an election year.

President Eisenhower pointed to farm subsidies as a field in which Government spending can be reduced. He also called for decreases in Federal operations in areas where private enterprise can do the job.

It is up to Congress to join with the President in putting into effect these sound recommendations which are mandated by present-day conditions.

The Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has written me of her concern over the present condition of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy facilities in my home State of Connecticut. Because of the nature of her appeal, I have requested unanimous consent that pertinent extracts of the letter be presented in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JANUARY 7, 1959.

I have a son who is at present a cadet at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London. Therefore, I am personally interested in conditions there, particularly, and I quote directly from the "Specific Recommendations" of the Report of Visitors, "Replacement of Deteriorated Temporary World War II Structures: These buildings are old wooden structures that are dangerous to personnel, extremely costly to keep in repair and near the end of their existence." I believe that now is the time to ask Congress for additional funds, particularly in view of the recent nationwide publicity concerning the Chicago parochial school fire and the fire in a similar barracks dormitory at Syracuse University, where seven student airmen lost their lives and 13 were injured. This horrible disaster could so easily be repeated at the Coast Guard Academy, where I am told the cadets can see outside through the cracks in the walls.

It seems unjustifiable that the Air Force Academy in Denver, Colo., should be elaborately constructed, while the Coast Guard Academy, which has served our country for such a long period of time, should be so sadly neglected.

We are told that our boys at the service Academies who are dedicating their lives to the service of their country, are considered the cream of the crop of all American boys, physically, mentally, and morally. Why, therefore, must they be obliged to live under such hazardous conditions?

It is particularly important that the members of the subcommittee and committee considering Treasury Department appropriations be notified that they want the Coast Guard appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to be increased by the sum of \$6,650,000 for the necessary acquisition, construction, rebuilding and improvements to the Coast Guard Academy as recommended by the Congressional Board of Visi-

tors in their report of May 2, 1958, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, No. 151, Thursday, September 4, 1958.

Please, Representative DADDARIO, will you do all that you can for our boys at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy?

Very truly yours,

Mrs. JOHN T. SULLIVAN.

Reaching for the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a timely and thoughtful article by David Lawrence entitled "Reaching for the Moon," which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for January 16, 1959:

REACHING FOR THE MOON

(By David Lawrence)

As we reach for the moon, shall we lose the battle on earth? Will moon gazing become a national pastime? The game is harmless so long as it is confined to those tired souls who long to get away from their earthly chores, but it becomes harmful indeed when we are asked to spend billions of dollars to win a stunt contest in outer space.

Laudable is the spirit of patriotism which seeks to win every race for our country. But we haven't always won the Olympics, and we have managed to adjust our lives to such ephemeral disappointments.

Military values are preeminent. Whatever is necessary to test out guidance systems for missiles must have a proper place in our defense budget. But a contest in launching satellites merely to outdo the Soviets makes little sense.

The sputniks last year threw us off our course and started a wave of spending in Congress. It is to be hoped that the psychological effect of the luniks will not be such as to open the floodgates to more indiscriminate expenditures for the spinning of metal balls in orbit around the sun or the moon.

Many Members of Congress seem to have become intrigued with the possibilities of space travel. They look upon the competition of our scientists with those of the Soviet Union as a gripping matter deserving priority above all else.

But the fact remains that the votes which elect our Representatives and Senators are to be found among the peoples living on the firm ground of the 49 States of the Union—not in outer space.

There is great need for a down-to-earth point of view in the present Congress. All the artificial planets that whirl around the sun will not create employment here in America where there is unemployment, nor bring taxes down from their painful heights, nor stop the raids on the American dollar.

The most important task for our legislators today is to conserve the economic strength of the United States of America. We are engaged in a "cold war" of frightening proportions. The war of missiles and nuclear bombs may never take place, but the economic war throughout the world is actually in progress now on a dozen fronts and on every continent.

This is not just a matter of distributing grants of money to buy allies, but of assuring economic stability for the United States, too.

The world is a trade unit. We are dependent on continuing trade arrangements that encourage the sale of our domestic production in various parts of the world and that make possible the purchase abroad of materials needed for use here in our own country.

Our biggest concern today is the constant infiltration by the Moscow regime in certain countries of the free world by means of loans and by barter exchange of commodities. We are witnessing an economic war such as the world has never known. The stakes are high. It could mean political control of vast areas for the Communists. Their strategy is to burrow in and subvert the recipients of Soviet favors.

Once our own fiscal position is improved, we can look forward to using more and more funds to check the Soviet advances on the economic front in Asia, Africa, and Europe, as well as in Latin America. This is not a battle that will be settled in 1 year—it is a struggle that will last for many years to come.

There is already a significant counter-offensive being made by the free world with financial weapons. The expansion of the various governmental lending agencies—such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank and the new Development Loan Fund, for which Congress has been appropriating relatively small sums—will mean a multiplication of private loans. The way is being opened in several countries already to sound development where foreign credit is needed and can be repaid.

But all this can be nullified unless there is respect for integrity of contracts. It is discouraging to find a government, such as the new one in Venezuela, becoming hostile to American investors after they have for decades poured their savings into that country.

If the end result after an era of lending is the emergence of nationalistic governments which, under Communist prodding, repudiate their obligations and wretch on their commitments to foreign property owners, private investors will be discouraged from again risking their savings.

Moral standards apply to nations—they must respect property, for it is never right to rob Peter to pay Paul.

We have many perplexing problems to solve in the economic field today. These involve down-to-earth questions of great difficulty. It is not a time for moon gazing. We have plenty of work to do on earth.

Congress might well bear in mind that it is the people of the United States whose interests are paramount and that just now we are engaged in a battle for survival on this planet and not in the vapors of outer space.

Korkosz Brothers Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, early in December I had the distinct pleasure of participating in Korkosz Day being celebrated in Chicopee, Mass., and that evening had the honor of attending a testimonial dinner for Frank and John Korkosz who built one of the world's most unique projectors, a 3-ton, 13½-foot instrument for the Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston.

Frank Korkosz is director of the Springfield Museum of Natural History, and he built the smaller Seymour Planetarium at the Springfield Museum in 1937. His brother, John Korkosz, is the manager of the Chicopee Electric Light Co.

Their recently finished projector at the Hayden Planetarium will show all of the planets, including Uranus, which is not shown in any of the other major planetariums of the country. It projects more than 9,500 stars, each according to its own brightness in the skies. The system allows the brightest stars to be shown alone; then in combination with the less luminous stars, and, finally with the dimmest stars.

The Hayden Planetarium and the Korkosz projector system has been referred to as New England's first major theater of the skies, and it is the ninth major planetarium in the United States. John Patterson, director of the Boston museum, said the Korkosz projector is the world's finest and puts the Hayden Planetarium in a class by itself.

The Springfield Union of October 21, 1958, said of Korkosz projector:

Considered the most realistic projector in the world, the 3-ton instrument gives a sky show complete with nearly 10,000 twinkling stars, a satellite and even a roaring jet plane.

The Korkosz brothers first designed and built the 13-foot blue and silver instrument in their Chicopee workshop. They then took it apart and reassembled it at the museum. The projector uses over 200 camera lenses and can reproduce 25,000 years of star motions at the touch of a finger.

Museum officials even brought the Boston skyline indoors to add to the realism.

Even buildings still on drawing boards or under construction are shown as they will appear in the future.

Museum officials, not wishing to leave a dollar unturned in their zeal to finance the project, also received contributions from the firms whose miniature signs appear on the indoor skyline.

ACTUAL SITUATIONS

The optical system of the Korkosz projector simulates, for the first time in any planetarium, the actual situation in nature where even the brightest stars—the sun excepted—show only as points of light. Other planetariums make bright stars larger, the Museum of Science instrument makes them of varying intensity but still points in space.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the news story that appeared in the Springfield Union on December 11, 1958, the morning following the testimonial dinner for the Korkosz brothers:

TWO KORKOSZ BROTHERS ARE GIVEN HONOR—BUILDERS OF HAYDEN PLANETARIUM PROJECTOR ARE FETED IN CHICOPEE

CHICOPEE.—Wednesday was Korkosz Day in Chicopee as citizens honored the brothers, Frank and John, for the national recognition they have received as creators and builders of a 200 camera lens, million-dollar projector for the Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston. More than 400 persons feted the brothers at a testimonial dinner at the Officers' Club at Westover.

The 3-ton projector was built by the Korkosz brothers in their spare time over a 7-year period. It can reproduce 25,000 years of star motions and is complete with 10,000 twinkling stars, a satellite and a jet plane. The projector can be used by the Air Force as a training aid in celestial navigation.

The Korkosz projector optical system simulates for the first time in any planetarium the actual situation in nature where even the brightest stars, the sun excepted, show only as points of lights of varying intensity rather than having bright stars as larger bodies as other planetariums do.

The speaker at the affair was Dr. Bradford Washburn, director of Boston's Museum of Science, where the projector is set up. Dr. Washburn declared the projector is the best in the world, as well as being a thrilling piece of equipment.

Col. Edward D. Wooten, Westover Air Force Base commander, declared that the projector will some day chart our roadways into the world of tomorrow.

"The projector fits the needs of a nation during such a space age as ours," U.S. Representative EDWARD BOLAND said.

Mayor Walter M. Grocki, of Chicopee, presented the brothers with plaques commemorating their services to science and their country.

The brothers declared that the projector would never have been possible without the aid and encouragement given by Hayden Planetarium directors, consultants, craftsmen, families, and friends.

The invocation was given by Rev. Simeon Kaczmarek of St. Stanislaus Church, and benediction by Rev. Edgar Redfern of the Chicopee Falls Methodist Church. Superintendent of School John L. Fitzpatrick acted as the master of ceremonies.

Guests at the head table were: Mayor Grocki; U.S. Representative Boland; John Patterson, Hayden Planetarium director; Charles Oates, Boston Museum lecturer; Jack Wilcox, Boston Museum engineer and lecturer; Mayor Samuel Resnic of Holyoke; Representative Joseph Wisniewski, Percy Gilbert, deputy director of the Boston Museum; Mr. Redfern; Friar Kaczmarek; Mr. Washburn; Superintendent Fitzpatrick; Colonel Wooten; Col. David C. Jolly, Westover representative; William Sheehan; N. P. Ames Carter; and Dr. Lewis Ayers.

Land, Wood, and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sapulpa Herald, Sapulpa, Okla., for December 17, 1958. This editorial entitled "Land, Wood, and Water" relates the progress made by Oklahoma's senior Senator ROBERT S. KERR in carrying forward a dynamic program of land, wood, and water for our great State.

The editorial reads as follows:

LAND, WOOD, AND WATER

Yesterday at Rotary the cardinal philosophy of Senator ROBERT S. KERR kept running through my mind as I listened to the discussion of the Deep Fork drainage area by the speaker, Charles Evans.

Land, wood, and water.

And I thought of the sneers, jeers, and jibes that have been loosed in KERR's direction down through the years as he went over the State and Nation talking about land, wood, and water.

Where is the man or woman now who thinks that the Kerr program is "corny," a mere political hunk of baloney?

Where are those who derided land, wood, and water as being part and parcel of the same cynicism as those who expounded home and motherhood as a political dogma?

Recently I pondered over a map of eastern Oklahoma. It disclosed Sapulpa as nestling quite near the hub of a vast network of lakes and reclamation areas.

Lakes both in and projected.

Count 'em off on your fingers, going clockwise or anticlockwise. It makes no difference, for you start running into water in any direction out of Sapulpa—big water.

Keystone, Heyburn, Hulah, Oologah, Grand, Gibson, Tenkiller, Texoma, Wister, and what is that big one that will start over by Eufaula and run almost to Okmulgee?

Water for municipalities, water for industry, water for fish and boats, water for transportation, water for irrigation—eastern Oklahoma is the last great frontier in these United States for water.

How wise Senator KERR was years ago when he jumped out in front in leadership with his land, wood, and water ideas.

As a result of his foresight, Oklahoma is years ahead of the rest of the Nation in the development of waterways and the improvement of drainage systems of innumerable creeks and streams.

I sat in a hotel room in Fort Smith, years ago, with Senator KERR and Claude Wickard, who was then the Secretary of Agriculture, and listened to their reactions to a terrible flood which swept down the Arkansas and laid scars on the fertile bottom lands west of Fort Smith that can still be seen.

We had toured the Arkansas River flood area that day.

This was before the huge stream control of Oklahoma rivers, that is now an actuality, was launched and completed.

As a matter of fact I think it was that trip down the Arkansas which solidified in KERR's mind the necessity of discipline and control of Oklahoma's waters.

Thus land and water, two prongs of his program, were either born that day or solidified in his mind and this State is enriched thereby and the benefits will snowball down through the upcoming years in a manner too vast for proper calculation.

Only trees are left—the "wood" part of his philosophy.

Oklahoma only has about three kinds of trees that are in any profusion and capable of being exploited commercially.

Two of them already are the pine and the pecan.

Only the blackjack is left for "a working over."

Does anyone wanna bet that KERR doesn't have any ideas about the blackjack?

If so, count me out.

Unwary, indeed, will be the person who gets caught out on that limb.

It might get sawed off.

For he has the ability to run his detractors out on a limb and then sawing it off.

Come to think of it this might be the "wood" phase of his three-part program.

A Challenge to Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the first convention of youth for the diocese of

Ogdensburg, N.Y., held at the Olympic Arena in Lake Placid, N.Y., on September 26, 1958, together with an editorial from the Adirondack Daily Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y., of September 27, 1958, entitled, "A Challenge to Young People":

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

I would not pretend to be an orator or a philosopher. I have never envied, however, those who can sway the minds of men by limpid accents and the dramatic marshalling of arguments. I can only give you the facts as I see them. Neither do I claim to be a man of special learning, because my education stopped far short of my desires. Yet I like to think I know something of my fellow men. I stand before you, too, as a Catholic, who regards his religious faith as his greatest blessing. Besides that love of my faith, I cherish with a fierce love my parents and family and, of course, I have warm affection for my political party.

In my youth I sought the company of my elders to learn the ways of life. In my manhood I was fortunate in having been part of the tremendous drama of my time. I was privileged not only to play a role, but to meet and know most of the great figures of our time. I have met and spoken with thousands of my fellow citizens. From all of them I have learned what I could. For there is no snobbery in man's greatest study, which is man. We can learn as readily from the humblest of our fellows as from the most respected among us.

My times have been eventful. Indeed, I have seen the twilight of kings in World War I and the twilight of the dictators in World War II. Kings lost their thrones by establishing hell on earth in war. They perished because they treated politics and morality as things apart. In World War II the days of two of the most powerful dictators ended shamefully because they attempted to put politics above morality.

For some time, East and West have been locked in a mighty conflict. We in America know we are armed with right because we are concerned with the dignity of man. Yet, because of our concern we must not take the role of aggressor, even for the right. A world system based upon any one country's idea of freedom stifles freedom by denying others the choice which is essential to freedom.

People have often asked me why I chose a career in politics. Sometimes I ask myself, too, what inducement drew me to a life of public service. Let me try to explain today, as I have explained so often to those who questioned me, the grandeur of such a calling, as I look back on over 40 years of my life devoted to it.

Politics is a science and ethics of government. As a science it deals with the administration, organization, and regulation of political entities from the town meeting to the State in both internal and external affairs. In their best sense political ethics are as rigid as the moral code. The same ethics, it may be noted, apply alike to Catholic and non-Catholic. There is no wavering on the line of morality. In their worst sense political ethics are the artful and expeditious management of political affairs for personal or party advantage.

It must be recognized that politics and morality are one and indivisible. Merit and good works are the end of man and they are the end of politics. Power to do good is the true and lawful end of political aspiration. This power to do good is not to be confused with political zeal, which can be good but which is often mistaken. Politics should bring man ordered progress toward general convenience and usefulness.

In following politics as a career, man adopts the most dangerous as well as the most noble worldly career. It is noble be-

cause the power to do good is noble. It is dangerous because the practice of politics is beset by hazards, temptations, and delusions by which man may well lose his immortal soul. This is of gravest concern to any man.

I have no intention of turning my attention to a public examination of my own political conscience or to a dissection of the weaknesses of my fellow men. We all should be most meticulous in observing the code of our religion in our public conduct; most especially we should not treat politics and morality differently, because once we attempt to differentiate we lose understanding and honor.

Political power is a terrible force. Wisely and judiciously handled, it can do untold good. Abuse of power corrupts and destroys. By the uses of political power man can lead his fellows out of the mire of deflection into the light of freedom. And by the same uses, if unbridled, he can lead his fellow men from the light of freedom into the darkness of slavery.

So I say to you, seek power but respect liberty. In our ideal, which we as Catholics share with non-Catholics, our Government should rest upon Christian ideals of love and the brotherhood of man. This does not mean that we must all be perfect before we can have a truly free government. We can even be selfish and promote free government by allowing self-interests to balance one another. But we cannot be vicious in self-interest, even though we persuade others that we are doing so merely to advance the common good. The truth is we are trying to justify absolute, irresistible power for its own sake.

We recognize that freedom must give way to power in time of great internal or external danger. For revolution or war must find the government clothed with power to muster the resources of the country for its own protection. Once the danger is past, these powers should be returned to the people, where they belong. They should not be retained. Power feeds voraciously upon itself, growing ever hungrier until at length it imprisons reason in self-interest and destroys the capacity of judgment, to the great danger of the people.

Abuse of power is the root of all evil both for the politician who governs and for those he governs. Abuse of power encourages corruption, breeds delays, fosters incivility and makes for insincerity. Unhappily, some Catholics in power have been prone to abuse their trust. We cannot evade facts. We should not bury our heads in the sand after the manner of the fabled ostrich. What I have said does not mean that Catholics are not to be trusted in government. But it does mean that we should be careful to entrust our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to honorable men, just as we are most careful and exacting in entrusting our watches for repair, or our jewelry, to experienced, trustworthy hands.

Political aspiring is entirely commendable—no one can quarrel with a noble ambition. But power in politics is not a license to do good and evil. Its only justifiable end is the good and it can be truly successful only when it shuns evil.

Political machines tend to grow arrogant and contemptuous of the rights of those outside their orbit. This is true whether machines are long entrenched or lately come to power as the result of a reform wave. They resort to force or threats. Too often their philosophy is that what is good for the machine is good for the people. This is just another way of saying that the end justifies the means.

In time, political machines tend to become the creatures of one man or at best a clique of men. The leader regards himself as an uncrowned king and refuses to surrender power even when his talent for leadership is

impaired by the relentless course of time. He becomes capricious in the distribution of favors and scornful of interests not identified with the machine. He becomes exacting in his demand for loyalty, so much so as to confuse personal loyalty toward him with true political ethics.

Corruption is the most familiar of the evils of the abuse of power. Man has always been tempted by easy money. From early days some men have looked at bribes as the proper reward of public service. Some regard fees they collect as their own funds. In their enthusiasm to win office, men frequently spend far more than they can hope to take home. They turn then to making up the difference—and a little bit more—by demanding or accepting returns for favors.

In all fairness it must be noted that many men see so little wrong in such conduct that they scarcely cover up their crooked operations. As a result, such cases are frequently easy to press in court. Many men in public office who are entirely reputable in their business dealings are most careless in their official conduct. Too often, I am sorry to say, some Catholics in public office feel that there is one code of conduct for their private lives and an entirely different code for their public lives. Of course, one cannot be a good Catholic on Sunday and a bad Catholic during the week.

Procrastination is another evil of political power. It is so easy to delay doing a public good, especially in a nonelection year. It is so easy to forget political promises until the next election. It is so easy to put off doing what is right when courageous action might cost votes. It is so easy to keep feeding on power and to forget the public good.

Incivility is no less frequent a fault. We have all known men to grow pompous and arrogant in power. Such men come to regard themselves as masters of the people rather than as servants of the people. It is perhaps too much to ask that every man in public life be free and easy of access. Many public men are harassed by the press of their duties. It is proper even that a public man be brusque in private and resentful of any invasion of his privacy, but when he assumes his public functions he must become another man—fair, patient, understanding and, above all, just.

Insincerity is the last of the mortal sins of abuse of power. Many espouse causes, not because they believe them to be good, but solely as the road to power. Many bury convictions to retain power. Some seek temporary power in order to reap financial reward by joining with those they opposed and even persecuted while in public service. Others pretend to be friends of the poor and needy, but have only been interested in heaping power upon power. All of these evils and a host of lesser ones can be avoided by those who scrupulously preserve the single standard of morality for public office against the double standard of one code of ethics for private life and another for public life. One's aim in politics should not be personal advancement and self-exaltation. The means one uses should not be log-rolling, back-scratching, and favors for favors received.

Politics should be directed toward bringing general security and prosperity. Yet, if in politics the majority rules, it does not dictate. Not everything a majority does is right, any more than everything a leader might do would be right of itself. It is entirely possible, to give a farfetched example, that a majority might decree that we again legalize slavery, but that would not make slavery right.

Fortunately for us, I think, we have a two-party Government. Each party is made up of various groups. Some of these have interests which sharply conflict and may be difficult to reconcile. Yet, each of these interests has a voice in making and executing laws through the party. Much of what

is done is achieved by compromise among the interests, which is good. There should be no compromise of principles, but there can be recognition of those who are honestly and sincerely in the opposition.

Under our system both parties must recognize and allow for the interests of farmers, labor, financiers, and industrialists, as well as for racial and religious groups. I would be less than honest if I did not think that the Democratic Party offers the most effective programs for security and welfare. Yet, I would not do away with the opposition party, nor would I see any fragmentation of the party system such as that which has brought confusion to many European nations.

Security and prosperity have been promised by dictators and are still being promised by the most powerful dictatorship of our time. In Soviet Russia the security of prison is being offered to those who dare to question the accomplishment of any of the various 5-year plans. This is the road to fear. About a hundred years ago we gave up security by force, the security of slavery, which, while for the most part benevolent, was purchased at the price of freedom.

The Socialists promise the same ends of security and prosperity. They madly throw money away and avidly confiscate private property, seemingly unmindful of the fact that the three greatest experiments in socialism ended in dictatorship in Russia, Germany, and Italy. They would have us believe that it was the fault of men rather than the fault of a system which is long on materialism and short on faith.

The people must guard their liberties most jealously. If men go wrong in public office, part of the responsibility is ours in not being more vigilant against concentration of political power into the hands of a few. It is our good fortune to be part of a nation which has given its citizens a greater degree of freedom than has been enjoyed by any other nation at any time in the history of the world. It is our responsibility to keep this torch of liberty lit in a dark world. Millions in bondage must be heartened to realize that this great candle still gives light in darkness.

We must not despair because a few men have gone wrong from time to time. It is sad that they have besmirched our code by their conduct. But the fact that they did so does not bring disrepute upon the code of the most revered among men, any more than it should bring disrepute on the many men who have been devout and humble in the exercise of power.

I have known men who have yielded to temptation in public office. I wish that any person so tempted and so beset by insatiable ambition could see, as I have seen, these poor, miserable, shattered men. I have seen them shed bitter tears of remorse, of regret, and of repentance. I have seen them crushed by the weight of their disgraces, not so much on themselves as on those they loved—their parents, their families, and their friends. And I have seen them numbed by the realization that they had seen the value of morality too late. For them, disgrace was forever.

It is a frightening fate to contemplate. The judgment of history and the judgment of men are alike unyielding for the violator of morality in politics. It is of utmost importance that men in public life exercise power most judiciously for the common good. They must not only shun temptation but avoid the suspicion of temptation. There is no greater crowning jewel in public men than true virtue. Virtue in politics can bring eternal fame, but it always gives the reward of a clear conscience and a deep sense of accomplishment.

Leadership is a precious and favored gift. We cannot all aspire to it in politics. It is not essential that we have it in the heroic degree of a Washington, a Jefferson, a Jack-

son, a Calhoun, Lincoln, or Cleveland. Yet we can all be politicians. They truly serve who do no more than cast their votes. It is important that we be jealous in doling out power and that we be exacting in our demands on those in power, so that they will not fail us.

I hold that so long as we maintain intellectual honesty by measuring our own interests against the rights of others, we perform an important political role. We will serve by demonstrating faith in our country, by going to the polls to tell our political leaders what we think of them and their programs. In that way we exercise a vital role in maintaining our freedom and working to advance our own security and well-being.

For most of us this will be the sum total of our political activity. That is good in itself, but it is not enough for all. The great and crying need of our country is for more good men and good women—especially young men and young women—to make at least part-time careers of politics. In the earlier days in our country it was a common feeling that men of families of wealth and position owed some portion of their lives to public service. This feeling brought generations of public service from various families. We are thankful that such traditions of service still continue among us.

My generation is passing. Maybe we did not handle our problems too well. Maybe we were too tolerant of political transgressors among us. That could be. If so, as a member of an older generation, I would be most remiss if I failed to appeal to young people to take up politics. We must not shrug off our responsibility by washing our hands of politics as a dirty business. Politics is not a dirty business unless we allow it to become so. It is rather a most serious business which has need of the most high minded and the most generous hearted among us.

I cannot urge upon you too strongly the necessity for citizens to take part in politics. I appeal especially, as I said, to the young people. If you brush politics aside as unclean, as something no decent person would enter, not only our Republic but our faith would perish. Politics needs persons of high purpose and high moral courage. If high-minded and moral hearted young people enter politics we can save the Nation and perhaps the world while we keep the faith.

Over the last decade and more especially in recent months, we have been hearing much of integrity in public office. I am not being partisan in this, because charges have been leveled, not without justification, against both parties. There have been suggestions that new ethical codes be written and enforced. This, while commendable perhaps, is actually silly. The code exists in every clean heart. Each of us knows the rules of the game. What our country and every country needs is more clean players.

In this connection I am reminded of the words of the late great American philosopher, George Santayana. Santayana, whose warm Spanish ancestry and chill New England upbringing combined to give him a mind of cold judgment and sympathetic analysis, said: "If a noble and civilized democracy is to subsist, the common citizen must be something of a saint and something of a hero. We see, therefore, how justly flattering and profound, and at the same time how ominous, was Montesquieu's saying that 'the principle of democracy is virtue.'"

Politics should be a joyous, dedicated effort toward man's advancement on earth, just as religion is a glorious effort toward bringing final, happy fulfillment in eternity. Moral strength must arm the political leaders of the future if we are to keep the country free and by example set the world free.

It is our good fortune that we had among us many men and women in politics who were motivated in their public lives not only by good political considerations but by highest moral principles. To these we owe our survival amid varying difficulties, misfortunes, and calamities. We are beset by fears and doubts and difficulties of highest magnitude, although if we will but look back in history, we will find that every generation of every country was threatened by disaster. Some generations met the challenge and others succumbed. If we look closely enough we find that progress was ever forward although man at times seemed to fall back.

We today should take heart for the future. It is for our leaders today and the many noble young people we will recruit for political careers to bring us greater and more rewarding service. We must not despair. Let us dedicate ourselves for as long as our way goes here below to seeking the best among us, mentally and morally, as leaders.

[From the Adirondack Daily Enterprise, Saranac Lake, N.Y., Sept. 27, 1958]

A CHALLENGE TO YOUNG PEOPLE

James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General of the United States, yesterday spoke to the Catholic Youth Organization Council convention at Lake Placid.

A man of great experience in politics, Mr. Farley spoke of the good that politics can do, while warning of the pitfalls of power.

"The great and crying need of our country," he said, "is for more good men and good women—especially young men and young women—to make at least a part-time career of politics. . . . Politics should be a joyous, dedicated effort toward man's advancement on earth. . . . Moral strength must arm the political leaders of the future if we are to keep the country free and by example set the world free."

"It is our good fortune," Mr. Farley declared, "that we have had among us many men and women in politics who were motivated in their public lives not only by good political considerations but by highest moral principles. To these we owe our survival amid varying difficulties, misfortunes and calamities. We are beset by fears and doubts and difficulties of the highest magnitude, although if we will but look back in history, we will find that every generation of every country was threatened by disaster. Some generations met the challenge and others succumbed."

Mr. Farley set his sights high in challenging the imagination of the young people at Lake Placid.

It is easy enough to shrug off politics and politicians as of no great account. If we do this we are condemning ourselves and our democratic way of life. Nothing is more important to our successful survival, as Mr. Farley eloquently pointed out, than that we have intelligent and courageous people in politics, in both parties.

Fighting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a resolution approved and adopted by the United States Savings and Loan League at its 66th annual convention held in

San Francisco, November 17-21, 1958, on fighting inflation:

FIGHTING INFLATION

(A resolution approved and adopted by the United States Savings and Loan League at its 66th annual convention held in San Francisco, Calif., November 17-21, 1958)

Erosion of the purchasing power of the American dollar has been a major economic problem throughout the postwar years. Despite periods of price stability in 1948-50 and 1952-55, some declines in the value of the dollar have occurred.

The business recession which started in the fall of 1957 had less effect in restoring the purchasing power of the dollar than had been hoped for by many segments of the American economy. Inflationary tendencies, however, were arrested. There is some danger now that a resurgence of business activity will bring additional inflationary pressures.

Psychological as well as economic forces are at work in relation to inflationary tendencies. In the thinking of a not insignificant number of business, agricultural, labor, and governmental leaders inflation is regarded as inevitable. Some political leaders in both parties are so convinced of this that they have proposed price and wage controls.

The United States Savings and Loan League is convinced that further inflation is not inevitable, that increasing competition will restrain future inflationary tendencies, and hence that direct Government controls of wages and prices are not now and will not be required in the future. It regards such controls as dangerous threats to the American business system. It applauds the Secretary of the Treasury in his stand for the position that inflation is manmade and can be man controlled. It pledges itself to continuous battle in what it believes to be one of the most important of all struggles to maintain a free and prosperous society.

The league suggests that an improvement in the will of the Nation to fight inflation could be aided by congressional action. The Employment Act of 1946, which has come to be regarded as the basic charter of the Federal Government's responsibility and policy in promoting prosperity, has frequently been used to defend public policies which are inflationary; at the same time other interpreters of the act hold that price stability is an implied ingredient of the economic goals there listed. The league applauds the study made by a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress of the relationship of price stability to the goals of the Employment Act. The league urges a declaration by the 86th Congress, either as an amendment to section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 or as a separate resolution, specifically stating that maximum price stability is a goal of Federal Government policy and leaving no doubt that this goal is of equal importance with maximum employment and maximum production.

A. W. Wainwright Receives Award for Faithful Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country a large group of faithful workers who make a tremendous contribution to our country. Their services should be recognized and ap-

preciated by the American people. I refer to the men who serve so unselfishly in the Selective Service System. From time to time a local member of a selective service board receives a Presidential citation for faithful service.

A gentleman from Bonham, Tex., with whom I have corresponded for many years, recently received a Presidential citation for 10 years of loyal and faithful service to the United States. The local paper in Bonham, Tex., should be commended for publicizing this award, and I take pleasure in quoting it for the RECORD:

A. W. WAINWRIGHT RECEIVES AWARD FOR FAITHFUL SERVICE

A. W. Wainwright, chairman of the Fannin County Draft Board, has been presented a Presidential citation for 10 years of loyal and faithful service to the United States.

The presentation was made by Charlie A. Foster, district supervisor for the Selective Service System, who was acting on behalf of President Eisenhower, Gov. Price Daniel, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Selective Service Director, and Col. Morris E. Schwartz, State director.

The award is in the form of a Presidential certificate of appreciation and is signed by the President, the Governor, and the National and State Directors of Selective Service.

"Mr. Wainwright has served his country and community well all these years without pay or thought of pay," Mr. Foster said. "It is my pleasure to carry out the directions of the President in making the award to him."

Panama Canal: More on "Digging the Ditch"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1958, I included a book review in the New York Times by Elting E. Morison on a recent volume on Panama Canal history by W. Storrs Lee.

Another review of that work by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, was published in the September 1958 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, the well-known monthly magazine for the advance of professional, literary, and scientific knowledge in the Navy.

In contrast with other reviews on Dean Lee's book, which emphasize its historical and human interest features, Captain DuVal stresses points of fundamental character and should be of special interest to the Congress, especially those committees concerned with interoceanic canal problems.

The review with an editorial note follows:

THE STRENGTH TO MOVE A MOUNTAIN

(By W. Storrs Lee—Reviewed by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, USN (retired))

(Captain DuVal is author of two important volumes on the Panama Canal, "Cadiz to Cathay," and "And the Mountains Will Move," a former captain of the Port of Bal-

boa, C.Z., 1941-44, in charge of marine operations of the Pacific sector of the canal; and later, head of the Panama Canal Liaison Organization and Isthmian Canal Studies of the Navy Department under the Chief of Naval Operations, 1946-49, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. Attention is invited to his article, "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," in the March 1955 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings.)

A most timely and instructive contribution that tells the dramatic story of building the Panama Canal, now verging toward another crucial period with respect to the type of its modernization. Consideration of this major element of our national policy, which will eventually involve the expenditure of vast sums has been immeasurably complicated by widespread agitations for wrenching canal ownership and control from the United States.

Dean Lee, recognizing the necessity for an informed public interest in interoceanic canal problems and an informed reaction, undertakes to reexamine our stake in the canal enterprise and to reassess the significance of its construction half a century ago.

Drawing upon many sources, independent as well as official, he has thus been able to capture the spirit of the times covered and to present his narrative with a refreshing degree of candor and objectivity. Listed in his references, these sources will be invaluable for those who may wish to delve more deeply into the complicated canal question.

Unfortunately, the book is not supplied with maps and schematic diagrams essential for those not intimately familiar with the subject to follow with proper understanding. For a work of its appeal, however, it is remarkably free of errors in terminology.

In a clarifying foreword, the author recognizes the advantageous geographical location of the Panama Canal, describes the impact of the Suez Canal seizure by Egypt in 1956 on the Panama Canal with resulting demands for relinquishment or reduction of U.S. jurisdiction, mentions the ill-fated 1939 Third Locks project that was suspended in 1942 after the expenditure of some \$75 million, and stresses the two principal plans for major increase of canal capacity.

The first proposal described is the 1943 Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan for the economic increase of capacity and improvement of operating conditions. This solution was developed within the Panama Canal organization as the result of experience in World War II, approved in principle by the Governor of the Canal Zone, and supported by the Secretary of the Navy in a report to the President. The author obviously sensed its historical significance, for he states that it was the "kick-off for a new 'battle of the levels' almost as bitter as the controversy of 1906."

The other is the 1947 sea-level plan, recommended by the Governor of the Canal Zone primarily to make the waterway less destructible under atomic attack. Though mentioning the report of which this recommendation was based as one of the most meticulous engineering reports ever written, Dean Lee balances the description by leveling charges from eminent, independent canal, naval, and nuclear warfare experts, as summarized by George M. Wells and Representative Willis W. Bradley, which challenge the primary assumptions on which the sea-level justification was attempted. Evidently through inadvertence, he did not state the facts that the sea-level report failed to receive presidential approval, and was transmitted by the President to the Congress on December 1, 1947, quite significantly without comment, or recommendation; and that the Congress took no action thereon.

As to demands and proposals for giving up U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, the author emphasizes the views of the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and former civil Governor of the Canal Zone, also a distinguished former Member of Congress, as strongly opposing any surrender of our rights and authority over the canal enterprise, either by internationalization or otherwise.

Most of Dean Lee's book concerns matters of great human interest and is fascinating reading. Yet woven through its fabric are points of fundamental character, which include explorations into the background of Culebra Cut, Gatun Dam, and some important facts about the long obscured history of the presently separated Pacific locks.

The author describes the location of these locks as the major weakness of the whole canal plan, a very expensive one. This error in design, which was inherited from the French, was first recognized by Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, who, early in 1906 recommended the combination of all Pacific locks in one structure as a desirable change in the adopted canal plan. On August 3 of that year, he approved an arrangement that placed these locks in three lifts south of Miraflores with the main terminal dam between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce on the west side of the present sea-level channel and Cerro de Puente on the east. This plan, afterward studied in more detail and unavailingly recommended by Col. William L. Sibert, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, would have enabled summit-lake navigation from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a summit-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that of the Atlantic end.

Unfortunately, an obvious lack of appreciation on the part of canal planners of marine needs and failure to seek the views of adequately experienced navigators on questions of fundamental planning continued, generally speaking, through many years. This policy was well illustrated in the design of the 1939 Third Locks Project, authorized primarily as a defense measure to accommodate larger naval vessels. Its complicated layout in the Pacific sector of the canal, tortuous channels, failure to remove the dangerous bottleneck at Pedro Miguel, and to provide other correlated operational improvements, are the bases for opposition by important navigation interests to the completion of that project as originally planned.

Though treated at some length by Dean Lee, the Pacific lock question has far-reaching angles that are not covered by him. Moreover, as was clearly foreseen by Stevens, it still remains a key problem of vital import to the future, and thus merits far greater attention.

In extending credit, the author is quite generous and just, with the result that the key figures in Panama Canal history are placed in much better perspective. Although Goethals and his associates, civilian as well as military, who took over the task of construction from Stevens, attained great fame as canal builders, Dean Lee rightly describes John F. Stevens as the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

Thus, it is most fitting that, in his conclusion, Dean Lee should revive the 1928 plan of Governor Thatcher for adequate memorialization of all who in significant ways contributed to the success of the great enterprise, for there is glory and honor enough for all.

Though not expressing his own preference as to future plans. The author ends his volume with a stirring appeal: "The United States rallied to a noble challenge in 1904. The country has another challenge now: The old canal is gradually becoming inadequate, and if the present rate of increase in shipping

through the cut continues, the waterway will be obsolescent in less than 2 decades. That leaves all too short a time to remodel the master work."

**Faith: Address of Hon. James A. Farley
at New York State Fair**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley on the "State Fair Pauses Before God Program" of the New York State Fair at Syracuse, N.Y., on August 31, 1958:

FAITH

Over the years I have made many speeches. In the past, I must confess, I have never done so without some uneasiness. I have always been aware I am no orator, one who can fire the minds of men by poetic imagery and limpid accents, and that I am no philosopher, one who can elevate the minds of men by clarity of thought toward the level of angels. On this day devoted to religion, a new anxiety has been added for me to the speaking platform; I am not a theologian, skilled in matters of morals and dogma, nor am I a man of learning, versed in metaphysics, science, history, or art.

I am a man of business. In business I have been fortunate and happy. I used to be a man of politics. In politics I have had my successes and my defeats, all of which have added to my knowledge and understanding of my fellow man, including my most recent decisive venture. It is this knowledge and understanding, along with my years—a full 3 score and 10—glowing with bright memories and unsullied by bitter cynicism, that moved the planning committee to select me as speaker for the religious day ceremonies.

I am a Catholic, rooted in my faith. In speaking at these ceremonies, I follow a Jew and a Protestant. All of us are Americans and don't let anyone tell you differently. The greater our devotion to our faiths, the deeper our dedication to America; and let none of us forget that for a single instant, because if we do, we place ourselves in jeopardy to the godlessness of materialistic totalitarianism.

The days of my years have covered the appearance of virtually all the great discoveries by which man has changed the face of the earth, approached the conquest of time and space, and armed himself with the power to destroy the world. Unhappily man has not learned how to control himself as well as he has learned to harness and transmute the bounties of nature.

Man has always had the power to destroy himself, using it first when Cain slew Abel. Succeeding generations have magnified that power until in this century we have seen two terrible world conflicts and a number of lesser wars, which have taken a frightful toll of lives, destroyed staggering totals of property and culture, and squandered many bounties of nature. Today we face the threat of a third world conflict, which might not only take even more fearsome tolls but could obliterate civilization as we know it.

But horrible as destruction and such a threat may be, we are confronted with a more terrifying prospect. Man has always

had the power to lose his immortal soul. Now, mankind is confronted with organized and regimented secularism or materialism, which would have him take a nonreligious view of everything. It would obliterate all faiths and have man deny God.

By nature man is religious. Man is an animal and has much in common with other animals from the ant to the elephant, not only in senses, passions, and instincts but some resemblances of body. He differs from other animals in two important respects; he has intellect and he has free will. By his intellect he can reason so as to pass from one idea to another. He can turn his intellect on himself, on the universe and on God. By his freedom of will he—and he alone of all living creatures—can subdue impulses and act against them.

At every turn as an individual or as a member of society, man is confronted by risks and must make decisions. In making decisions man alone has the power among living creatures to weigh concepts such as freedom, truth, and justice—against images.

From the beginning of time man has sought to relate himself to the unseen, the transcending power that makes for the thirst for righteousness—God. In this respect we might say that man is metaphysical as well as religious, but he has not arrived at his understanding of God through intellect alone. Materialistic men would have us believe that we have created a fantasy for lulling ourselves to unreality, by pronouncing religion the opiate of the people.

No; we of the three faiths know God has spoken to man Himself and through men. To accept anything on the authority of man we must be convinced, by reason, of his credibility. Revelation is credible when we are convinced he is telling us what he knows. Faith does not ask the surrender of reason; rather, reason is what supports faith.

In opposition to faith we have the materialists and the secularists who oblige others to accept what they say as truth because they say it. Those who would oblige others to accept what they say as truth are dictators lustful for power or men swollen with the pride of intellect, the sin by which angels fell so that it is no wonder it devours their reason by the insidious flatery or egotism.

By its nature materialism is a force for slavery as faith is a force for freedom. Today we are engaged in a titanic struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery. The forces for slavery have organized a powerful and lawless conspiracy which we know as communism. These would subvert the forces for freedom by lies, deceit, ridicule, distortion, hate, and treachery, with strife in reserve as a last resort.

The tyrants of world communism are strangers to truth. They were able to conclude an unholy alliance with Hitlerian forces of aggression, which loosed World War II, sealing this foul pact with the blood of an outraged nation whose security they had pledged. They were able to attack a tiny nation and scream they were protecting themselves against aggression. They were able to gorge themselves on nation after nation on a tidal wave of imperialism such as the world has never known before and pose as lovers of independence. They have posed as lovers of peace while threatening all who oppose them with destruction.

Over the 40 years they have been in control, the leaders of Red totalitarianism have broken their signed and pledged word in a thousand pacts and treaties. Their word is as changeable as it is hollow. If we had no other proof of this, the voices of the patriot dead of Hungary, led by the recently executed Premier Imre Nagy, blare their condemnation trumpet-tongued for all time down the corridors of history.

Even while professing to call for peace, the leaders of the Kremlin boast that they are now powerful enough to loose the monsters of nuclear war. They have threatened to destroy the United States and Britain while calling for a summit meeting at which they would have the great powers of the world dictate and enforce Communist imperialism on the smaller nations of the world. While professing to proffer the gentle fluttering of the wings of the dove of peace, the dictatorial oracle of the Kremlin ranted, "We bolsheviks are a ravenous people . . . we want more and more." This same leader boastfully predicted that grandchildren of those now living would live under Communists and that communism would destroy us.

Let us take a look at the situation of this proclaimed Communist enemy. It is now 40 years since the last czar of Russia was done to his death, with most of his family in a Russian cellar, by frightened bolsheviks. Leaders of this revolution have now had four decades to reconstruct Russia and make its people happy. In the same initial period we made tremendous strides toward our present prosperity. From the scraps of news that come out of Russia, it is evident that the Russian people are living on a very meager diet and in the barest of comfort. Even granting that the crudest Russian peasant and the poorest Russian worker in the cities is better off than he was under the czars, the advance has not been anywhere near the world of plenty and happiness the Communist leaders promised when they began making over Russia.

It is now evident that the Iron Curtain has been erected not so much to keep the rest of the world out of Russia as to keep the Russians satisfied within. The Soviet leaders do not want faith and the truth entering with foreign visitors. For almost 40 years the leaders of the Red revolution have been educating the Russian young people, but there is no doubt that some 60 million young Russians, whose minds have been partially awakened, are becoming more and more of a problem. These young people have been aroused to question what they are told, because their tastes have been expanded and their appetites sharpened. Some have seen the Western World in their marching in war. They have seen that the Soviet promises of a better and fuller life are a shocking disappointment by way of contrast with what the poorest people enjoy in the freer outer world.

Many Russians under the age of 40 know now that they have been getting sputniks and arms instead of bread and butter. They have been getting uniforms and drill and more work at more hours instead of better homes, simple luxuries and a peaceful life. There can be no doubt that many millions of young Russians are unhappy, to say nothing of millions upon millions of people who have been enslaved by the violent energy the Communist leaders put into building weapons to defend their regime while professing to defend Russia.

The greatest threat to Russia at it is constituted today is not what the Communist leaders rant about day and night—the alleged imperialism of the United States or the alleged belligerency of the Western Powers. The great threat to the Soviet leaders lies partly in the unhappy and disgruntled millions in Communist slavery and largely in the vigorous, hungry, and ambitious young Russians who may awaken to faith. Almost four decades ago Communist leaders told the Russian people: "You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain." Today, from the trickle of information that comes out of Russia, we learn young Russians are awakening to a growing realization that they have not gained anything of the world's abundant freedom, but have merely added to the weight of their chains.

For this reason I am convinced that Soviet Russia does not want war. For this reason I am also convinced that Soviet Russia does not want peace. If Russia goes to war, the discontented young Russians might turn on their leaders and seize the government for themselves. It is always easier to turn upon a tormentor at home than an enemy abroad. I am certain that the Russian leaders are aware that in launching any conflict, they would risk their future and lives, just as certainly as did Czar Nicholas in 1918 and Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914.

I have said that I do not believe that the Russians will launch a war, but neither do I believe that they will ever agree to a lasting peace. They will not execute a solemn and binding treaty at any conference between the East and West, no matter how high the summit, because peace will hasten what I believe to be their inevitable destruction. Russia's present leadership cannot survive war and Russia's present leadership cannot survive peace. That is their great dilemma.

They cannot survive war because they will be destroyed by an outraged citizenry. They cannot survive peace because they will be destroyed by faith born of learning. The learning which they are implanting in the minds of their young in their desperate striving to dominate the world in the space age is the devastating time bomb that will blast the materialistic tyrants.

The tyrants of communism fear force, but more than they fear force, they fear faith. Let each of us then keep the faith, knowing that those who keep the light of faith a sacred flame on our altars of catholicism, protestantism, and judaism truly save the race, as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end.

Jimmie John Jarnagin, of Jetmore, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body an article appearing in the October issue of the Kansas Future Farmer pertaining to Jimmie John Jarnagin, of Jetmore, Kans., who has received the highest possible honor in the Future Farmer organization—that of Star Farmer of America. This young man has brought great honor to the State of Kansas, and to his city and country. He is to be highly commended for the contribution he has made to agriculture.

The article follows:

A young Kansas wheat and cattle farmer by the name of Jimmie John Jarnagin, Jr., has been judged winner of the Nation's most coveted farm youth award, the 1958 Star Farmer of America.

He is 21 years old, lives near Hanston, Kans., just 20 miles north of the famed Gunsmoke town of Dodge City, Kans., and is a vocational agriculture graduate from the Hodgeman County Community High School at Jetmore.

The award, carrying with it a \$1,000 check from the Future Farmers of America Foundation, Inc., was made October 14, during colorful ceremonies at the Tuesday evening session of the 30th anniversary national FFA convention in Kansas City's Municipal Auditorium.

The 1958 Star Farmer of America is a wheat and cattle farmer from the dryland farming section of southwestern Kansas where agriculture is largely influenced by the whims of nature, and prosperity depends upon the farmer's fortitude to stick when times are hard, and management foresight to strike for big stakes when the rains come.

Such is the story of Jimmie John Jarnagin, Jr., who weathered 2 years of searing drought in 1955 and 1956 and came back during the past 2 years to earn more than \$30,000.

Jimmie had unusual help from his father, J. J. Jarnagin, Sr., in getting started in farming. He added unusual management ability and hard work of his own to develop a 1,600-acre farming and ranching program with a gross value of \$111,071.11. His program this year included 413 head of beef cattle, 230 acres of wheat, 155 acres of silage and grain sorghums, and about 1,200 acres in grass. He owns 1,200 acres; rents the remaining 320.

Jimmie is married and has a 2-year-old son. He and his wife, Charlene, with some help from her father, have built an attractive rambler-style home on the ranch. They're still working on the development of landscaping, a garage, shop, corrals, and other structures needed around the farmstead.

Jimmie's early years as a vocational agriculture student were not particularly impressive. Even though his father had bought a 160-acre farm in Jimmie's name in 1945, the boy's supervised farming program as a freshman in Hodgeman County Community High School at Jetmore consisted of only two registered Hereford heifers to begin his beef cattle herd. As a sophomore he added 12 sheep and half-interest in 70 acres of milo. Drought got most of the milo, and he lost money on both the sheep and the cattle. His net labor income for those first 2 years was \$126.

It was then, in 1954, that his high school vocational agriculture instructor, George Turnbull, got father and son together for a long and searching talk about the boy's future. The elder Mr. Jarnagin had a large farming operation. He was past 65. His older son and two daughters already were married and away from home.

Mr. Jarnagin made arrangements for Jimmie to purchase 800 acres of the home farm for \$24,000 on a time-payment basis. There was a 450-acre growing crop of wheat on the land at the time of the purchase. Jimmie expanded his beef herd to 24 and his sheep to 20. The wheat crop was good, and he harvested 6,500 bushels. His labor income at the end of the year amounted to \$13,889.50. With it he paid off \$12,000 of the amount owed his father.

That was to be his last good wheat crop until this past summer. In 1955 he netted \$142 from 400 acres. There were failures again in 1956 and 1957, although he did get returns of about \$2,400 during each of those 2 years from land placed in the soil bank.

In the meantime, Jimmie sold his sheep and attempted to expand his beef herd. In 1955 he pastured and fed 70 head of his father's cows for one-half of the calf crop. Selling his share of the calves, he bought more cows. Then the drought got worse. At the beginning of 1956, Jimmie had 52 cows, 4 heifers, and 2 bulls. Because of feed and water shortage, he sold his entire calf crop and 20 of the poorer cows.

The rains came in the spring of 1957, too late for that year's wheat crop, but a blessing on the pastures. Native buffalo and bluestem grasses greened up once more and started growing. Jimmie bought 320 acres more of grassland from his father for \$15,000 and leased 320 acres from his mother at \$2.50 per acre per year. He got 31 calves from his 34 cows. In the fall he borrowed more money to buy 214 head of stocker steers and cows. He was so heavily in debt by this time that another failure of wheat

and pasture could have resulted in his loss of the entire farm.

But the 214 cattle represented a particularly timely purchase. He paid \$21 per hundred pounds for them, wintered them on wheat pasture and milo stubble. By last spring the steers had gained an average of 200 pounds each and prices had gone up. He sold 106 at a good margin, getting enough to pay off his note and still keep the remainder of the steers and cows to eat this year's good pastures.

At the time he filed his application for the FFA's American Farmer degree last spring, young Jarnagin had nearly \$30,000 worth of cattle, \$70,000 in land and buildings, with machinery and other miscellaneous items to bring the gross value of his holdings to \$111,071.11. He still owed \$33,000 on the land, \$14,500 on the cattle, and \$965 in other liabilities, for a net worth of \$62,606.11.

Of that amount, he could count \$53,634.05 gained in actual earnings from farming and other sources over a period of 6 years. The remainder represented his father's gift of the original 180-acre farm and increased inventory value of the land he had purchased.

Jimmie was graduated from high school in 1955 and in August of that year married a classmate, Miss Charlene Bamberger. They chose a site on the 800 acres he had bought, and with the help of Charlene's father in the framing, wiring, and plumbing, built their home. They have modern equipment and furniture in the house, and plans for other improvements.

"That takes a back seat to reduction of the mortgage on the farm, though," says Jimmie.

In high school, Jimmie was a leader in the FFA, student council president, captain of the football and basketball teams and played in the school band. He and Charlene are active in community affairs now, particularly in the activities of Farm Bureau and their local United Presbyterian Church.

Jimmie continues his interest in vocational agriculture by participating in a young farmers class, conducted by the present teacher, Hubert Mal, at the Jetmore School. Mal visits the Jarnagin farm frequently to help with the development of plans for improving the farm.

Jimmie has plans for joining the soil conservation district and is in the process of developing a complete conservation program for the farm. Also in the planning stage is a large farm pond where he hopes to store enough water to irrigate some of his crops.

"My immediate goal is to maintain a herd of 200 cows which will be used to produce feeder calves," Jimmie said. "I plan to continue to winter stocker steers whenever feed and pasture are plentiful."

Jimmie started building a garage last spring, and had plans ready for a machine shed. Most of the lumber needed for corrals and loading facilities was on hand.

"My farmstead will grow as rapidly as my time and funds are available," he said.

There were many times when it would have been easy for young Jimmie Jarnagin to quit, but Jimmie did not quit, and today he has received an honor which makes every FFA boy in Kansas proud to be a member of the Future Farmers of America. It is true that the Star Farmer of America had unusually good fortune in securing land which is not available to every FFA member who would be a farmer, but also it must be remembered that when that opportunity came, Jim Jarnagin was ready and waiting to accept it as the challenge of his lifetime. What Jim did when faced by this challenge in extremely adverse farming conditions will serve as a real inspiration to every FFA member in Kansas and the United States to be ready to take advan-

tage of opportunity which may come his way.

Much of the credit for Jim's success goes to his parents and vocational agriculture teacher, Mr. George Turnbull. It was through their sound advice and counsel that Jim has been able to take the giant steps to establishment in farming. Jim's wife, Charlene, has also been a major factor in his success. Not only has Charlene offered moral support and encouragement but has many times been seen in the feed lots or fields helping wherever necessary.

Attack on HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a fine and objective editorial "Attack on HUAC" appearing in the January 12, 1959 issue of the Daily News of New York City:

ATTACK ON HUAC

We congratulate today the House Un-American Activities Committee, hereinafter designated as HUAC, and its current chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat, of Pennsylvania).

Our reason for congratulating HUAC is that it is now under ferocious attack from all the Communists in the country and a raft of pinks, liberals and habitual joiners of Red front organizations.

For example, a big advertisement was printed in a Washington newspaper last week, petitioning Congress to eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Standing Committee.

The blast was signed by, among others, Stringfellow Barr, Eugene Carson Blake, John A. Mackay, Alexander Meiklejohn, A. J. Muste, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Aubrey Williams.

It accused HUAC of many things—ruining individual reputations or even lives, perverting Congress' powers of investigation, discouraging U.S. students and scholars from "studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand," and so on.

This advertisement was and is part of the abovementioned mass Red, pink and liberal drive to persuade the heavily Democratic 86th Congress to sack HUAC.

ENEMY OF ENEMIES OF THE REPUBLIC

The truth is that HUAC, ever since it was set up in 1945, has been a powerful and effective enemy of the Kremlin's fifth column in the United States.

HUAC took up where the old special House antisubversive committee headed by Representative Martin Dies (Democrat, of Texas) left off. Dies and his colleagues dug many a Communist and Fascist out from under the rocks and started him toward jail or oblivion—Fritz Kuhn, William Dethlefsen, William Dudley Pelley, and Earl Browder, to mention only a few.

HUAC's most distinguished single achievement to date, we'd say, was its relentless digging into the Alger Hiss case, with RICHARD M. NIXON (now Vice President) doing most of the pick-and-shovel work. For that, U.S. leftists have never forgiven Mr. NIXON.

Under Representative WALTER's chairmanship, HUAC has continued the fight against

subversives and traitors of all kinds. In doing so, it has had to steel itself against smears, character assassination and all the other dirty tactics and strategies habitually used by leftists everywhere.

Its latest work in the service of the Republic is a booklet entitled "Patterns of Communists Espionage," in which HUAC (naming names and summarizing cases) shows how widely and dangerously the United States is still infested with Soviet agents.

To repeat, congratulations to HUAC on this newest attack. The nature of its enemies is a tribute to its courage and effectiveness—and a tipoff to Congress to let HUAC go right on operating, with ample funds.

Defense of the Small Tobacco Farmer of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent presentation made by my colleague, KENNETH HECHLER, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division of the Agriculture Department on the controversial question of acreage allotments to burley tobacco growers of his State.

Mr. HECHLER's remarks, which appear under the caption "Defense of the Small Tobacco Farmer of West Virginia," are pertinent because they attribute the plight of the tobacco industry in the State as one of the contributing causes to West Virginia's overall sad economic situation.

Congressman HECHLER's remarks follow:

I represent the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, along the Ohio River. In this district live virtually all of the more than 4,000 tobacco farmers in our State. It is on their behalf that I am appearing before you today.

None of these West Virginia tobacco farmers own large, prosperous farms. Their farms aren't mechanized to any great extent. None of them surveys vast tracts of land from the shade of a veranda, with a mint julep in his hand.

Instead, these are, in the main, poor people. The smallness of their farms is matched only by the smallness of the tobacco quotas assigned to them. In fact, each farmer in my district grows an average of less than six-tenths of an acre each year under the present quota system.

With an average yield of 1,600 pounds an acre, at 60 cents a pound, this means that the average farmer in my district receives only about \$576 a year from the growth and sale of tobacco.

This, I am sure, sounds trivial to you. You may be asking yourselves, "Why should we concern ourselves with a small group of farmers who produce only a small amount of tobacco?"

May I answer by pointing out that for a majority of these 4,000 farmers, tobacco is the only major cash-producing crop. For many of them, it is the one crop that brings any dollar income into their homes. For a large number of these people, it is the only way they have of making cash for them-

selves as they eke out a rustic, precarious living in the mountains of our State.

Considering these farm families, it is possible that the actions you agree upon here will determine directly whether or not upwards of 20,000 West Virginia citizens will have their pitifully low income slashed even further.

May I offer a corollary to this problem: Other sections of our Nation have recovered from the recent recession. West Virginia has not.

In the past 18 months, 45,856 persons have exhausted the unemployment benefits they merited under West Virginia's regular job-security program.

More than 300,000 persons in the State of West Virginia are subsisting on Federal surplus commodities. This constitutes more than 15 percent of the people in the State—the highest percentage of any State in the Union.

What this all means is that if these small tobacco farmers are not permitted to continue to make a small amount of cash income from their burley crop, they have no place to go to find new sources of cash income. I sincerely trust that no action will be taken by the Department of Agriculture that would add more of these hard-working people to the relief rolls. If they are driven to the cities in search of jobs, this will make the urban unemployment problem much more acute.

The economic fate of the tobacco farmer is so closely bound to the actions you take here, I am certain you will do nothing to damage his already hazardous position.

The West Virginia tobacco farmer has stood by passively and cooperatively while acreage controls have been drastically reduced. The number of acres harvested in our State has dropped from a high of about 19,000 acres in 1910 to 2,300 acres in 1958. This is the lowest figure since records of tobacco acreage were begun in 1866.

Even more recently, we can see how the production of burley in West Virginia has declined. In 1954 the poundage marketed at our warehouses in Huntington totaled 7,930,874 pounds. By 1957 this figure had dropped to 5,633,013.

Now this all has come about because of quota cutbacks. I have been informed by Charles E. Campbell, tobacco specialist with the West Virginia State department of agriculture, that West Virginia tobacco farmers have notably good records of support for the control program.

This means that although the Government was cutting back acreage in the only money crop many of these farmers grew, they still were willing, in a spirit of cooperation and good will, to accept these controls and, indeed, roll up an enviable record of compliance with the Government's orders.

Now it would be a gross distortion of the truth to say that these small West Virginia farmers are happy with these small quotas. I don't think we can expect them to be happy with quotas that limit their cash income to an average of less than \$600 a year.

But I can say that these farmers are good people; they recognize and agree with the theory behind crop controls and adjustments. They realize that maintaining a good price for tobacco is essential, and they want the burley export market to remain strong.

If it is in the best national interest to keep quotas at their present levels, I am sure the West Virginia tobacco farmers will accept them. But any effort to cut quotas below their perilously low level will cause havoc and additional economic misery in the State.

This is the general viewpoint of tobacco farmers in my district regarding the present system of figuring acreage allotments.

Now may I pass to another phase of the problem.

I would like to comment for a few moments on a series of recommendations made to the Secretary of Agriculture by a group of representatives of growers, auction warehousemen and leaf exporters of burley tobacco. These recommendations were handed to Secretary Benson on November 17, 1958.

Recommendations concerning a return to the old parity formula—that is, parity as calculated prior to the Agriculture Act of 1948—receive our understanding. Also, we might add that we support these tobacco men in advocating acreage allotments for 1959 the same as those for 1958—since there seems little prospect for any increase in quotas.

I believe this is a sound proposal, because the facts indicate that the surplus of burley tobacco is declining. I would like to point out that the production of burley tobacco has been below the level at which total stocks have been depleted for four consecutive years.

It is a third proposal put forward by these tobacco experts which disturbs me, and places me sharply at odds with the men who drafted these recommendations.

That would be the proposal which states "that the Department assign a task force to work with leaders representing various segments of tobacco production and trade, including college of agriculture personnel, in studying, developing, and preparing in legislative form an acreage-poundage control program for tobacco."

This recommendation, which would take tobacco off an acreage system and put it under a pounds-per-acre system, is a very serious mistake, in my opinion. It might prove harmful to the large tobacco farmer under certain circumstances. It would surely prove disastrous to the small farmer, such as we have in West Virginia.

And why is this so?

For one thing, the regulation of pounds per acre is a difficult business at best. It is well known that annual rainfall—or lack of it—has a powerful influence on the weight and quality of tobacco yielded by any given field.

For a more important reason, however, I must assert again that this bill would hurt the small farmer.

The small farmer has a small tract of land to nurture and coddle. Because he is so severely limited by acreage, he devotes tender care to his tobacco plot, and often is rewarded with a heavy yield. The big tobacco farmer, who uses mass-production methods, consequently is willing to forego the higher yield in order to cut production and labor costs.

I am told that acreage limitations of something in the neighborhood of 1,600 to 1,800 pounds may be advised for the 1960 crop year. This would work a serious hardship on many West Virginia farmers, who by diligent work and unstinting effort obtain a yield of 2,300 to 2,500 pounds per acre on some of their pitifully meager tracts. Sometimes their output rises into the vicinity of 2,800 to 3,000 pounds.

Surely we are not going to reward these small farmers who obtain superior production by dint of long hours and unceasing care by altering the formula for calculating the amount they may produce, so that it will wipe out the fruits of their efforts.

It also can be argued that the small farmer deserves a better break than this because he must spend a longer time cultivating his crop, regardless of the methods and yield. It is estimated that in our West Virginia mountains, a minimum of 500 man-hours must be spent in cultivation of 1 acre. In Kentucky's bluegrass area, this figure drops to a comparatively low 300 hours. Thus, the extra hours put in by the hill-country farmer will go unrewarded if we make such an alteration in the quota-figuring formula.

The pound-acre formula is specifically designed to help the large, big-quota, mass-production farmer. The Secretary of Agriculture has argued that he wants to return agriculture to the free enterprise system. But can this be free enterprise, when a system is devised that takes money from the pockets of the man who is willing to spend long hours and devote tender care to his crop, and favors the man who operates on impersonal, businesslike lines?

You must agree that this is not free enterprise, as we understand it, in any sense. It is instead, I fear, a callous and heartless policy which builds a monument to massive, factory-type, mass-production farms upon the graves of small, marginal farms. This may seem to be efficiency, but it is a false efficiency if it is achieved by driving our small farmers into bankruptcy and starvation.

But, as I said, this program was evolved by tobacco men, not Federal officials.

However, it is significant that West Virginia's tobacco farmers were not even invited to the meeting at which these policies were adopted and endorsed.

I protest against the unfeeling and cruel attitude toward the little farmer, and I strongly urge that action be taken to protect this little man in the tobacco business, who apparently is being thrown to the wolves by his big brothers.

The West Virginia tobacco farmer is, in his way, as efficient as the big men in the field. Although West Virginia rates a rather low 18th in production, it rates 13th in yield per acre. And when we consider that tobacco is the State's fifth most important crop, the effect on the already troubled West Virginia economy can be appreciated.

So stringently do West Virginia burley farmers oppose this new formula that the State's department of agriculture has informed me that "this program, if adopted, could put the State out of the tobacco business."

I do not dispute the right of the big tobacco interests to present their case before you here today. I do not dispute that their share of the tobacco economy is larger than ours.

I ask you only to remember that any action you take here which is detrimental to the small tobacco farmer will be disastrous to 20,000 people in my home State. Therefore, I urge that you take no steps which would strike another blow at West Virginia's economy.

I do not want the famous old tobacco slogan "LSMPT" to come to mean "let's starve mountaineer farmers of tobacco."

A Great Teacher Teaches Much More Than Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Louis Seltzer's fame as a journalist is widespread. While the Cleveland area shares much of his talent with the rest of the world, we are fortunate in having something of a monopoly on the local sketches he writes for the Cleveland Press. In a recent profile of Dr. Harry A. Peters in that newspaper, Mr. Seltzer is particularly accurate in capturing the essence of the man who for 40 years has

served as headmaster of the University School in Cleveland.

Dr. Peters probably would modestly try to deprecate the fact that he is an American Mr. Chips in the eyes of thousands of boys who attended the school. My good friend and very able colleague, Representative FRANK BOW, of the 16th District of Ohio, shares with me the good fortune of having studied under Dr. Peters.

When I needed a chairman for my Service Academy Advisory Board, which selects candidates for the service schools, Dr. Peters graciously added this duty to his many others. He has served in that post 4 years, bringing to it the wisdom, integrity, and insight into youth which continues to enrich the lives of University School boys, young and old.

Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the Record the following article by Louis Seltzer from the January 13 Cleveland Press:

A GREAT TEACHER TEACHES MUCH MORE THAN BOOKS

Any man who makes of himself a tradition during his lifetime must be endowed with unusual qualities.

Harry A. Peters is a tradition.

Let me tell you why.

First, he was a druggist's son in Mauch Chunk, Pa. He had a passion for learning. To get \$200 to enter Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass., he did odd jobs, worked in a railroad paymaster's office, ran errands, did whatever would help acquire enough for Phillips.

As a boy he was a stern self-disciplinarian. It became an integral part of his life and philosophy. He was sure the first challenge of a man, particularly an educated man, was supremacy over himself before he could exert influence over others.

At Andover he became from the beginning a standout scholar. He won prizes in Latin and Greek. He did the same thing at Yale, where he acquired the Phi Beta Kappa key. He entered Yale Law School, but then switched to accept an opportunity to teach French at University School in Cleveland.

This was in 1902. The school, located then at East 71st and Hough, was a single building. The football field was a sandlot. It was infested with sandburs. The bleachers were alongside the field and the ends were jammed with buggies—and a few horseless carriages. The school was only a dozen years old when Harry Peters joined its faculty.

Boys knew from the start he would tolerate no monkey business. They were there to learn. They were also there, Harry Peters believed, as he believed through a subsequent lifetime of teaching, to have strong characters, strong bodies, strong control, healthful, inquisitive, searching minds, and, above all, an enduring sense of integrity—plus the ability at all times to win and lose with equal grace.

In 1908, the young man who came to teach French became headmaster of University School and distinguished himself for 40 years thereafter in that job.

Now, that's the somewhat biographical nature of Harry Peters and University School. To it could be added the great multi-million-dollar grouping of buildings in Shaker Heights that went up in 1924 and have been steadily added to since.

To it, also, could be added that in his time 2,700 students went through University School, which, under Harry Peters' headmastership, became world renowned for its mind and character and body building. Of these, 2,200 were graduated. The score of some of his boys, as he unfailingly called all, is significant. Like a batch of 416 alumni. The

batch divided like this: Chairmen of boards or presidents at the time of his retirement in 1946 as headmaster, 111; high executive officers, 159; attorneys, 67; doctors, 31; teachers, 12; ministers, 4; engineers, 22; public officials, 10.

While statistics of current vintage as to the further progress of Harry Peters' boys are not available, they would represent an extension of those set down above.

And yet not even this tells the why of the Harry Peters-University School tradition—the inseparableness of them even a decade after his retirement.

Why, then?

There was the boy from a rich family. He had a swagger.

Anything he wanted he got. His family lived in fear of him. His fellow students not only feared but disliked him. He had thoroughly insulated himself against everything and everybody by an ego built not by his own accomplishment but by his parents' money.

Headmaster Peters booted him out of school. As he knew, the family instantly created a furor. Peters stood his ground. The boy was out. And he stayed out.

One day, again as Dr. Peters suspected would happen, the boy showed up in his office. He wanted to return to school. It was his life. It was more important than anything else.

"You come to school only on my terms," Headmaster Peters said. "You earn your own way. You take nothing from your parents. You don't ride. You walk. You don't require others to do for you. You do for them. You go on the second squad of all the athletic teams and you win your way back on them, yourself. You study yourself. You don't get or seek any help."

The boy did. He is the head of one of America's great corporations. He became—on his own, and without his family's help—completely different, and one of the most popular students and athletes in the school's history.

There was a meeting. There were about 100 students around a fireplace. Dr. Peters started it off. No punches pulled, he said. No questions barred.

"Only one condition—the usual one, we conduct ourselves as gentlemen," he said.

I was the speaker. For 2 hours, and this was in 1929, when the economic bottom dropped out of America, I was bombarded by questions. Dr. Peters let it go on. He offered me no help. On the contrary, he urged his students on.

"He's getting off light," he said. "Bear down on him."

They did. After the questions, Dr. Peters rose. He said:

"There are two things about this I want you to remember. One, you had a good time. You went at it hammer and tongs. You got answers. Maybe not all satisfied you. But even more important is this. Some of you in this school don't like to be asked questions. You offend easily. You think you know everything. Here's a man who came out today and exposed himself to a whole afternoon of questions, many of them embarrassingly personal and frank. He answered them all—without flinching, becoming mad or irritated. Go thou and do likewise. Meeting adjourned."

Harry Peters became a tradition for these and many other reasons—better reasons than I have set down here as character-revealing anecdotes. He is a great man. He is today a great and useful citizen of Greater Cleveland.

His mind is like a steel trap. He is as keen a student today as he was when he came out of Mauch Chunk to go to Phillips Academy. His outlook is youthful, his belief in the future great, his love of boys even keener than ever.

The silver haired, slightly bent figure, with the keen, intellectual countenance, and merry twinkle in his eyes, is a great university school tradition. He is an even greater tradition as one of Greater Cleveland's finest citizens.

L. B. S.

Inspection of Alcatraz and Terminal Island Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, having drafted legislation affecting Federal prisons in the 85th Congress, members of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee No. 3, of which I am chairman, visited two Federal institutions during the latter part of August 1958, to study at firsthand the problems associated with the confinement of Federal offenders. Representatives WILLIAM M. TUCK, ROLAND V. LIBONATI, and I, accompanied by Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield, counsel to the committee, inspected the Federal correctional institution, Terminal Island, Calif., on August 25, 1958, and the U.S. penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif., on August 28, 1958.

TERMINAL ISLAND

Terminal Island is headed by Warden Preston G. Smith and is the only Federal institution in which both men and women prisoners are confined. Terminal Island is a medium security institution located in the heart of Los Angeles Harbor on a small peninsula known as Reservation Point. On the day of our visit the total prison population was 845, with 688 men and 157 women. It has a staff of 163 persons, 129 of whom are assigned to the men's prison and 34 to the women's division. The ratio of prisoners to employees is quite excessive, especially when it is remembered that the employee staff must be spread out over a 24-hour day, 7 days a week.

Terminal Island receives men prisoners, with sentences of 5 years or less, and women prisoners, regardless of length of sentence, from the area west of the Rockies, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The largest offense group is made up of prisoners convicted of narcotic law violations. Other offenses represented most numerous in the population are forgery, car theft, and illegal entry into the United States. The average length of sentence for the men is about 39 months and for the women about 50 months. However, the committee noted the length of sentences varied over a wide range even in virtually identical car theft or forgery cases. Public Law 85-752, enacted in August 1958 by the 85th Congress, was drafted in subcommittee No. 3 to minimize such disparities, and the members of the subcommittee are hopeful that the prevalence of the noted disparities will dwindle as the new law becomes more commonly used by the Federal courts.

The subcommittee visited the recently overhauled admission-orientation unit where the men are housed during their first month in the institution. This is a clean, well-lighted and well-ventilated area consisting of a dormitory with a capacity of 46 beds, 8 individual cells, a combination day-lecture room and 2 small interview rooms. It was explained that the capacity of this unit would be increased shortly by the addition of double-deck beds, required because the population of this unit frequently exceeds the present 54-man capacity.

During the month that the men spend in this unit they are given a program of orientation geared to help them adjust to the routine of the months and years ahead and to encourage them to make the best possible use of their time in prison. A good many of the men begin various types of study courses while they are still in this unit.

At the end of their first month the men appear before the classification committee, composed of the warden, associate warden, classification and parole chief, educational supervisor, social worker, chief medical officer, and chaplain. This committee advises the inmate on the type of program considered best suited to his needs and assigns him to living quarters, work program and custody classification. For those who test below fifth-grade level one-half day school attendance is compulsory. All other school work is voluntary but the committee encourages attendance at evening classes on this basis. The school is staffed by two full-time staff instructors, two part-time instructors from the local school system and a number of inmate teachers. The program is accredited by the Los Angeles school system and certificates and diplomas are awarded for attainment of elementary or high-school graduation.

An active vocational training program and on-the-job training is carried on in the various shops, powerplant and culinary department. A concerted effort is made to install good work habits, to promote a high standard of personal appearance, to maintain excellent sanitation in living quarters and places of employment, and to discourage vulgar and profane speech.

The committee was pleased to note that Terminal Island has two full-time chaplains. These are young and vigorous men who appear to be keenly interested in their work. The Catholic chaplain speaks Spanish fluently and acts as interpreter for the classification committee in dealing with the considerable number of Mexican inmates who speak and understand very little English.

The medical staff is composed of two doctors, a dentist, and four male nurses for the men's division and two female nurses for the women's division. They are supplemented by part-time consultants in the various specialties form the local community, available on an as-needed basis.

The subcommittee visited the institution's library, and the hobby shop where men can spend their leisure hours working upon articles of handicraft. Television sets were observed in some of the

housing units and Warden Smith explained that these sets were rotated weekly among the several units on an incentive basis. Each group is anxious to have the benefit of television and competition for these sets is quite keen. One of the results of this system was seen in the extreme orderliness and sanitation in the living quarters. These sets, incidentally, were acquired partly through donation and partly through purchase from commissary profits. No appropriated funds were expended for this purpose.

The work program at Terminal Island poses some unusual problems because of the site, the dual nature of operations and the restricted area of the reservation which precludes the farming operations normally carried on at a penal institution. To offset the lack of a farm to some extent the institution has developed with neighboring government agencies working arrangements which permit the use of labor details at those installations for grounds maintenance, shop operations, and various similar services. Approximately 50 inmates are assigned to details of this type at the Coast Guard station and immigration and naturalization offices just across the street from the institution and at Fort MacArthur in San Pedro.

On industrial activity, furniture refinishing, is now operated at the prison and employs 40 to 45 prisoners. Construction of a new building to accommodate additional industrial activities is underway. It is planned to use this new space for metals industry fabricating steel shelving, lockers, and various small metals products. With institutional maintenance requirements, the services performed for other agencies, and the expanding industrial program, sufficient employment to keep approximately 700 men usefully occupied will eventually be furnished.

Keeping the women inmates usefully employed is more of a problem and an industrial activity for them is being developed. Meanwhile job training is being afforded by such activities as cooking and baking, sewing, landscape gardening, cosmetology, and various other lines.

Terminal Island uses the standard ration allowance common to the entire prison service. Its food costs are higher than those of prisons having farms but notwithstanding this circumstance the food costs slightly less than 59 cents per inmate per day, including raw food, minor equipment, repairs, and the supplies involved in meal preparation and serving.

When the institution was returned to the Bureau of Prisons in 1955—it was used by the Navy from 1942 to 1950 and by the State of California from then until 1955—funds provided for its reactivation were sufficient to cover only a part of the total job required to restore the plant to minimum standards. The dining hall, kitchen, and dormitories are in need of overhauling. The hospital also requires a number of alterations and improvements, including adequate facilities for disturbed patients, modernization of the operating room, ceiling and floor treatment in the wards and corridors. A

chapel is needed to replace the present makeshift space that is being used for religious services.

The women's unit is housed in a temporary type of barracks buildings which were constructed by the Navy during World War II. These buildings offer no security and constitute a fire hazard. Replacing the women's unit with buildings of fireproof construction, designed and equipped for their intended purpose, is perhaps the most urgent need at Terminal Island at this time.

CONCLUSION

On the whole, the Terminal Island institution seemed to be operated efficiently. Morale among both staff and inmates appeared to be at a high level. Sanitation and orderliness were especially noteworthy throughout the institution and the personal appearance of employees and inmates was excellent. It was the feeling of the members of the subcommittee that the Terminal Island staff is doing a good job in attempting to rehabilitate the men and women prisoners committed to their custody and that Federal funds are being expended economically and judiciously at this institution.

The problem of disparity of sentences will, it is clear, remain an important concern of our subcommittee. The new law, we hope, will reduce the prevalence of such disparities.

THE BAR ASSOCIATION

The members of the subcommittee also had an opportunity to attend several sessions of the American Bar Association which was meeting at the same time in Los Angeles.

We attended the dinner of the section on judicial administration and some of the meetings of the criminal law section dealing with the problem of representation of indigent clients and the administration of criminal law. A very interesting paper, entitled "What Price Justice?" was delivered by the Honorable Irving R. Kaufman, of the U.S. district court of New York. A number of suggested improvements in the administration of Federal law were discussed and these doubtless will be presented later to the full committee for consideration.

ALCATRAZ

On Thursday, August 28, 1958, the members and counsel of the subcommittee, accompanied by Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON, visited the U.S. Penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif. This institution, of course, is much different from Terminal Island and holds some of the most hardened criminals in America.

The 290 prisoners at Alcatraz were transferred there because they were too unmanageable even for such penitentiaries as Leavenworth and Atlanta, or because they were considered to be dangerous men whose escape would represent a distinct threat to the public safety. They were convicted, typically, for committing quite serious crimes and their sentences are long, averaging well in excess of 20 years, and including about 30 life terms. Alcatraz, in the opinion of Director James V. Bennett, must be considered one of the most difficult and complex prisons in the world to administer.

The subcommittee was transported from Fort Mason to the island by the penitentiary's boat. Upon arriving at the landing the committee observed a metal detector and stepped through it to test its operations. The manner in which the inspectoscope worked was explained by the operating officer and it was obvious to the subcommittee that this type of equipment is needed for a super-security institution where both prisoners on the inside and their friends on the outside are constantly trying to devise some means of outwitting the institution's security system. This was sharply dramatized in an episode several weeks after the committee's visit when two long-term prisoners made an abortive attempt to escape from the island by overpowering their supervisory officer and swimming away with sets of makeshift waterwings.

Warden Paul J. Madigan, a veteran of over 25 years in the prison service, is in charge of operations at Alcatraz. It is run on a surprisingly economical basis, considering the fact that everything that is used and consumed, including water, must be ferried to the island. Each prisoner, for example, is fed three meals a day for the relatively small sum of 59 cents. The subcommittee learned that the Government expends an average of \$10.34 a day to keep one prisoner at Alcatraz, as contrasted to \$3.05 at Leavenworth and the \$4.58 average for the entire Federal prison system. Yet Alcatraz is performing a valuable service for the protection of the public.

The penitentiary has a rather ancient physical plant which presents a difficult maintenance problem. The climate surrounding the island is highly damaging to physical structures, and while at other prisons, inmates can be used to make repairs, the custodial requirements of Alcatraz permit very little use of inmates outside the security of the inner compound. Consequently, practically all repairs to the physical plant must be made by civilian tradesmen.

Upon entering the cellhouse the subcommittee observed that the visiting room was being renovated. The area for the outside visitors was partitioned off solidly from that for the prisoners. Speakers were being installed which would permit two or three visitors to converse at one time with a single inmate. The subcommittee was informed that each prisoner was allowed one visit of 90 minutes duration each month. However, of the population of 290, an average of only 15 inmates received visitors each month.

The subcommittee first visited the cellhouse which contains 2 inside cellblocks, each with 168 cells. The cellhouse was immaculate, and the cells themselves were sparsely but comfortably equipped. The committee then went to the kitchen area where feeding arrangements were discussed and the menu for the current 10-day period was displayed. It was obvious that although the Alcatraz prisoners have few privileges and no commissary as in other Federal prisons, they were well fed. The kitchen and dining room looked exceptionally neat and clean.

At the prison hospital the committee talked to the chief medical officer and his medical technician. The subcommittee was informed that on the average about three prisoners a day were in hospital status, which would indicate that the health of the Alcatraz population was safeguarded well. The subcommittee inspected the operating room, the outpatient clinic, and the wards which were equipped with beds recently acquired from surplus property lists. Like the rest of the penitentiary, the hospital was neat and orderly. While Alcatraz does not have a full-time dentist, a local dentist visits Alcatraz one day each week, and, according to the warden, this time has been sufficient to provide adequate dental care for the men.

The subcommittee visited the treatment unit, where men who are in punitive status or who must be segregated from the rest of the population for various reasons are housed. At the time of the subcommittee's visit, 20 prisoners were in segregation status and 1 in punishment status.

Returning from the disciplinary unit, the subcommittee stopped at the library and examined the bookshelves. The warden pointed out that Alcatraz had recently received a number of surplus books from the Navy and now had about 14,000 volumes. He explained that the average Alcatraz prisoner read about 85 books a year. The books, selected from a published list, are delivered to the cells. After the working day is over, the prisoner can also listen to the radio, if he wishes, by means of the earphones installed in each cell. The radio is turned on at 6 p.m. each night and turned off at 9:30.

Following lunch, the committee went to the industrial area and entered the laundry. This unit performs work for local government agencies; and while 40 inmates were assigned at the time of the subcommittee's visit, the laundry was being disbanded because local government agencies do not furnish enough work to keep 60 or 70 men busy.

Visiting the clothing factory next, the subcommittee observed 36 inmates working on an order from the U.S. Army for cooks' and bakers' white trousers. The members circulated through the cutting room and through the main shop, stopping occasionally to talk to the prisoners. Warden Madigan advised me that this was the most efficient industrial activity at Alcatraz and that there was little difficulty in securing enough work to keep the factory busy. The morale of the inmate workers seemed high, considering the circumstances, and few of them stopped work long enough even to inspect their visitors.

In the glove factory the members observed operations in the leather cutting department and the sewing shop, where 35 men were making leather gloves for the Army Quartermaster. According to Warden Madigan, the shop had enough orders on hand to keep the activity busy for several months.

In the furniture refinishing shop, 20 prisoners were renovating desks and chairs for Travis Air Force Base, one of several air bases in the area served by

the unit. The quality of the work turned out by the prisoners was very high, with the finished product not readily detectable from a newly manufactured article. The issue of tools was carefully controlled by means of a carefully designed tool board, with the absence of a tool evident at a glance.

In the brush shop, the last industrial activity visited by the subcommittee, 22 men were making 14-inch brushes for the Navy. The brushes were turned out with rapidity, and it was obvious that the inmate workers had acquired high skill.

After leaving the work area, the subcommittee inspected the powerplant. Warden Madigan explained that the electricity supply was a source of difficulty, inasmuch as it generated chiefly d.c. current. For example, it was troublesome to operate the prison's metal detectors with only a small amount of a.c. current. The powerplant itself was operated by a chief engineer and five assistants, who rotate on shifts around the clock.

The committee was interested in noting that many of the staff lived on the island with their families and were dependent upon the institution's boats to get to San Francisco for shopping, attending school, and securing other community services. Normally a boat makes round trips every hour or two between 6 a.m. and 12 midnight. However, it is apparent that the life of the island's civilian residents is rather restricted, and the dedication of these public servants must be admired.

CONCLUSION

Although it might be considered regrettable that the United States has need for a supersecurity prison such as Alcatraz, the prisoners confined there are being accorded treatment which is as humane and reasonable as the circumstances permit. The primary function of Alcatraz is to protect the public, and this task is being performed well, under rather trying and difficult circumstances, in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee who visited the institution.

The Military Significance of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an informative address, "The Military Significance of Space," made by Rear Adm. John E. Clark, U.S. Navy, Deputy Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, before the Shrine Luncheon Club of Cleveland, Ohio, on February 7, 1958:

THE MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE OF SPACE

The role of technology in the conduct of military operations has risen fantastically in relatively few years. The fighting power of the Armed Forces, as never in the past, now depends on the attainments of tech-

nology, on the potentiality for the mass production of new kinds of weapons, and on the level of the technological preparation and the education of the many millions of masses of the population.

Recognizing this fact, as well as an expression of our national desire to get on with the broad research and development necessary for scientific progress, two new agencies have been created within our Executive Government. A new National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now getting organized to pursue those of our national and international space programs which are purely scientific in character. Thus, the United States seeks to keep scientific progress within the framework of the peaceful intentions that are inherent to a working democracy.

On the other hand, the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) was established in February of this year to plan and direct advanced research projects vital to our national security.

I am not sure what you have heard about ARPA and its way of doing business, but it is a fact that we are a different kind of organization insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned.

I should like, therefore, to review for you briefly how ARPA works—its functions, its objectives, its method of operation, and its relationship with other Government agencies.

There has grown up, in the very brief period of ARPA's existence, an impression that we are a space agency. This is understandable since the specific assignments made to ARPA include the entire field of space technology, ballistic missiles defense, and related research in chemistry of propellants. Nonetheless, the directive under which we operate does not limit us to these assignments, and the Secretary of Defense does not intend that our task be as simply stated as this. ARPA is now seeking to develop this broader area of our undefined but understood responsibility.

Ordinarily projects assigned to ARPA will fall into one or more of three categories: (1) Those which, by virtue of their advanced nature, cannot be identified within the stated military mission of an individual military department; (2) those for which a military mission can be identified as being of interest to more than one of the military departments; and (3) those which, for various reasons, must be pursued by an agency not subordinate to one or more of the military departments.

Military research and development has, we believe, been hampered in the past by the requirement that funds be allocated to research only when the product could be immediately identified with a weapons system. ARPA does not have this limitation.

This means that for the first time the Defense Department is prepared to sponsor pure research against the judgment that it might lead to a valid military application without proving the judgment in advance. The pace of scientific progress is undoubtedly one of the distinguishing features of this century. As it applies to the military, the President has clearly stated the fact that the days of wholly independent ground, naval, and air forces are gone. There can be no doubt but that many present development projects and many of those to come will have application to more than one of the military departments. This is certainly true of ballistic missile defense, as an example.

Research in such areas must take the fullest advantage of all our U.S. capabilities. It cannot be limited to a portion of our laboratory skill that happens to be employed by a single service or a single company. Since we cannot, and should not, deprive ourselves of the traditional value of military decentralization, we must achieve effective management at a higher level if we are to

take advantage of all the skills and resources available.

Essentially, this boils down to a matter of personal integrity on the part of each officer and each civilian official of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Intense service viewpoints, the outward products of which are inordinate degrees of service rivalry, competition, and duplication, must yield to thinking that is total defense in scope. We cannot—we absolutely must not—permit excessive Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps partisanships to diffuse the defense effort and dissipate resources.

We have many programs underway. I am going to show you a number of view graphs now that illustrate as an artist's conception the sort of things that might be done to enhance basic military operations and scientific exploration by means of satellites.

Often research which at first glance seems to be of no anticipated special significance militarily, works out in practice to accomplish a revolution in technology and exercises a revolutionary influence on weapons systems. As an example, one might refer to the research in semiconductors like the germanium crystals. Research has shown that the semiconductors can replace many types of electronic tubes in complex radio technical and electronic instruments. This permits the making of both very compact and reliable radio devices. From this arise great possibilities in the manufacture of guided and automatic weapons and other important types of modern military equipment.

Even such sciences as celestial mechanics and astrophysics have now acquired decisive significance for military affairs. Celestial mechanics until recent times has been interested in calculating the motion of celestial bodies. Now this science is employed to calculate the flight of long-range rockets and artificial earth satellites. Astrophysics is concerned in part with the study of the physical characteristics of cosmic space. Information about these characteristics is now used in order to forecast the environment within which artificial satellites and rockets must work. It is necessary to know how cosmic rays would act upon their delicate mechanisms, what the temperature of the rockets would be when heated by the sun, and what would happen in the event of their collision with a meteorite. The research of astrophysicists regarding the condition of the matter within the sun and the stars at temperatures of millions of degrees and pressures in billions of atmospheres has great significance for the correct understanding of the essence of the atomic explosion.

Guided and self-homing missiles are swiftly replacing guns and some types of aircraft. They have special components making possible the change of direction of the flight of the missile in flight. This is achieved in various ways. One can place instruments in the missile which sense the target and guide the missile to it, or have the missile ride a radar beam, or by following the target path one may direct the missile to it by radio command.

These things are done on the basis of a new sphere of science called cybernetics, the theory of the guidance of machines and mechanisms with the assistance of automatic devices. This science obviously has great significance for the automatization and mechanization of commercial production.

Everything that I have said up to this point leads to but one conclusion—war is no longer an art but a science. Technology and science in warfare have advanced so fast and far, and are advancing faster and farther, so that in any kind of war, be it limited—which is far more likely—or all-out nuclear, that side with the highest order of technology and science on its side will prevail.

In past wars there has been time after the war started to initiate and carry out massive, expensive crash programs in technological

fields. In the last great war such things as radar, influence fuses for antiaircraft guns, and atomic bombs were developed during the course of the war. If we aren't ready to use advanced technology and have in hand superior weapons if any war starts in the future, we may not survive the first operation.

With continuing hope in the essential good in man, the United States has lived in a glass house during the International Geophysical Year. Recognizing that penetration of the secrets unfolding before us requires the efforts of philosophers and scientists the world over, the United States has sought a truly international effort.

And what has this meant to the U.S.S.R., the other national participant in earth satellite launchings? It has meant great benefit to itself with little return to others in kind. We should ask ourselves why, and we should keep putting this question to ourselves until we make the honest answer. Why are we told little or nothing about Soviet launchings, launching equipment, experimental results, and the like? Why do the Soviet leaders and scientists play coy and superior in an international effort purportedly devoted to all mankind?

We don't like the real answer because it means a long pull effort during which consumer sacrifices will be made. It means a devotion to research which will grant progress at the expense of present-day luxuries. It means intense work, resolution, and character, expended perhaps over our entire lifetimes, and a few generations beyond us. Nevertheless, the answer has not changed since the Communist Manifesto, it has not changed since Stalin, it will not change after Mao and Khrushchev.

Communism has short-term tactics; it does not have short-term strategy. Its strategy is domination of all there is to dominate, whether in earth or in space. Until communism as a way of life has faded from control over key areas on this earth, the United States and the free world must go forward by giant steps, on the long legs of advanced research.

There has been great concern throughout the free world that space will not be used strictly for peaceful purposes. There has been no such concern evident in the Communist camp. Again, why? And again, let's face up to the answer. The Communist leaders know beyond a shadow of a doubt that the free world longs with all of its collective heart to keep free space free. They rely on this longing, they abet it with hollow pronouncements, while pursuing secure programs under strict military discipline. Their few scientists who are not also generals receive laurels and medals, speak eloquently, but apparently are isolated from the actual space programs of the U.S.S.R. and the absolute military applications securely tied thereto.

Is there anyone here who doubts the grave military and political implications of a Soviet man circling the earth in a space vehicle beyond our power to counter? Does anyone doubt the military profit inherent in a manned lunar base? I can assure you, there is no doubt in Moscow.

I am certain you recognize that the effort to maintain technological leadership adds up to hundreds of millions of dollars annually and therefore demands not only the understanding of research-oriented individuals but also of the entire American people. Dollar signs cannot be placed on freedom. They cannot be placed upon a progress that leads to the basic truths of our existence.

We must have the courage to look to the future and to invest in it through research. We must further have the courage and confidence in our way of life not to scare easily; but to pursue our scientific and military programs on earth and in space with the dynamic quality of a nation seeking to express

its integrity and the strength of its form of government.

Unless we as a nation can achieve this kind of deep conviction and resolution, we are surely lost. Until we are ready to make sacrifices, we cannot turn the tide unmistakably in our favor. In the situation we find ourselves today, the armed services must be ready for maximum effort at any minute. There would be no time to get ready after it starts this time. And we must be ready for any kind of war, and ready for it in any of several localities, including here at home.

Current budgets are marginal for this kind of readiness and I ask you, Where do we get the money to support the terrifically expensive competitive effort in space exploration, space travel, and space research for defense? As surely as we weaken our defense structure in some category or categories to fund a space effort, we may be sure that when trouble starts, it will make a concentrated appearance in an area previously covered by those categories.

And yet support it we must. The era of space travel is here. I expect to witness unmanned space flights to the moon and manned round trip flights into orbit in my lifetime. Truly the sky is the limit, and every paper in the country is full of questions. Also, they are full of suggestions and demands. Every conceivable idea has been advanced, and some violently championed, except one. I have yet to see one single suggestion as to how to pay for it. I have yet to hear one single person suggest that this is equivalent to wartime emergency and therefore should be supported by increased taxes. The nation that controls space may well control the world, and we will never achieve it if our first objective is an automobile for each member of the family.

Changing the Level of Imposing the Federal Tax on Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that all segments of small business in this country should be entitled to compete equitably with larger concerns, I have introduced H.R. 1343, which is designed to give the independent oil jobber and wholesaler the same break as the major oil company has with reference to the payment of the Federal tax on gasoline.

Under existing law the 3-cent Federal tax on gasoline is imposed at the time of sale by the producer. The producer is the refiner and, from the standpoint of volume, this really means the major oil companies. The word "producer," as defined by section 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code, includes "blenders" and "importers"; however, the volume of gasoline handled by these last two categories is relatively insignificant.

When the existing language of the code—as implemented by regulations—is translated into actual operation what it means is that the refiner or major oil company does not pay the Federal gasoline tax until up to 45 days after the time of sale, whether that sale be direct to a consumer, to a service station, or to

a reseller, such as a jobber or wholesale distributor. It also means that the wholesale distributor who pays this tax at the time of purchase must not only permanently encumber approximately 20 percent of his inventory capital but, in addition, he must suffer tax losses due to evaporation and unavoidable spillage between the time of purchase and the time of delivery into the tank of the person to whom he sells. Neither of these burdens is imposed on the major oil company with whom this small, independent jobber must compete. It is estimated that the jobber's losses due to evaporation and unavoidable spillage amount to approximately 2 percent of the total volume of gasoline handled. A majority of the States imposing gasoline taxes recognize this inequity and allow the jobber varying percentages to compensate for these losses and some of them allow additional percentages for the handling of this tax burden, collection of the tax and the maintenance of the necessary records required by the collector. The Federal Government, however, has refused to either recognize or remedy this inequity.

My bill would change the definitions in the code in such a way that the independent jobber or wholesale distributor will be placed on the same basis as his major oil company competitor insofar as payment of the Federal gasoline tax is concerned. In my bill the jobber will pay the tax at the time he sells the gasoline rather than at the time of purchase. This will not only release badly needed capital which this category of small businessmen can use to improve their competitive position but, in addition, will relieve them from paying taxes on a product which has evaporated before the time of sale. This method of collection will not add any appreciable number of taxpayers to the rolls nor will it cause any loss of revenues to which the Government is equitably entitled. The bill, in brief, will at little or no cost to the Federal Government remove an existing inequity between a group of deserving small businessmen and the major integrated oil companies. I can conceive of no cheaper way to help some small businessmen than the passage of this legislation which I have introduced.

Colorful "Doc" Miller to Sea Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, among the distinguished Members of Congress who were not returned to office in November was Representative A. L. Miller, of Nebraska. "Doc" Miller served the people of Nebraska's Fourth District for 16 years and served as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 83d Congress. The House certainly loses one of its most respected and earnest Members in A. L.

Miller. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article on "Doc" Miller, written by John Jarrell, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Omaha World-Herald:

COLORFUL "DOC" MILLER TO SEA AGAIN

(By John Jarrell)

Representative A. L. Miller, who perhaps didn't leave enough thumbprints on enough doorknobs, left Congress in January; and Congress loses another of its more colorful Members.

"Doc" Miller wasn't a flamboyant orator, and he wasn't particularly striking in appearance, but nevertheless he had that something called color.

Most people in Washington figured Dr. Miller would continue to represent the Fourth Nebraska District as long as he lived. It didn't turn out that way. He was defeated November 4.

It was after his victory in 1956 that a national magazine asked him to outline the basis of his success at the polls, which had brought him eight straight terms in the House.

"Hard work with a smile," he replied. "Leave thumbprints on as many hands and doorknobs as possible. * * * No substitute for personal contact, telephone, friendly letter, or wave of hand."

"SCOOTED" TO CAPITOL

Dr. Miller has been a familiar figure in the subway between his office and the Capitol—breezing along on his motor scooter.

Several years ago, the several-times-daily walk between office and House Chamber became too much for the legless Nebraskan, who lost both lower legs in a hunting accident years ago, and has artificial limbs.

So he bought a scooter. Now and then an intrepid passenger would ride with him, hair flying and frightened expression on face. Not Dr. Miller, though. He thoroughly enjoyed it.

If Dr. Miller takes a long sea trip soon, as he has indicated he will, it will be history repeating itself.

When he first announced for Congress, Dr. Miller mailed receipted bills to all his patients—some \$40,000 worth—then proceeded to get himself elected. Right away, and before he took office, he went around the world in a slow ship.

Dr. Miller wasn't averse to controversy. He and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association didn't see eye to eye, and Dr. Miller lashed out at it with characteristic vigor.

He feuded for several years with Representative MIKE KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, because the Ohioan claimed he only voted for public power projects in Nebraska, never in other States.

QUITE A SOOTHSAYER

He was a strong supporter of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and both in 1944 and 1948, General MacArthur was his candidate for President. He corresponded at length with the general in Japan on the subject.

Every year, Dr. Miller offered his prediction of things to come. He didn't confine it to legislation—he was worldly in scope. He had a pretty good batting average, but it was by no means perfect.

Once he raised a furor when he said American battleships in foreign waters were carrying atomic bombs. Some top braid at the Pentagon blew up over that one.

Dr. Miller got along well with reporters generally, but when he differed with the press, he did not keep it a secret. Usually, he wrote a letter to the editor about it.

He displayed a lot of personal courage that people generally did not know about. There have been times when the stumps of his legs pained him greatly, from their constant rub-

bing against his artificial limbs. No one ever heard him complain about it.

COLUMNIST ERRED

He got one of the biggest laughs a few years ago over an item carried in the column of a widely quoted syndicated columnist.

It was at a time that the Republicans controlled Congress. Dr. Miller was chairman of the House Interior Committee. His fellow Nebraskan, the late Senator Hugh Butler, was chairman of the Senate Interior Committee.

The columnist wrote that the two chairmen from the same State were engaged in a bitter feud, so savage that they refused to speak to one another.

The day it appeared, Dr. Miller and Senator Butler were together on a hunting trip. Three days earlier Senator Butler had Christmas dinner with Dr. and Mrs. Miller. And for years the two men had got together about three times weekly to play pitch.

When he read the item, Dr. Miller exploded with laughter, called up Senator Butler and the two of them chortled together.

FOUGHT MARTIN, BENSON

He wasn't afraid to rush in where angels feared to tread. A case in point related to the almost-sacrosanct Republican House leadership of Representative JOE MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Dr. Miller decided Mr. MARTIN wasn't a good leader, so he announced it openly, rather than work in the background. He found Mr. MARTIN too solidly entrenched, however, and had no success in finding a successor—though he won some converts.

It was Dr. Miller, too, who was in the vanguard of House Members who felt the farm policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson would cost the Republicans House seats in the 1958 election. So he went to the President and told him that 25 to 30 GOP Members would lose if Mr. Benson remained in the Cabinet.

Whether or not Ezra Benson was responsible, as it turned out, Dr. Miller was too conservative and more than 40 GOP House Members lost their seats. Including Doc Miller.

Why Not Use Food Surplus for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there could be no better use of the farm surplus than to use this vast surplus in aiding our foreign allies.

I have advocated the use of surplus food for this purpose for many years, and I am glad to find my opinion on this subject agreed with by the editor of the Radio Post, of Fredericksburg, Tex., Mr. Norman J. Dietel. Mr. Dietel has written an editorial in which he quotes Senator MIKE MANSFIELD on this subject who has for many years been an advocate of a sound foreign-aid program.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower stated:

Outlays of the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year for the support of farm prices on a very few farm products, will exceed \$5 billion. That is a sum equal to approximately two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the entire United States.

By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands surplus farm products worth about \$9 billion. And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of \$1 billion a year.

This level of expenditure for farm products could be made willingly for a temporary period if it were leading to a sound solution of the problem. But unfortunately this is not true. We need new legislation.

In the past I have sent messages to the Congress requesting greater freedom for our farmers to manage their own farms and greater freedom for markets to reflect the wishes of producers and consumers. Legislative changes that followed were appropriate in direction but did not go far enough.

The situation calls for prompt and forthright action. Recommendation for action will be contained in a message to be transmitted to the Congress shortly.

I trust that in the President's future message to Congress he will recommend the use of our food surplus for foreign aid to replace the hard-earned dollars which we have heretofore voted for this purpose.

I am submitting herewith the editorial from the Radio Post of Fredericksburg, Tex., written by Mr. Dietel on this subject:

FOREIGN AID AND FARM SURPLUS

Finally, after many years of waiting, a U.S. Senator has come forth with the idea that our Nation "could scale down foreign aid costs by substituting food for dollars in hungry world areas."

Although the suggestion is many years late, the idea should be promptly promoted and put into effect as soon as possible. The statement above was made recently by Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, who is assistant Democratic floor leader and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He also serves as the Senate Democratic whip and becomes acting Senate Democratic leader when Senator Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic majority leader in the Senate, is out of town. Johnson is chairman of the Democratic policy and steering committees of which Mansfield is a member.

Some years ago this writer stated editorially, and in conversation or correspondence with others, that it might be a wise step if our Government would consider sending some of our farm surplus commodities (of which I understand there are millions of dollars worth, possibly billions, stored throughout the country) to the destitute people in the world who could really use this surplus.

Sending this food surplus, for which our taxpayers are paying, might be much better than sending cash or the equivalent thereof in other items to the foreign countries who have apparently been the thankless beneficiaries.

Our national debt is rising and yet our Government insists on more cash (which comes also from taxes) for foreign aid, and it is possible that very little if any of this cash, or goods, ever gets to the poor people, those who really need it. The rich people over there could not possibly use up all of our surplus food, but the poor people, those who would get most out of the farm surplus commodities, would certainly appreciate our gesture. They might even remember this Nation and speak some kind words on our behalf once in a while.

Foreign aid, as it might be, could be, and it should be, a good thing for our country if it were used wisely, for military purposes (for instance) and for purposes of adequate defense bases, but we've read and heard about

too many instances where much of this foreign aid seems to go into a rat-hole, down which we drain our resources and our cash. Taxes are paid for the farm surpluses and they lay around in this country, rotting away. Then, instead of using this surplus and giving it to the needy (in which our people, our Nation, have always been staunch believers) they tax again so that cash will be forthcoming in order to supply the dukes and duchesses, the kings and queens, the rich and elite, those in position of power and authority, so that we might appease them and that they can go on living on a high plane, or, as is customarily and more frequently referred to, as a "high standard of living." Many people, everywhere, could no doubt go on a higher plane of social living if Uncle Sam will provide the means. A lot of people in this country might also want their standard of living raised a little. If our country really wants to check communism it could, perhaps, do much better if our surplus commodities were given to the needy instead of sending cash or other supplies to those who think we owe them a living and never really appreciate it anyway. I'm of the opinion that no one denies other more fortunate people all the wealth they possess and all the additional riches they might gather for themselves or their family in their span of life while on earth—if they actually get out and work for it, such as the average hard-working American taxpayer does. But it just does not seem to make good sense if the American taxpayer has to continue bearing the brunt, in providing luxurious living for overseas or foreign aid year after year with no apparent letup.

Senator Mansfield has made a suggestion which may culminate in a program of real overseas relief, real foreign aid, a program designed to foster good will and promote peace and understanding. Giving cash to those in the upper brackets and forgetting the poor, the great bulk of the masses, hasn't accomplished for this Nation the job that foreign aid was intended. Giving food and clothing could do a better job. It's worth trying, the sooner the better. Especially in view of the fact that we have a considerable farm surplus on hand, not too much cash surplus, and also in view of the fact that our national debt is not decreasing from year to year. It has been increasing at an alarming rate and many Congressmen in Washington are seriously becoming disturbed.

Are We Lagging in Atomic Ships?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the recent success of Russia in launching its moon satellite emphasizes the unpleasant fact that the United States is no longer preeminent in scientific development. Our lag in satellites and missiles seems destined to extend to the use of nuclear power at sea. While we are producing the first nuclear-powered merchant vessel, we are content to default in the continuing struggle to keep abreast of other nations in the maritime field. In this connection, the following editorial from the Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N.C., point up our present unhappy state:

ARE WE LAGGING IN ATOMIC SHIPS?

The United States will launch the *Savannah*, the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, sometime in 1960—thus repeating its triumph with the first atomic submarine. But a ship is not a fleet and Chairman BONNER of the House Merchant Marine Committee fears that we are not moving fast or far enough.

Mr. BONNER admitted that both the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission are working in this field. But he said that there seems to be nothing firm in the way of administration policy to put these plans into execution. Other nations, he said, are going ahead of us at a faster relative rate of development. The Soviet Union, for instance, is known to be at work on a nuclear-powered icebreaker—a craft that could alter the historic Russian desire for a warm water port.

Abortive projects for a similar ship to be developed in this country, for a nuclear-powered tanker, and for private industry to take part in atomic ship development were cited by Mr. BONNER. "None of these proposals has gotten anywhere," he wrote Commerce Secretary Lewis Strauss.

He asked Mr. Strauss to inform the House committee about present and future plans for atomic shipbuilding, and for a report on possible marine uses of nuclear energy not yet in the planning stage. His point is that having forged out front in this field, the United States ought not now to mark time while other nations catch up and go on.

Whether Mr. BONNER's fears are justified or not, his point is certainly well taken. And his emphasis on the importance of nuclear ships is apparently shared by the U.S. Navy. Merchant craft and men-of-war are not strictly comparable, of course. Still, it is worth noting that the new "Jane's Fighting Ships" reports the United States to have 150 nuclear-powered warships under construction, only 75 of them submarines. The Soviet Union, France, and Britain are also working on atomic naval vessels.

Moreover, the recent voyage of the *Nautilus* under the polar ice from Pacific to Atlantic demonstrates the vast new marine capabilities of nuclear energy. There is reason to believe the United States has done more than any other nation to develop those capabilities. As Mr. BONNER has warned, however, we cannot go to sleep on our laurels. It was the indolent rabbit who lost that famous race, not the tortoise.

Washington County (Ky.) Observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article of December 4, 1958, from that fine newspaper, the Springfield Sun, at Springfield, Ky. This article covers the launching of Washington County's observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial which will be celebrated throughout the year 1959. Inasmuch as Lincoln's parents, Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks, were married in Washington County, Ky., it seems fitting that this area, which is also a part of our Lincoln country,

should have a prominent part in the observances honoring our great former President on the occasion of the sesquicentennial of his birth. The Fourth District of Kentucky is truly honored to be able to claim the distinction of giving Abraham Lincoln to the Nation.

WEDNESDAY'S CELEBRATION ONLY A PRELUDE OF PLANS FOR SESQUICENTENNIAL YEAR

(By Mrs. Bennett R. Lewis)

Down Springfield, Ky., way, folks believe in making the stones they throw do double duty. For instance, the parade that turned normally quiet Main Street into Carnival Avenue on the afternoon of November 26 not only climaxed the activities of Farm-City Week but also launched Washington County's observance of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial which will be celebrated throughout the year 1959. The theme of the parade was the life of Abraham Lincoln and the floats depicted events in the lives of the Lincolns, their neighbors and relatives in the original Lincoln country in Washington County.

In 1782, 10 years before Kentucky was admitted to the Union and when all this vast territory was still a part of Virginia; Abraham Lincoln, Sr., and his family, consisting of his wife, Bersheba, and their 5 children, came to Kentucky and settled on a 100-acre tract on the Beech Ford of Salt River. There the pioneer Abraham, grandfather of the President, built the log cabin in which he lived until he was shot by an Indian, in 1783. There his son, Thomas, grew to manhood, and there his family continued to live until the year 1802.¹

In Lincoln Homestead Park, 6 miles north of Springfield, a replica of the Lincoln cabin has been erected on the exact spot where the original homestead stood. Nearby is the Francis Berry home, a large, two-story building, in which Nancy Hanks was reared. This home was moved from its original site 2 miles northeast of the Lincoln home and carefully reconstructed within the confines of the park.

According to Washington County historians, the wedding of Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks took place in the spacious Berry home and the young couple went to housekeeping in a small log cabin belonging to Richard Berry, Jr., the same cabin which some years later was sold for \$50 and is now enshrined in the Pioneer Memorial Park at Harrodsburg. The date of the marriage was June 12, 1806, and the ceremony was performed by Rev. Jesse Head, a Methodist circuit rider. At least one child was born to Thomas and Nancy before they left Washington County; an infant lies buried alongside Abraham, Sr., in the family graveyard.²

Abraham Lincoln knew very little about the early life of his parents and less about the history of his earlier forebears. He believed that his mother and father had always lived in Hardin County, Ky., and that they had been married there. Consequently, in 1858 when his political enemies were circulating the sordid tale that his parents had never been legally married, Lincoln wrote to the clerk of the court of Hardin County asking for a copy of the marriage record. He received a reply from the clerk stating that no record was to be found. The President went to his grave believing that he was an illegitimate.

In 1878 the marriage bond of Thomas Lincoln and the minister's return of the wedding were found in the clerk's office in Washington County. There they may be seen today, along with numerous other documents pertaining to Lincoln history.

The Washington County Sesquicentennial Committee has already formulated ambitious plans for the sesquicentennial year. The high point of the celebration will be a reenactment of the marriage of Lincoln's parents on June 12 with direct descendants of the Lincoln, Berry, and Head families in the principal roles. An old time infare will follow with folk dancing on the green, games, merrymaking, and feasting. Hundreds of invitations will be sent out to former residents of Springfield and Washington County requesting their presence at the marriage and urging them to attend the biggest and most unusual homecoming the community has ever known.

Yes, it looked like just another parade at first glance, but it's really a preview of a busy and exciting year to come, here in the original Lincoln country.

Commissioning of the U.S.S. "Independence"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to comment on the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Independence* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard on January 10 at approximately 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Secretary of the Navy Gates and Admiral Burke participated in the ceremony. The commanding officer of the *Independence*, Capt. R. Y. McElroy, Lebanon, Ky., read his orders and accepted the commission. He relayed his command to the chief executive officer, Comdr. Warren Cooper, his fellow Kentuckian from Elizabethtown, who "set the watch" and officially put the ship in commission.

Both Captain McElroy and Commander Cooper are native Kentuckians, from the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in Congress. In addition, Commander Cooper is from my own place of birth, Elizabethtown, while Captain McElroy hails from Lebanon, my adopted home in Marion County. I am extremely proud of both of these fine officers and feel that I have been amply repaid for the wee bit of service rendered to the then young McElroy, who was seeking an appointment to Annapolis, by going to the then Representative of the Fourth District, the late Honorable Edward Creal, and urging McElroy's appointment.

The *Independence* is the world's biggest aircraft carrier, it weighs 60,000 tons, took 3½ years to build, has a 4-acre flight deck space and cost \$190 million. It is big enough to hold the liners *America* and *United States*, with room to spare on its deck.

It is a proud and glorious day for the United States, for the Navy, and for old Kentucky in that two of her distinguished sons both battle-scarred in defense of their country and recipients of many service medals, have been selected to command the ship. I would like to congratulate them and all members of

their staff and crew most heartily and extend my warmest best wishes for their success. May the good Lord bless and protect them—and preserve for us all—peace and happiness "forever and a day."

I would like, also, to congratulate the parents of these outstanding naval officers. They have long been my good and close personal and political friends. Commander Cooper's father is the able and prominent attorney of Elizabethtown, Mr. Damon Cooper. Captain McElroy is the son of Mr. R. Y. McElroy, Sr., a leader in the community and a retired insurance executive at Lebanon.

I would like to include this splendid editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, under date of January 10, 1959:

OUR STATE'S PRIDE WILL RIDE WITH THE
"BIG I"

Kentucky ties with the Navy will be strengthened next week when fellow Kentuckians meet in Lexington to welcome home Navy Capt. R. Y. McElroy. A native of Lebanon, Captain McElroy has just been named commanding officer of the spanking-new USS *Independence*, latest of the Navy's giant aircraft carriers and the largest and most powerful fighting ship afloat in the world today.

The occasion comes at a good time, for Kentucky's ties with the fleet have been sagging of late. Time and technological advances caught up with the battleship-hull that was to have carried our State's banner into the age of nuclear ships. Cutters' torches have long since reduced her to scrap. And today for the first time in more than half a century, no capital ship carries the name of the Bluegrass State on her prow.

But if there is no Kentucky to sail with the fleet, the *Independence* will have a strong Kentucky flavor. For not only is her first skipper a native of Marion County, her executive officer and second in command will be a Hardin County boy, Comdr. Damon W. Cooper, of Elizabethtown. What better reason could we ask for adopting the "Big I" as our own?

And if we have no namesake of our own, the *Independence* is an adopted son of which every Kentuckian may be proud. It is not just the largest ship in the world (stood on its bow, its stern would reach the 80th floor of the Empire State Building; afloat, its island will tower 25 floors above the keel; the flight deck is as big as two and a half football fields and could accommodate our two largest ocean liners with room to spare). It is also the most powerful. Its steam catapults can launch a plane every 30 seconds. Its 100 supersonic aircraft pack more explosive power than all of the air fleets of World War II combined. It is literally a highly mobile air base, ready and able to carry the striking power of the United States against 80 percent of the globe's surface on a moment's notice.

The name *Independence* is an illustrious one in the records of the Navy. The previous bearer of the name was sunk by the Navy after having been made dangerously radioactive in the first Bikini atom bomb tests. But before that she wrote a brave page in Navy history during the Pacific sea-air war against Japan. The two Kentuckians who will command the new *Independence* contribute equally illustrious records to their new craft, both having been highly decorated for bravery in action.

Perhaps it would be improper to contribute to the *Independence* some of the pieces from the old silver service that was returned to Frankfort after the last Kentucky was decommissioned. But it is good to welcome home the two native sons who have given Kentucky an interest in this new ship. Glad to have you aboard.

¹ Earl Times in Washington County, Ky., by Orval Baylor, published 1943.

² From the depositions made before notaries public by relatives and neighbors of the Lincoln and Berry families.

Few Americans Write to Their Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am presenting for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues a recent article by Roscoe Drummond, pointing out the need for an easier mode of communication between the average voter and the average Member of Congress. I purposely put in the word "average." Mr. Speaker, because my own district, the 13th of Illinois, sends me so constant and so huge a volume of correspondence that it is admittedly an exception to the rule which Mr. Drummond lays down.

However, I am exceptionally proud of the fact that the active citizens opinion poll, which Mr. Drummond praises as one method of increasing the mutual responsibility of a Congressman and his district, originated and has grown to substantive usage under the direction of a distinguished professor who lives in my district. I agree with Mr. Drummond that the method provides a most useful experiment which should be developed and utilized in all areas where the average voter has not formed the habit of making his views on current problems quickly and easily available to his representative.

FEW AMERICANS WRITE TO THEIR CONGRESSMEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One thing which impresses a roving correspondent looking in on this congressional campaign is the lack of communication—the lack of regular contact—between Members of Congress and the voters.

Most of the time it is as though there was a dead wire between Capitol Hill and Main Street.

It seems to me for the most part:

That relatively few voters really know what their Representatives in the Senate and House did to them—and for them.

That very few Congressmen have any sustained or reliable means of knowing what their constituents are thinking.

What needs to be done? I incline to look at this matter from the standpoint of the voter, and what is needed is:

1. A better means by which the voters can keep tabs on how their Congressmen and Senators are voting—continuously, not just as a quick look before voting.

2. A better means by which the voters can regularly get their views to their Congressmen—their views of what they want done in Washington and the way they want it, and not as a lobby for anybody except the interested citizen.

A beginning is being made to do both of these things.

This fall the Congressional Quarterly, an independent research organization in Washington, provided about 100 of its newspaper clients—those who asked for it—with a meaningful boxscore of how the Senators and Congressmen of each area voted. It also provided a place for each paper to fill in the known views of the opposing candidate (if not a Member of Congress) and a convenient place for each voter to fill in how he would have voted.

This kind of reporting is particularly helpful to voters who find themselves looking over politicians who, after doing all they can on earlier ballots to kill a measure, vote for it in the end so they can stand on both sides, depending on their audience.

A greater need is to provide a good mechanism by which more voters, outside of purposeful pressure groups, can make their views heard to better effect in the Halls of Congress on major issues.

There are two main hurdles in the way. One is that most citizens, unless really worked up or responding to some organized lobby, refrain from writing their Congressmen because they do not think their letters count for much. The other hurdle is that there is rarely enough spontaneous voter expression to make up a reliable and influential guide to public opinion.

Can these two hurdles be surmounted?

It seems to me that the Active Citizens Opinion Poll in Chicago points the way. Here is a not-for-profit, nonpartisan group, headed by Prof. W. P. Cortalou, of Roosevelt University, which does three things.

Once a month it submits a series of yes-or-no questions relating to the main aspects of such topical issues as tax reduction, postal rates, foreign aid, policy toward Red China, to all participating voters throughout the country. Anyone can participate by paying a small fee covering costs. It analyzes and tabulates the answers and then sends the results to all participants—and reports its findings to all Congressmen.

Expanded and more fully developed, this could be a valuable and continuous reflection of public opinion applied at the point where it would count most. Mr. Cortalou does not consider that his group is necessarily the best instrument for carrying out this of-the-people, for-the-people report to Government.

It seems to me that this is a useful experiment which ought to be taken up on a larger scale, possibly with the aid of one of the foundations.

I am not arguing that Congress should abdicate its independent judgment or make its decisions solely on the basis of polls or letterwriters. I am arguing that the interested, independent voters ought to have the means of making their views visible and influential.

U.S. Marine Corps: Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in November 1958 the U.S. Marine Corps, with which I am proud to have served in both peace and war, observed its 183d anniversary. Thus, it was historically fitting that Shipmate, the alumni monthly of the U.S. Naval Academy, the great school that has sent so many of its graduates to the Marine Corps, should devote its November 1958 issue to this commemoration.

While aware of its past exploits to a unique degree, the U.S. Marine Corps has never been intellectually stationary. Instead, it has been equally farseeing and a leader in a number of fields, especially amphibious warfare.

In an informative article in the November 1958 issue of Shipmate, Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle, USN, retired, a

distinguished Naval Academy alumnus, emphasizes Marine Corps versatility. The article follows:

THREE-DIMENSIONAL MARINES

The U.S. Marine Corps has fought our country's battles magnificently "from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli," and in every clime and place where we could take a gun, "on the land as on the sea." These splendid words of the Marine hymn connote, however, two-dimensional warfare, on the surface of the sea and land.

In recent generations mankind has been expanding its battlefields vertically, both upward and downward. As was to have been expected, the Marines have been in the forefront of military verticalization. They have become a three-dimensional elite fighting corps. Our Nation can well be proud of them, as it was of the surface-bound Marines of former times.

Marine Corps fixed-wing aviation, its close combat integration with the surface Marines, and its splendid performances in World War II and Korea are so well known as to need no elaboration. Less well known, however, are three other varieties of three-dimensional Marines, i.e., the stratosphere, the submarine, and the helicopter ones. These will be briefly covered herein.

Twenty-five years ago, Col. (then major) Chester L. Fordney obtained cosmic ray and other research data at the highest altitude man had attained up to that time. He was the scientific observer and aid in the stratosphere balloon which, on November 20, 1933, spent 2 hours at the then record altitude of 61,237 feet.

Fordney was in charge of the Marine Corps exhibit at the Chicago Century of Progress Exposition. "Mike" Fordney, along with being a typical Marine with a splendid combat record, had mathematics as a hobby. He could translate feminine dress contours into third-power mathematical equations. So, he was also in charge of the mathematics exhibit in the Hall of Science at the exposition. He was, obviously, a natural for the stratosphere balloon research project sponsored by the exposition, the Chicago Daily News, the Marine Corps and Navy, and other organizations.

Among the eminent persons connected with the project were: Col. Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, and later Secretary of the Navy; Brig. Gen. Lewis Rock, USMC, retired, then business manager of the Daily News; Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel prize winner, scientific director of the project; Drs. Auguste and Jean Picard; Mr. E. Howard Perkins, Dow Chemical Co., project engineer for construction of the magnesium alloy gondola, and now head of the Detroit firm which built the Vanguard's satellite; Mr. Glenn O. Carter (U.S. Naval Academy, 1905), then an executive of the Union Carbide & Carbide Chemical Corp. and later president of the Naval Academy Alumni Association; Capt. (then lieutenant) S. W. Townsend, USN, communications officer of the project who, in World War II, had a leading role in development and service adaptation of antisubmarine warfare electronic equipment; and Fleet Adm. E. J. King, then a rear admiral and Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The Marine Corps recruiting and Reserve units in Chicago valuably assisted in the project.

The 600,000-cubic-foot hydrogen inflated balloon took off from Akron, Ohio, about 0900 on November 20, 1933. Its crew comprised Major Fordney, scientific observer and aid, and Lieutenant Commander Settle, pilot. Fordney had 11 categories of scientific research gear to operate including several cosmic ray instrumentations, a solar spectrograph, sky color charts, air sample flasks, vegetable disease spores, and photographic

equipment. In addition there was the log to keep, aerological and physiological observations, and ordinary ship handling and navigation.

After takeoff we stayed in low altitudes until midday when, over the Ohio River, we commenced jettisoning the lead dust ballast and started up. Arrived at peak altitude about 1400 and oscillated at and near 61,237 feet until 1600 when we started down. Throughout the flight Fordney was as busy as a squad of Marines in a good scrap, with his scientific gear. He found time, however, to talk frequently by voice radio directly with Admiral King in Washington, Colonel Knox in Chicago, and Lieutenant Townsend in Akron, giving them reports on the progress of the operation.

At dusk we made a normal "egg-shell" landing in a swampy region near Bridgeton, N.J. It was inadvisable to try to get out of the swamp and bayou area during darkness. So, after securing the balloon and gear, we rolled ourselves up in the balloon fabric, with a bottle of an old Scottish preventive against mosquitoes, and had the best night's rest we had had in weeks.

In the morning a Coast Guard plane spotted us. New Jersey State police and local inhabitants helped us get the balloon and gear, and Mike's scientific records, to dry ground.

Dr. Compton and his colleagues found Fordney's observations and records of high value in important research programs then in progress. Fordney had spent months in preparatory work and testing. I later recommended that Colonel Fordney be awarded the Distinguished Flying Medal for his outstandingly valuable work in this important pioneering project. Regrettably, departmental policy precluded an award. Nevertheless, it was a high privilege to all of us concerned to have been associated with this fine three-dimensional marine in the first U.S. manned balloon operation to reach above 50,000 feet.

The Marine submariners are the "recon" units in the amphibious reconnaissance and raiding submarines of our fleets' amphibious assault forces. Security classification precludes disclosing detailed information on these three-dimensional marines, except that they are highly specialized and intensively trained units, of high value in amphibious operations. Their potentialities in amphibious warfare far exceed their relatively small numbers.

The fleet marine forces and the amphibious forces of the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets are closely integrated teammates in the combat teams of amphibious warfare. An amphibious task force with its embarked Marine assault troops and its integral supporting units comprising most of the other fleet surface, subsurface, and air types is a combat team for assaulting an overseas enemy's defended coasts and carrying decisive offensive combat into his territory.

In World War II we fought our way back from Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, and into north Africa and Europe, by amphibious assaults projecting our Marine and Army troops into enemy territories. These were essentially two-dimensional assaults as the troops were landed preponderantly from surface craft, albeit there were some paratroop drops, fixed-wing airlifts; and air support, offensive and defensive, was indispensable.

The brilliant Inchon amphibious assault in September 1950 was excellently described by Brig. Gen. V. H. Krulak in the September 1958 *Shipmate*. That operation may well have been the last major amphibious assault in which the troops were landed solely by surface means. For the Marine Corps has verticalized the concept of assault landings and has developed vertical envelopment tactics, utilizing troop-carrying helicopters in lieu of, or in concert with, surface assault troop carriers.

In recent years (insofar as the few ships available have permitted) helicopter assaults and supporting operations have been tested, and tactics further developed, in amphibious exercises and by simulation. The Marine Corps now has troop helicopters designed for amphibious assault. The Corps has unrelentingly urged the Navy to design from keel-up, and build an adequate number of amphibious assault ships (helicopter) (LPH). However, most of the new-construction funds have been allocated for nuclear air-raiding, submarine, and anti-submarine types. A useful step was taken, nevertheless, 2 years ago in converting an old CVE, the *Thetis Bay*, into an experimental LPH. It is to be hoped that it will be feasible in the coming few years to properly implement the Marines' vertical envelopment concept, and revitalize the obsolescent prime offensive combat arm of the fleets with keel-up designed amphibious assault ships (helicopter).

If the Marines and Navy amphibians are to keep and further develop their amphibious know-how, particularly if the vertical envelopment concept is to be brought to fruition, it is essential to design and build LPH, other combatant amphibious types, and assault helicopters, in adequate numbers and within a few years. If this should be done (which seems doubtful to this writer) we could envisage a future major amphibious operation with three-dimensional Marines swarming onto and behind enemy beaches from clouds of helicopters, from ships, boats, vehicles and submarines, as well as by parachutes and fixed wing air lifts. And one can have a certain wry sympathy for the hypothetical unfortunate enemy coastal defense commander beset with U.S. Marines assaulting him from his front, rear, flanks, and from overhead. And with their greater prelanding mobility and free choice of landing spots the assaulting Marines, doubtless, could utilize their tactical nuclear weapons more effectively than could the defenders.

The conclusion is inescapable that our present-day three-dimensional Marines of all varieties, along with the surface Marines, are as vital a national asset, if not more so, as were the valorous Marines of the two-dimensional era.

wrote about Judy Garland in 1957. However, she refused and was ordered turned over to a marshal to go to jail. Miss Torre said in a statement, and we quote, "I have great hope that this action will lead to legislation which will protect a newsman's sources." The *Herald Tribune* supported Miss Torre in her defense that she could protect a news source through the freedom of the press guaranties in the first amendment to the Constitution. When the U.S. District Court of Appeals upheld her conviction last September 30, the case was taken to the U.S. Supreme Court, but the highest tribunal in the land refused to review the case. We who are involved in the gathering of news feel that a basic principle is at stake in this issue. And that principle is the right given in the Constitution guaranteeing freedom of the press. Freedom of the press should not be limited to basically the publication of news and information but should be carried on to hold newsmen harmless in disclosing the source (whatever it may be) of the news that is published. There is no doubt that legislation is needed to remedy the law as it stands today.

Marie Torre has the backing of all members of the fifth estate in her stand not to disclose the source of a news story. One doesn't have to look too far beyond his nose to see that a restriction such as the Marie Torre case implies could have far reaching effects in the business of news gathering. At present there is no law or previous decision that extends to journalists the privilege of withholding information from the courts. If that be the case, we make a public plea for immediate legislation to protect one of our most cherished rights, freedom of the press. We in the radio industry, firmly believe that legislation be required for the gathering of news. We affirm, at the same time, however, that the decision of our courts must be obeyed and respected. To do otherwise, would to us be anarchy. A copy of this editorial is being forwarded to Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and Congressman STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT. We will await their reaction and let you know the outcome of this legislation.

Junior Colleges Play Bigger Role Annually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appearing in the *Portland, Oreg., Journal* provides some valuable statistics concerning the growth of the Junior Community College during the last two decades. An institution that was once viewed as an experiment is now, happily, accepted as an integral part of our educational system. Moreover, the 2-year college is becoming an increasingly important aspect of that system as witnessed by the establishment of a new community college every 2 weeks.

The advantages of this type of institution of higher learning are many. Easy accessibility coupled with low cost make the community college a natural next step in the further development of the Nation's educational opportunities.

As the sponsor of a proposal to provide Federal assistance for development of the 2-year college, I congratulate the

The Case of Marie Torre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House an editorial broadcast made by a radio station in my congressional district, Station WBAB in Babylon, L. I., in regard to Marie Torre of the *New York Herald Tribune* who today completes her 10-day sentence for contempt after refusing to disclose a news source. The case of Marie Torre strikes very strongly at the heart of journalism, a subject which deserves serious consideration by the Congress of the United States:

New York *Herald Tribune* radio and television columnist, Marie Torre, was put in Federal custody today to begin serving a 10-day jail term. She had been sentenced for contempt after refusing to disclose a news source. When Miss Torre surrendered before Federal District Judge Sylvester Ryan in New York, he gave her a chance to purge herself by telling where she got a story she

Portland Journal on its interest in this matter and ask permission to have the article inserted in the RECORD:

**JUNIOR COLLEGES PLAY BIGGER ROLE
ANNUALLY**

(By Louis Cassels)

Twenty years ago junior colleges played an insignificant role in U.S. higher education. Their total enrollment for the 1938-39 school year was only 196,000 students.

Today there are 667 junior colleges in America, with an enrollment of 892,000. The 2-year institutions are springing up like mushrooms all over the country at an average of one new one every 2 weeks.

The latest directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges shows that 275 of the colleges are private institutions. Among them are several large schools, like Stephens College in Missouri and Colby College in New Hampshire, that draw students from all parts of the Nation.

A substantial majority—392, to be exact—are public institutions whose students live at home. There is an increasing tendency to refer to them as "community colleges" or "city colleges."

Most are operated as part of the community's public school system. Some are extension centers of State universities. The latter pattern is particularly prevalent in the northeast. Pennsylvania State University, for example, has 11 such off-campus branches.

Educators agree that junior colleges are destined to continue growing rapidly, both in number and in size. Last year they absorbed one out of every four students who entered higher education. By 1970 they may well enroll half of the Nation's total freshmen.

There are several reasons for their phenomenal growth. A basic one is that they make higher education financially accessible to many students who could not afford to go away to college. Many community colleges are free. Where tuition is charged, it rarely exceeds \$300 a year, and often is considerably less.

And, of course, many commuting students have no room and board to pay.

By contrast, the cost of attending a regular 4-year residential college is high and increasing steadily. The latest estimate from the U.S. Office of Education put the average cost of attending a State college or university at \$1,500 a year, and of a private college at \$2,000 a year. Many educators believe these costs may double within a decade.

The junior college also has strong financial appeal for the public agencies charged with providing adequate higher education facilities for a college student population that is expected to grow from 3,258,000 this year to perhaps 6 million by 1970.

According to Government studies, it costs close to \$6,000 a student to build dormitories, dining halls, classrooms and other necessary features of a 4-year residential college. Comparable educational facilities can be provided at a commuter college for \$3,000 a student.

Money aside, community colleges are particularly appealing to the growing number of adults who want to continue their education after acquiring a family, a home, and a job.

Nearly half of those enrolled in junior colleges are adults who are attending classes on a part-time basis, or who are taking special vocational courses.

The first public junior college was established in Joliet, Ill., in 1902. The idea spread, slowly at first, to other States. Today California leads the Nation with 75 junior colleges. Texas is next with 45, and New York is in third place with 36.

Senator Humphrey After 10 Years

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest and enjoyment Mr. Russell Baker's article on the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times magazine.

Believing that this article will be of interest to the Members of Congress and many others, I, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HUMPHREY: THUNDER, LIGHTNING?

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON.—As HUBERT H. HUMPHREY rounds out a turbulent decade in the U.S. Senate, he may be justified if he sometimes feels that destiny is beckoning him into a grander decade ahead. Ten years ago this month, when he took his seat in the Senate, the patriarchs who hold the place in trust looked him over and seeing nothing but a young pipsqueak from the windy prairie, quietly passed the word that he just wouldn't do.

Nowadays, ranked among the leading Democratic contenders for the Presidential nomination, he is doing very well indeed, not only through the country but also within that small coterie of men who dominate and give character to the Senate.

At 47, dynamic of spirit and limb and long of wind, he stands among the Democratic Party's men of the future, a monument to the political virtue of pure energy and a quick tongue—in many fields. He is equally at home talking feed-grain prices to Minnesota farmers, arranging a deal with Senate horse-traders or advising Nikita S. Khrushchev on what is wrong with Soviet policy.

"Everybody writes that I talk on every subject," he told a group of newspapermen recently. "Hell—I do. I like every subject."

This is probably the most succinct thumbnail sketch it is possible to draw of HUBERT HUMPHREY. No one else in the Senate (for that matter, few others anywhere in American politics) is quite so intensely fascinated with quite so many things about this earth as he. The energy and exuberance with which he pursues his multiple interests has alarmed some, set others to grumbling that he is a vacuous headline hunter and given him in the past a reputation around the Senate—where excessive zeal is frequently regarded as bad form—for being an upstart.

The catalog of HUMPHREY's activities is a full one. In Minnesota, he has constructed and now operates one of the most efficient political machines in the country, under the all-inclusive label "Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party." In New York and Washington, he manages to keep the most dedicated Democratic liberals convinced that he is liberalism's most effective champion in the Senate. In the Senate, where liberalism is sometimes suspect as a vaguely alien philosophy, he manages to hold the respect of and work successfully with the grandees on the conservative side.

In his various other excitements, he is applauded as a defender of civil rights, of the ailing farmer, of the embattled Supreme Court, of Israel and of liberalized immigration policies—to name a few of his causes. He has also found time to make himself expert on the incredibly intricate question of

disarmament and to come up with ideas for treating every world problem from starvation in Southeast Asia to the isolation of Berlin. Passing through Helsinki recently and learning that the anti-Communist Finnish Government was about to collapse under Soviet pressure, he quickly rounded up the best local opinion on what needed to be done to save the day, then wired his proposals to Washington. The State Department was still giving them "favorable consideration" when the Government fell.

Among all the Senators who are potential Presidential material, none quite equals HUMPHREY for executive energy applied to such a global range of problems. LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, the most complex of the contenders, has built his case on a genius for getting things done through conciliation. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, relies heavily on organization and personality. STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has hitched his future to the single issue of national security and a quiet voting record considered perfect by Democratic liberals.

HUMPHREY is a fighter rather than a conciliator. For this era of television campaigning, he has obvious personal shortcomings in comparison with JACK KENNEDY. ("The trouble with HUBERT," complained one admiring Congressman who worries that television might hurt him, "is that he looks like a 'yakker'.") Unlike SYMINGTON, he has rarely been content to vote quietly on any issue. More often, clad in the armor of liberalism, he is on his warhorse and charging into the middle of every battle on the horizon.

The public HUMPHREY is clattering, strident, and bellicose; often a scold, sometimes a nuisance, always a nonresponder of the proprieties. In this he has changed little from the Minnesota terror who first took his seat in the Senate a decade ago.

In rare moments when he is being the private HUMPHREY, however, it is obvious that he has changed a great deal. For one thing, he and the Senate have finally come to terms. In a private conversation recently he said that he doubted he would ever again seek the Vice Presidential nomination, as he did in 1956. "I've come to like the Senate too much to want to spend my life waiting for somebody to catch cold," he explained.

In part this may be due to LYNDON JOHNSON's skill as tutor to Democrats eager to learn how to make the Senate work for them. Both JOHNSON and HUMPHREY started political life as New Dealers and while HUMPHREY's Minnesota brand of liberalism is too rich these days for JOHNSON's Texas constituents, there is a personal bond between the two men which is mutually beneficial.

Near the close of the last Congress, when JOHNSON was holding a private post mortem on a particularly delicate piece of business which HUMPHREY had managed on the floor, he was patiently analyzing HUMPHREY's mistakes. At one point, JOHNSON noted, HUMPHREY had permitted another liberal—PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois—to get too prominently into the act. "Remember," he told HUMPHREY, "there can just be one leader—just one leader."

In all probability, HUMPHREY will emerge as the effective leader of the expanded cadre of Senate liberals in the Congress just opened. It is equally probable that his influence will be exerted behind the scenes to a larger extent than ever before. The first order of Senate business is the fight to break the old filibuster. In this, HUMPHREY is apparently destined to handle the private arrangements that will have to be made in the wings on behalf of the liberals if a solution is to be reached.

This is not to predict that the public HUMPHREY will be any less in evidence. As he confessed recently after his talk with Khrushchev, he loves to talk and is helpless

to stop himself. Each day, when the Senate is in session, he fills large segments of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Once, running through the old formula of "Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the Record—" he stumbled and said, "I ask permission to insert in my record."

It is this passion for talk, he believes, that kept Khrushchev interested during their extraordinary 8-hour conversation in Moscow early last month. HUMPHREY has since said that he suspects Khrushchev shares his vocal compulsion and recognized in him a worthy match for a battle of spellbinders. "You can't help it," HUMPHREY says of the overwhelming passion to be heard. "It's just glands."

Under cover of the sound and fury, however, HUMPHREY has quietly graduated to the Senate inner sanctum, composed exclusively of men who, for reasons not clearly understood, clearly count. To borrow from George Orwell, all Senators are equal, but some Senators are more equal than others. No one has ever quite defined why this should be, but it is nonetheless true, and it is true that HUBERT HUMPHREY now holds a membership in the elite.

This is largely a southern elite with little liking for HUMPHREY's politics but with great respect for the man—regardless of his politics—who understands the Senate. Thus, while HUMPHREY will usually be at odds with these elders, and may infuriate them on civil rights, there will be channels for reaching understanding and accommodation which are available to few other Senators of the liberal persuasion.

One other point is essential in understanding the HUMPHREY of today: he remains a consummate politician. During his Minnesota apprenticeship he forged the Democrat-Farm-Labor alliance that carried him to office and gradually turned Minnesota into a Democratic stronghold. Those most familiar with Minnesota politics doubt that EUGENE J. MCCARTHY could have been elected to the Senate in November without HUMPHREY's considerable assistance.

Like all finished politicians, he is exceedingly sensitive to what is going on back home and to the message of his mail. When the question of congressional calls to the Federal regulatory agencies created a lively controversy in Washington, HUMPHREY held forth heatedly at a dinner party one night with the argument that it was a Senator's solemn obligation to his constituents to go to their aid with every device within the law when they had problems before the agencies.

Nor does his liberalism express itself in a passion for fighting to the death in lost causes. When HUMPHREY fights, it is usually to win, but part of his Senate education has been that when you cannot win the whole loaf, half is better than none.

While he follows classic form in denying all interest in the Presidency for the moment, it requires only a few minutes in his presence to sense that he is beginning to run a low-grade White House fever.

The celebrated Khrushchev interview, he realizes, was a mixed blessing for his future. Khrushchev's whim in keeping him for 8 hours was a stroke of luck in that it pulled HUMPHREY out of the wings and put him at stage center in the American political drama long enough to make politicians and public remember his face and start examining his qualifications.

At the same time, it is plain to HUMPHREY that there is limited political fuel in the Khrushchev affair and that he must see his hopes rise or fall on his record over the next 2 years.

Moreover, there are real political dangers in the method of his projection onto the stage. His office has received angry letters complaining that he was taken in by the Russians. As a shrewd politician, HUM-

PHREY realizes that it might be expedient to do the demagogic thing and use his visit with Khrushchev as a claim to special expertise about the menace of the Soviet Union.

Some of his critics tax him with being, at heart, a demagog; but in the Khrushchev matter HUMPHREY clearly feels that he must forgo the politically expedient thing in order to keep open what could be an important point of contact with the ruler of the Communist world.

The HUMPHREY of today is a direct if considerably more sophisticated descendant of the agrarian and Populist leaders who held the West at the beginning of the 20th century. His father, a lifelong Republican, turned Democrat after hearing William Jennings Bryan speak in South Dakota. One of four children, HUMPHREY was born in Wallace, S. Dak., May 27, 1911, and christened, after his father, Hubert Horatio.

His mother had immigrated from Norway. His father was a small-town pharmacist. "I was born over a drugstore and raised inside one," HUMPHREY once told a biographer. In high school he was—like Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON—a prize debater. (Both men suffer in their speaking style from the oratorical glibness of formal debating technique.)

He finished high school in 1929 and enrolled at the University of Minnesota. Two years later, the depression forced him to quit. He went back to his father's drugstore and, with 6 months out for a course at the Denver School of Pharmacy, stayed there for 6 years, watching the South Dakota farmers lose everything as the dust storms consumed the land.

These memories still infuriate him. Recently, discussing Washington's attitude toward Latin America, he denounced it as the smug, self-righteous posture of the well-to-do man who constantly advises his struggling neighbors to "put your house in order." It reminded him, he said, of the bankers and businessmen who had come to the ruined farmers of the Dakotas during the dust-bowl years and used the old catch phrase.

"You're not in a very receptive mood when you're penniless and your children are hungry and some rich bird, who's probably just robbed the bank and gotten away with it, tells you to put your house in order," he said. "You feel like telling him, 'Look here, mister, how are my children going to eat?'"

In 1935, at the age of 24, HUMPHREY scraped together bus fare and made his first trip to Washington. He wrote back to Muriel Buck, his fiancée, now Mrs. Humphrey: "I need to do more reading, more writing, and more thinking if I ever want to fulfill my dream of being someone in this world. Maybe I seem foolish to have such vain hopes and plans but, Bucky, I can see how some day, if you and I just apply ourselves and make up our minds to work for bigger things, we can live here in Washington, and probably be in Government politics or service. I set my aim at Congress. Don't laugh at me. Maybe it does sound rather egotistical and beyond reason, but, Muriel, I do know others have succeeded."

Back at the University of Minnesota, doubling as drugstore clerk and janitor to pay the bills, he soon became a voluble New Dealer and a figure widely known and heard on campus. He moved on to Louisiana State University to do graduate work in political science. His master's thesis was "The Philosophy of the New Deal." Returning to Minnesota, he taught briefly, then became impatient with the academic approach to politics and plunged into its practical applications.

After a brief whirl through the regional offices of various Government agencies, he decided to run for mayor of Minneapolis. He was then 31. Finishing second in a 10-man field, he lost the run-off by 5,000 votes

and went back to work to pay his campaign bills. He taught political science, worked as a radio news analyst, did public-relations work, and, in between, managed to weld together the diffused farm and labor elements of Minnesota's political system into the cohesive Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party.

Two years after his first race for office, he ran again for mayor and won by 31,000 votes. He promptly rocked Minneapolis with a law-enforcement program that shut down the wide-open brothels, the after-hours liquor joints, the flourishing handbooks, dice games, and punchboard operations. When labor leaders complained about his choice of a police chief, he told them: "I'm my own boss." In 1947 he was reelected by the biggest majority in Minneapolis history, and began looking toward Washington.

He began by ordering a purge of Communist elements and Henry Wallace's Progressive backers who had begun to infiltrate the Minnesota organization. His lieutenants worked over the State, pruning them out. When the State convention met in 1948, he thrashed the remnants of the Wallaceites and won the senatorial nomination by acclamation.

First, however, there was the Democratic National Convention. HUMPHREY was among the "young Turks" who that year led the civil-rights fight that put a strong libertarian plank into the platform and forced the South to bolt the party. His rallying cry to the convention is still remembered: "It is now time for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly in the bright sunshine of human rights." This plank carried by 69 votes.

In the Minnesota campaign, he traveled 31,000 miles, made 691 speeches, milked cows, led bands, and dressed in Indian bonnets. Campaigning, he told a newspaperman, "is like running a drugstore. When people come in, you've got to do things for them, show an interest in them, take them to the door." He overwhelmed the Republican incumbent, Joseph H. Ball, by 243,000 votes.

HUMPHREY arrived in the Senate with no great fund of goodwill among the elders and promptly turned their indifference into outrage. One of his earliest efforts was an assault on the full majesty of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the reigning patriarch from Virginia. Even veteran Senators blanched when HUMPHREY proposed abolishing BYRD's famed Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the base on which BYRD had built his reputation as the taxpayers' friend. HUMPHREY's argument for getting rid of it was that the committee was "a waste of the taxpayer's dollar."

Shortly thereafter he was openly rebuked for disrespect for the Southern elders. This time it was a debate over a fair employment practice bill and HUMPHREY, during a floor speech, impugned the motives of the opposing Southerners. Twice during the debate the Southerners had him ruled out of order for using intemperate language, and twice he was forced to take his seat, like an offending schoolboy, before he could proceed.

And so it went, the long uneasy affair between HUMPHREY and the Senate. Time has since performed its alchemy. After the early mutual suspicion and annoyance, HUMPHREY is 10 years older, graying at the temples and no longer the enfant terrible of the late 1940's. He and the Senate are at peace. Each has had to bend its neck a bit to make the accommodation possible, but neither has yielded much on principle.

A HUMPHREY story, possibly apocryphal, has it that one of his university professors told him: "If God had given you as much brains as he has given you wind, you would be sure to be another Cicero."

As one looks at HUMPHREY today, it is possible to say: "Maybe God did. Maybe HUBERT will."

Permit Lease and Transfer of Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, if the cotton farmer and the cotton industry are to survive under the economic pressures now being exerted upon them, it is mandatory that the 86th Congress act at the earliest possible moment to modify the laws regulating the allocation of cotton acreage.

I am today introducing legislation to allow transfer of commodity acreage allotments from one farmer to another, on a lease basis, within the same county.

The chief purpose of this legislation is to provide greater flexibility in the system of allocating land for farming cotton by giving to the small cotton farmer the incentive to expand and make more efficient his operation, while allowing those who no longer wish to devote themselves to cotton farming an opportunity to relinquish their allocations for valuable considerations and devote themselves to other employment.

The farmer who wants to grow cotton should have the right to do so profitably. Simply stated, this is what my bill seeks to encourage.

During the past few years, under the influence of the farm policies now in effect, there has been a mass exodus from the farm, as the incentive for farming waned in the face of mounting costs, the decreasing acreage allotments, and the appeal of better paying off-farm employment. In the Fourth District of Alabama, for example, more than 40 percent of the farmers work off the farm 100 days or more each year. Many of these earn more in these jobs than the total value of agricultural products sold by them. Actually, farming has become a burden to them.

And so, in an increasing measure, the situation is leaning heavily toward part-time farming, much of which is pursued half-heartedly by individuals who have lost their interest in farming but who feel obliged to plant their allotments or else lose them. Under the rigid, inflexible allocation program, there is no practical or profitable way to yield their disinterested hold on the land.

In the cotton States, farming of cotton includes the existence of thousands of small operations where there is a woeful loss of productivity. Alabama had 119,844 cotton allotment contracts last year, of which 45,680 were for 4 acres or less. Many of these operators farm only as a sideline and would gladly give it up altogether if the Government did not make it difficult to do so.

At the same time, there are other small- and medium-size farms whose operators are truly interested in raising cotton but who are restricted from expanding their operations by the same rigid rules which encourage part-time farming.

It is clear that there needs to be flexibility in allocating cotton acreage to inspire the interested farmers to expand and to produce more efficiently, or to withdraw from the production of cotton in favor of off-the-farm employment. The result would be to attract to cotton farming those who want to farm and to give them incentive to do a better job at it.

This is the essence of my bill. The decision to stay at cotton farming or to withdraw would be left completely to the individual farmer. If he wishes to devote his time exclusively to outside employment, he could, under my bill, lease his allotment to a farmer in the same county who wishes to pursue the livelihood of cotton farming.

The farmer staying with cotton would be able to expand, on his own land, his cotton-farming operation. He would be given the encouragement to proceed with a degree of confidence to invest in equipment needed in this mechanized age to efficiently produce cotton.

The individual giving up his allotment would be free to work full time in other employment, and at the same time receive such stipend for his allotment as he and the leasing farmer may agree upon.

It is obvious that such a plan will appeal to the farmers. Now who else will like this idea? In a recent statement, Frederic H. Heidelberg, executive vice president of the North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, pointed out that the transferability of cotton allotments should appeal to just about everybody associated with farming.

He states:

No opposition to such a provision should come from the agricultural leaders who believe small-scale farming must give way to large-scale farming enterprises. Their belief is based upon the view that developments in agricultural science and technology require large-scale farming operations in order to pay off. Flexibility in allotments which would enable regrouping of acreage would be in this direction.

Those who believe it is important to retain the traditional family scale farming enterprise of modest capitalization should welcome such legislation. If properly conceived it would rescue untold numbers of small-scale farmers from the brink of disaster.

Transferability of acreage would be welcomed by sincere agricultural educators. They have watched with dismay during the past decade the depressing results of overdiversification on small-scale farms. This trend has been particularly adverse in areas where each farm has kept a few acres in several controlled crops. An opportunity to shift acreages into volume adequate for adoption of improved practices in preferred and suitable crops could revitalize the development of individual farms.

It is right for new hope, fresh incentive, and a horizon of opportunity to be established for cotton farmers in a broad area of the Cotton Belt. Transfer of acreage allotments is an immediate step which can be taken in this direction. Opposition could be predicated only on sectional prejudice and selfishness.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT WILL BE STIMULATED

President Eisenhower, in his message to the 85th Congress on January 18, 1958, spoke of the rural development program initiated at his request by the Department of Agriculture.

This program is a cooperative one between local, State, and Federal governments. It has been in operation on a demonstration basis in 63 counties and 8 trade areas in 30 States for 3 years.

It has three major objectives: First to help families with the desire and ability to stay in farming gain the necessary tools, land, and skills to do so; second, to widen the range of off-the-farm employment opportunities; and, third, to help rural people enjoy more opportunities for adequate training and improved health.

This rural development program has been cited frequently to committees of Congress by the present administration as one of its real accomplishments for the welfare of the small-scale farmer.

When applied to areas where cotton production is an important agricultural pursuit, a close look at the first of the rural development program's objectives leaves one scratching his head. Many small-scale farmers in these areas do not need more land. They need more cotton acreage for the land they already own.

On the other hand, the second of these objectives aims to speed retirement of some small-scale farmers from active agricultural pursuits.

Would it accelerate attainment of objectives of this worthy program if the cotton acreage allotted to those who are finding off-the-farm employment satisfactory could be transferred to the agricultural programs of those who want to stay with farming full time? It is certainly logical to believe so.

As matters now stand, there is no bridge for the flow of allotted acreage from farms whose owners are engaged in off-the-farm employment to those farms whose owners need and want additional acreage to meet rising costs of production and of living.

In the interest of success for its rural development program, USDA should certainly look with favor upon establishing such a bridge.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of revitalizing cotton production through an allotment transfer program will certainly be felt by the cotton industry. This great industry desperately needs the benefit of decreasing production costs and increasing production yields.

This is what the bill which I am introducing today seeks to accomplish.

Let Us Defend the Written Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1958, our distinguished colleague from the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia delivered a masterful address at a meeting of the American Carpet Institute in Skytop, Pa. The sound doctrine expounded by Mr. HARRISON merit serious thought and consideration. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following complete text of the address:

There is an element in the United States dedicated to the principle that the working class is the only essential class, and that wealth produced by this class and paid to private ownership is surplus. To obtain this surplus, a constant class warfare must be waged for the control of the private prop-

erty essential for the production of wealth. The control of such private property should vest in Government, and the control of Government in Socialists' hands. You are fully aware of the vast progress the Socialists have made in the past 25 years toward these objectives. Tonight in every corporation represented here, the Government is the unwanted partner to the extent of 52 percent of net income. Fortunate indeed is the executive who does not contribute 50 percent of his net earnings to Government. A galaxy of laws, State and national, have invaded and pounded down upon our free enterprise system. But, as yet, the Socialist victory has not been complete and the outcome of the struggle remains in doubt. Corporations still earn and declare dividends, farmers still maintain some control over their lands, laborers still in some places may obtain employment without paying tribute. Government control of person and property is not yet fully realized though the outcome teeters in the balance.

To obtain their objectives, the Socialists must reduce the Constitution of the United States to shambles. To the extent its written word is observed, the rights of private property and private enterprise are observed because the Constitution protects them both. An authority cited with all inclusive acceptance by Chief Justice Warren in the school segregation cases was "An American Dilemma," by the Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal. This book to which the Supreme Court of the United States has given unanimous approval contains this passage: The Constitution of the United States "is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people."

Speaking 2 years ago of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Edmund W. Flynn, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island, declared "recent decisions have departed so far from constitutional precepts that this country no longer has a written Constitution any more than England."

Judge Learned Hand, of New York, one of the most eminent men ever to sit on the bench and the kind of man who used to be appointed to the Supreme Court, in a series of lectures at Harvard University, has charged that the Supreme Court is pursuing a tendency to set itself up as a third legislative chamber. He says that the Supreme Court has one rule where property is involved and another where liberty is at issue. He says public support disappears from the Court "insofar as it is supposed permissible for the judge to smuggle into his opinions his personal notions of what is desirable." "For myself," continues Judge Hand, "it would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians."

The chief justices of 36 States in a remarkable indictment have charged "that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly . . . the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint. . . . It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

Let me give you one more quote. The California leader of the Communist Party said: "This decision will mark a rejuvenation of our party in America. We've lost some members in the last few years, but now we are on our way again."

No outsider can match the abuse which members of the Court have heaped upon one another. For example in one case, Justices Douglas, Black, and Chief Justice Warren said the action of their colleagues was "a

shocking instance of the abuse of judicial power." This is not a suggestion that the majority has made an honest mistake, it has been pointed out. A shocking abuse of authority is an intentional act; a wicked and dishonest thing. In another case, Justice Tom Clark said: "Unless the Congress changes the rule announced by the Court today, those intelligence agencies of our Government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop for the Court has opened their files to the criminal and thus afforded him a Roman holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets . . . and all in the name of justice."

The layman cannot realize the extent to which these nine men have gone toward destroying and distorting our written Constitution. They have decreed that under our Constitution a local school board of the State of New York may not dismiss a teacher who refuses to say whether he is a Communist; that this very State of Pennsylvania may not convict Steve Nelson, a notorious Russian spy, for plotting to overthrow the State government; that the Federal Government may not convict, under the Smith Act, one who advocates the violent destruction of the Federal Union provided such advocacy is "abstract," whatever that may mean; that the State of California and New Mexico must permit subversives to practice law in their courts; that the Government of the United States may not dismiss its own employee who plots the Government's overthrow unless he occupies a sensitive position; that the Cabinet head of a Government department must keep on the public payroll a person he believes should not be entrusted with confidential assignments bearing on national policy; they have so tortured the salutary provisions of the fifth amendment, that "taking the fifth" has become a part of the language of the underworld meaning a smug and effective recourse of racketeers and subversives. These nine men have opened the secret files of the FBI to the criminal; they have struck down the criminal laws of the States; they have licensed the seller of filth and obscenity to the youth; they have assaulted the rights of officers of the law to arrest for serious felonies committed in their presence; they have swept away the power of the police to fight crime by reasonable interrogation of suspects and by introduction of voluntary and truthful confessions in evidence; they have decreed that the Congress of the United States, which this year spent \$40 billion of the people's money to protect against Communist invasion, has no power to control hostile Communist activity in the United States or even to make inquiry into Communist doings or to remove Communists from Government payrolls; in countless other decisions they have gladdened the hearts and built up the power of criminals and subversives.

In the South conditions threatening chaos have been produced by the decision that racial separation in the public schools violates the Constitution of the United States. This decision did not contend that Southern States had denied equal opportunity to colored children in the public school. Upon the facts, such a contention could not be made. In my State of Virginia, for example, the average salary of a public school teacher is higher for the Negro than for the white. In 10 years, the value of school property per enrollee has increased 258 percent for the Negro as against 144 percent for the white. Thirty-four percent of the State money spent on school construction since 1950 has gone for Negro schools, although Negroes represent only 25 percent of the school population. The taxpayers of Virginia—and that means, by and large, the white taxpayers—have been paying willingly for the creation of truly equal facilities for education of the white and colored child.

Does the Constitution of the United States prohibit the separation of the races in the public schools?

The judges said the acts of Congress providing for segregated schools in the District of Columbia are in violation of the fifth amendment. The 5th amendment was written into the Constitution in 1791, and under it human slavery existed for 75 years until abolished by the 13th amendment. Can any honest man say that language which permits human slavery denies the right of separate school facilities? Separate schools in Virginia, the judges said violated the 14th amendment. The 14th amendment did not give to Negroes the right to vote which was conferred by the 15th. Can any honest man say that language which does not give the right of suffrage denies the right of separate school facilities? The very Congress which submitted the 14th amendment set up a system of segregated schools in the District of Columbia and six times the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that separate but equal facilities comply with the 14th amendment. Chief Justice William Howard Taft was the most recent and expressed the opinion of the Court that "the separate but equal principle . . . is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

However much we may argue about legal niceties, there are certain aspects of this decision which we in the South know, and know beyond peradventure of debate. First, we know that we cannot carry it out and at the same time educate the youth of either race. In the District of Columbia the public schools were integrated in 1954. A congressional committee has established that in the wake of this action has come disciplinary problems described as appalling, demoralizing, intolerable, and disgraceful. Fighting, lying, stealing, vandalism, obscene writing, vulgar talking, absenteeism, and truancy have increased to an amazing degree. Teachers have resigned in disgust, courses of study had to be abandoned because supplies were stolen so rapidly they could not be replaced, children go to school with weapons. The committee found that the vilest sex talk, dirty writing on walls, foul and unspeakable language to teachers, and vicious and obscene tongue battles in classroom, as well as during recess. They reported an enormous increase in venereal disease, which included 13 colored girls of 6 years of age. A majority of the people in the District of Columbia are white, but the school population is 73 percent Negro. Where are the children of the white parents?

A second thing we know about this decision is that no civil government, Federal or local, can enforce it. Under the principles of the Declaration of Independence, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. When you have government exercising power to which the people do not consent, and to which they are deeply opposed, you have widespread violation if you leave enforcement to civil authority, as during prohibition. The only alternative must be a substitution of government by fiat and military might for civil authority and popular government.

I earnestly contend that when constitutional liberty, the right of peaceable assembly, the right to operate local government dies anywhere in the United States, it is threatened everywhere.

What is the real reason the leftwing, with the Supreme Court as its heavy artillery, wages war on the South? In an editorial in this week's U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence says: "If it had not been for Democratic leaders from the South in the last session of Congress . . . America now would be facing economic disaster."

The leaders of the South, such as BYRD, RUSSELL, IRWIN, and HOLLAND, for 20 years, have held the pass against the Socialist

march. When they are succeeded in the Congress by a new generation of carpetbaggers and scalawags, kept in power by Federal bayonets, the votes will be in the Congress to carry the class war to victory not only against the South but over the last vestige of written constitutional government, the last trace of private ownership of property and private enterprise. Thus, the purpose of all of the decisions discussed tonight, including the segregation decisions, is not the protection of the Negro, or the workingman, or the downtrodden individual; the purpose is the destruction of the written Constitution, the breakdown of the police power of the States, the promotion of class warfare, the establishment of Marxist socialism.

As one people of one nation, let us defend the written Constitution and say of it, as did that great New England poet:

"Sail on, O Ship of State.
Sail on, O Union, strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Detroit Economy To Rise 10 Percent in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following article by John R. Stewart which appeared in *The Detroit Free Press*, a weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce. In his article, Mr. Stewart makes certain predictions concerning Detroit's economy in 1959 which present a much brighter picture for that area which has suffered more during the recent recession than any other part of the country:

[From the *Detroit Free Press*, Dec. 15, 1958]

DETROIT ECONOMY TO RISE 10 PERCENT IN 1959

(By John R. Stewart)

All phases of business and industrial activity in the Detroit area should improve in 1959. Gains over 1958 are expected to range between 3 percent for wages and 28 percent for passenger car production. The unweighted average rise predicted for the barometers tabulated below is 10 percent. (Unemployment and consumer prices are excluded from this average.) Aside from the sharp increase noted for automobile production, substantial gains include nonresidential building, up 19 percent, truck output 15 percent higher and industrial power sales, up 12 percent.

These forecasts, representing the combined opinions of 17 local economists, were presented to members of the Detroit Area Economic Forum at its annual dinner and forecasting session held December 4.

Experts from Detroit banks, utilities, government agencies, manufacturers, builders, retailers, newspapers and trade associations made forecasts for each of the 14 measures of local economic activity tabulated below. These figures represent the average answers of the 17 economists, including the undersigned, made in questionnaires prior to the meeting. The only fields wherein the writer differs materially from the group are in building, where our estimate is 5 percent lower for nonresidential construction and 4

percent higher for housing, and in department store sales.

Payrolls in 1959 are expected to top those of the current year by 11 percent (the group estimates 9.2 percent) with a smaller proportion put aside in savings. Credit outstanding should increase. If department stores secure as large a share of the money spent in the area as in 1958—a reasonable expectation—sales by these outlets should increase somewhat more than the 5.5 percent indicated in the table. A 10-percent rise seems more likely, bringing the index up to 134 for 1959.

The writer agrees with the group estimates for employment, but feels that unemployment

will be lower than shown in the table, perhaps as low as 150,000. This lower estimate is based upon a drop of 25,000 in the area's labor force as it seems probable that many of the 200,000 currently unemployed will look for jobs outside the area or drop out of the labor force in marginal cases.

In summary, next year should see a continuation of the current upward trend in business and industrial activity throughout the first 6 months with perhaps some leveling off in the last half. Activity in general is not expected to reach the boom levels of 1955-57, but many barometers, notably population, wage rates and perhaps retail sales, should be at all-time high.

Detroit area	1958 estimate	1959 forecast ¹	Percent change
Population July 1	3,840,000	3,905,000	+1.7
Nonfarm employment	1,267,000	1,343,000	+6.0
Unemployment	251,000	170,000	-32.3
Hourly earnings, manufacturing	\$2.65	\$2.73	+3.0
Weekly earnings, manufacturing	\$104.43	\$107.58	+3.0
Consumer Price Index ¹	124.0	125.0	+0.8
Department store sales ¹	121.8	128.5	+5.5
Retail advertising linage	40,000,000	42,700,000	+6.8
New dwelling units, number	21,000	23,050	+9.8
Nonresidential building, value	\$200,000,000	\$237,500,000	+18.7
Passenger car output, United States	4,254,000	5,447,000	+27.8
Truck output, United States	880,000	1,014,000	+15.2
Power sales, Edison, kilowatt-hours	5,234,000,000	5,865,000,000	+12.1
Bank debits, Detroit banks	\$70,000,000,000	\$76,100,000,000	+8.7

¹ 1947-49=100.

² Combined average of 17 economists.

Hon. Davis Elkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deepest sorrow that I learned of the recent passing of the esteemed and beloved former distinguished Senator of the great State of West Virginia, the Honorable Davis Elkins.

Illustrious scion and great leader of a family which for more than 75 years has been a prominent, vital force in the upbuilding and development of his great State, Senator Elkins leaves a precious legacy of devoted public service and constructive business leadership.

Educated at Lawrenceville, Andover, and Harvard College, Davis Elkins early enlisted in the Spanish-American War as a volunteer with Company E of the 1st West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and served with great distinction with that unit throughout that history-making conflict. During World War I inspired by that high sense of patriotism and civic virtue for which he and his family were noted, the Senator again enlisted in the Army and served in Europe with the high rank of major and once more distinguished himself as a gallant fighter and a devoted son of Uncle Sam.

Of his outstanding service in this war, the late famous Percy D. Haughton, famous Harvard football coach of the era, himself an officer in the American Expeditionary Force, said of Senator Elkins: "Dave Elkins was a great soldier and a great human being, respected and loved by all."

Evidently the people of his home State felt the same way about his patriotic contributions, high character and ability since, while he was still on the European battlefield, they elected him to the U.S. Senate in November 1918.

Much could be spoken of his fine service in the Senate. He early won the high regard of his colleagues and served his constituents, the State, and the Nation with unquestioned integrity, outstanding fidelity, and great ability during his term.

He did not run for reelection. His large and varied business interests, civic and family responsibilities which he had long unselfishly sacrificed to serve his country, demanded his consideration and attention and he reluctantly retired to private life.

Senator Elkins' warm friend of Senate days, President Warren G. Harding, greatly honored him by offering him an important Cabinet post, but his many business affairs and domestic duties enjoined him from acceptance, notwithstanding the persistent urgings of the President and his many friends and advisers. As the Senator put it himself: "I am grateful for the honor and wish it were possible for me to serve. But I must give some attention now to my business and my family."

Senator Elkins' family life was typically American and fabulously happy. In 1926, he married the charming, talented, and gracious Mary Regan of Washington, a young lady noted for her beauty, keen wit, and popularity, who bore him three lovely children, Katherine, now Mrs. Charles J. Kelly of New York City, Maureen, now Mrs. A. Thomas Zirpolo of Cleveland, Ohio, and Davis Elkins, Jr., now of Elkins, W. Va.

The Elkins family life was also truly ideal and brought great joy and great pride to the distinguished Senator.

Very many friends of official Washington, the Nation, and even the world, the famous and the unsung, drawn from every walk of life, moved from time to time in and out of the noted Elkins home where hospitality, graciousness, love, generosity, kindness, and a strong Christian faith always abided.

I can speak with intimate personal knowledge of this lovely Elkins family because it was frequently my privilege and pleasure to visit them in their home. Never have I known more generous hosts; never have I experienced more gracious hospitality; never have I seen a more beautiful family or a more wholesome, interesting, inspiring home environment.

The great and the humble passed through the doors of that inspiring home. It was a salon, in the very best sense, of fine culture, enlightenment and gaiety. Above all, it was a home which exemplified the finest qualities of parenthood and the most appealing attributes of filial love and devotion. The home of Davis and Mary Elkins was a home to remember, as those who have ever visited it will gratefully testify.

The Elkins children were brought up with scrupulous, yet loving vigilance, care, and affection and they have lived up to high early promise. The girls are happily married, are blessed with beautiful children; the boy is rapidly making his way in the business world. Together, they brought great joy to their devoted dad and granddad and to their loving mother and grandmother—a family of which anyone could be proud—American to the core, that can “walk with kings nor lose the common touch,” that shines out like a bright star in the firmament of modern life in our great Republic.

Davis Elkins was a man of rectitude and high honor, a two-fisted American who up to the time of his disability attended prize fights, wrestling matches, and athletic contests. Born to the manor, so to speak, he was plain in speech, democratic in manner, kind of heart, generous of impulse.

He was a hard hitter, blunt spoken against injustice, sham, and quackery, firm in his convictions, rugged of character, stern in his sense of duty. Essentially, he was a kind and generous soul, deep in his knowledge of humanity, keenly aware of its problems, eager to do his part whether by bountiful private philanthropy or public action to lighten the burden and better the lot of all those unable to help themselves.

His loyalties and affections knew no narrow bounds of party, race, creed, or class. He was a friend to man, a public servant of whom any nation could be proud; a husband and father of whom any family could be eternally grateful, as I know his devoted family is.

In the poignant sorrow of their bereavement, I extend to Mrs. Elkins and to each and every one of them the most heartfelt sympathy of my family and myself. May the good Lord bring them strength and courage in their dark hour of sadness and travail. May they find “that peace of God, which passeth all understanding.”

An able honest man, a noble statesman, and a great American, Davis Elkins, has gone to his heavenly reward. His State, the Nation, the people and his many friends join his bereaved family in mourning his lamented passing. May God bless and keep him.

Why Blame the Small Tobacco Farmer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the small tobacco farmers of West Virginia of whom there are over 4,000 in my Fourth Congressional District.

These small farmers grow burley tobacco, and their average acreage is only about six-tenths of 1 acre. Their average income is less than \$600 per year, and for many of them tobacco is the only cash crop.

Over the past few years we have experienced the effects of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's policies which have driven millions of our smaller farmers off the farms. On November 18, 1958, Secretary Benson indicated he was planning a 16-percent cut in the quota for burley tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture itself stated in hearings of the Tobacco Division which I attended only yesterday morning that the Department had overestimated 1958 production of burley tobacco by some 20 million pounds. I submit that there is no surplus of burley tobacco. And even if there were, I cannot get it through my thick head why the small West Virginia tobacco farmers should be blamed instead of the big tobacco growers who have large acreages of tobacco.

I say it is about time we in Congress stand up and protect the little fellow. Many of these small tobacco farmers will go bankrupt if Secretary Benson is allowed to cut the burley tobacco quota. Then what will happen? They may go to the cities and add to our already overburdened relief facilities. But most of them cannot even do that, and they will either starve or eke out a meager existence on Federal surplus commodities, on which over 300,000 people in the State of West Virginia are now barely subsisting.

Mr. Speaker, the tobacco farmers of my district are law-abiding people. They recognize the need for quotas and controls. But I am not going to stand idly by and watch them starved by a policy of favoring the big tobacco interests. I serve notice that if there is any cut in the burley tobacco quota, I will introduce and fight for legislation to restore that quota.

Thomas Jefferson once said that farming is not only a means of making a living but a way of life itself. That is the case with our mountaineer tobacco

farmers. Let us not sell them down the river.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to print excerpts from letters I have received from small tobacco people in West Virginia.

TRAYS, W. Va., January 12, 1959.

Dear Mr. HECHLER: The farmers in this section of Putnam County want me to write to you in regard to the tobacco situation in this neighborhood. None of us have more than six-tenths of an acre allotment and some not more than five-tenths of an acre. And we don't earn more than an average of \$500 a year, but that little bit is vital to most of us. It enables the landowner to buy his seed, fertilizer, and necessary farm machinery and repairs.

Yours truly,

Mrs. DAVID WHITE.

MILTON, W. Va., January 13, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HECHLER: You are well aware of the fact that many a poor man is dependent on his small allotment of one-half an acre of tobacco or maybe less to keep him off D.P.A. To reduce allotments would result in some having to apply for relief and, at the same time, lowering their pride and morale.

Yours truly,

H. L. WOODY.

Needed: More Defense Contracts in Indiana Areas of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to praise the action taken this week by the Rules Committee of the House in urging that the Committee on Armed Services investigate the failure by the Department of Defense to award Government contracts to areas of substantial unemployment.

I refer specifically to House Resolution 19 which, among its other purposes, authorizes the committee “to conduct a full and complete investigation” into the procurement and use of materiel, equipment, supplies, and services by or within the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, since 1953 we in the Third District of Indiana have suffered violent fluctuations in employment. Two of the four counties in my district have too often been in the substantial labor surplus or distressed area category.

Because of economic conditions within my district and because of similar conditions in other distressed areas throughout the Nation, I am glad to see the scope of the investigation covered by House Resolution 19 extended to include a study of whether or not defense contracts are properly being awarded to business firms in areas suffering from serious unemployment.

I have discussed this possibility with the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, of Gary, Ind., who was among those members of the Rules Committee reporting H. R. 19 favorably to the House. My distinguished colleague from Indiana has in-

formed me that the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is in agreement with the extension of the committee's power to study the relationship between first, unemployment, and second, the favoritism by the Defense Department of big companies over small firms in the granting of Government contracts.

I specifically call to the attention of the Armed Services Committee and of Congress the critical unemployment situation in the South Bend area, and I want to commend my good friend, Congressman MADDEN, for his emphasis at the Rules Committee hearing yesterday on the situation at the Studebaker-Packard plant in South Bend.

I respectfully submit that the investigation of which I speak can develop much valuable information toward the end that areas of substantial unemployment are, whenever practical, awarded more contracts by the Department of Defense.

The human and economic cost of high unemployment is ample justification for awarding more government work to such areas.

Smears and Slogans, and What They Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE M. RHODES OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the current issue of Labor, official organ of the railway unions:

SMEARS AND SLOGANS, AND WHAT THEY MEAN
Congress is open again, the President is talking again, and however short the supply of new jobs in 1959 there's no doubt the year will bring a plenitude of one commodity—words.

Some of the glittering phrases now being tossed around don't shine quite so brightly, however, if you look beneath the chrome. Here are some undraped definitions for a few of these glittering phrases:

Better business climate: This is the slogan worked out by the giant General Electric Co., and used by some manufacturers associations too, to describe their goal in jumping into politics.

This phrase doesn't sound antilabor. But GE President Robert Paxton, speaking to an audience of industrialists recently, was much more frank. "Unless businessmen can build more effective counterforce to the alliance between the labor unions and the welfare-state politicians," he told them, "the political climate for business is going to deteriorate rapidly." For GE, a better climate means one where unions are weak or nonexistent.

Union monopoly power: This refers to the ability of unionized workers to stop work all at once, that is, to strike. A popular phrase among the heads of monopolistic corporations. It's usually coupled with a demand to put unions under the antitrust laws to prevent union monopoly power, and thus outlaw many strikes.

Monopolistic labor bosses: The ones who make use of union monopoly power by leading a strike. Nearly always, to hear the industrialists tell it, the helpless workers are dragooned into striking by the labor

bosses. No mention is made of strike votes by the members.

Union crooks: This refers to the approximately 40 trade union officers against whom Senate and House committees in the last 5 years have uncovered proved or provable dishonest acts. The labor movement has 16,000 full-time paid national and international union officials and 420,000 local union officers.

Citizen Action Committee: Political front group for industrialists. In last year's elections, according to Charles R. Sligh, Jr., executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers: "At our suggestion Citizen Action Committees were formed, not NAM committees but committees of like-minded people who were willing to work, to organize, and to serve at their own local levels."

Conservative: A fine old English word, but not to be applied to Britain's Conservative Party, which supports national health insurance and is too radical for U.S. manufacturers. As used by big business spokesmen, a conservative is a politician who would conserve America's institutions by ripping out all the reforms of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

Radical: What Ford calls Chevrolet's new styling this year. What the Republicans call the Democrats who won last year. Also, any politician opposed to the wrecking job urged by conservatives, as cited above.

Big spender: Any Member of Congress who's not content with voting \$40 billion a year for the military but who also wants adequate funds for the Food and Drug Administration to stop sale of filthy foods and poison drugs, or a few million more for the Wage-Hour Administration to stop employers from cheating on the \$1 an hour minimum wage, or for other measures to protect workers and consumers.

Right to work: This old chestnut is still with us, alas. Five years ago Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell nailed it as follows: "They call these right-to-work laws, but that is not what they really are. In the first place, they do not create any jobs. In the second place, they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitation upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively. . . . Third, they restrict union security and thereby undermine the basic strength of labor organizations."

When you come across any of these glittering phrases, pause just a moment to think what they really mean. Nowadays, as many workers have found to their sorrow, the old nursery rhyme needs rephrasing: "Sticks and stones can break our bones, but words can hurt us too."

Dr. Felix J. Underwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. FRANK E. SMITH OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Felix J. Underwood, who contributed more to Mississippi than any other Mississippian during my lifetime, passed away on Friday, January 9. Although Dr. Underwood had officially retired last June as head of the Mississippi State Board of Health, he was still hard at work in his office when death came so suddenly.

Dr. Underwood left private practice to enter the public health service in 1917.

I can never care for more than 2,000 or 3,000 people as a private physician—

He said.

As a public health physician I can care for millions.

Dr. Underwood's own career proved this to be literally true. It was a popular saying in Mississippi that he had saved a million lives. During his administration deaths from malaria were cut from nearly 1,000 annually to less than 1 per decade. Maternal deaths were reduced from 7 for each 1,000 live births to slightly more than 1. Tuberculosis deaths dropped from 4,000 a year to rare cases. Venereal disease is down 93 percent.

Dr. Underwood received the Laska Foundation Public Health Service award and many other tributes for his great work in the health field. I was especially pleased by the fact that in the year of his retirement the editors of my State voted him the man of the year in Mississippi for 1958.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to include as part of the RECORD, first an excerpt from my book "The Yazoo River," which describes some of Dr. Underwood's work in the Mississippi Delta, and an editorial from the Clarksdale Press Register and from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

EXCERPTS FROM THE YAZOO RIVER

(By Hon. FRANK E. SMITH of Mississippi)

A few farsighted individuals began to protect themselves and their homes from mosquitoes after the Gorgas discoveries became known, but relatively little was accomplished that was not already foreordained in the interest of personal comfort—protection from the bite of the mosquito, not its consequences. The first real attack on malaria made in the delta came only after 1920, when a young man from the hills came down to Jackson to become director of the Mississippi Department of Public Health. Felix J. Underwood and the miracles he has accomplished on a threadbare budget are something of a legend in American public health services, but there is no better record than his attack on malaria in the delta. His first job was to persuade the counties to set up proper public health departments as a means of spreading health education and preventive practices. The people had to be taught that the mosquito bite brought malaria and that the mosquito could be controlled by eliminating his breeding areas. The 1920's were a period when Federal Government agencies were a long way from the idea of major health expenditures in Mississippi; Dr. Underwood had to get his pump-priming money from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Dr. Underwood was convinced that most malarial transmissions were made by night-biting mosquitoes. Homes could be screened to keep the mosquito away from sleeping victims. More than just telling about this, the State board of health established screen-door factories at strategic points in the delta. Strong screen doors were made to fit tenant houses and furnished at cost to plantation owners who would agree to screen the cabin windows, which could be done by merely tacking screen wire across the window casings.

During much of the early period of the delta's history, many of the largest life insurance companies in the country came into the area only for investment purposes. Farm mortgages produced a good income, and

eventually financing of farm operations became part of the overall insurance investment program. Some of these same life insurance companies would not write policies on delta citizens because of the high malaria mortality and other adverse health conditions. In the late 1920's the State board of health submitted the first survey of the accomplishments of the malaria control program, and the insurance companies decided they could take the risk on delatans. Today all special area rate discriminations have been eliminated.

The depression knocked out Dr. Underwood's screen funds, as well as his cooperating planters, but the depression-born WPA offered him a chance for an even more extensive program. For 7 years, beginning in 1935, a malaria control program emphasizing elimination of mosquito breeding places was in operation, with approximately 1,000 WPA workers assigned to the project in the Yazoo-delta area.

WPA ended with World War II, but the war-borne development of DDT as an anti-malarial insecticide brought dividends to the delta. A Federal malaria control program was carried on 5 years after the war. Dr. Underwood allotted all of Mississippi's share of this program for the mass use of DDT as a residual spray in the interior of substandard homes in the delta. The Federal program has been ended, but many delta counties and cities today still carry on a limited spraying program in some fashion, with generally popular results.

The residual spray program, like most of the other malarial control measures, had very important secondary benefits. The spray killed flies and other pests just as it killed mosquitoes. In one county the infant death rate dropped 64 percent, largely as a result of the practical elimination of dysentery and other intestinal disorders.

Cold figures best tell the story of the anti-malarial campaign which the Mississippi State Board of Health has led. In 1920 there were 65,271 reported cases of malaria in 17 delta counties, with death resulting in 477 cases. In 1951, in the same counties, with much better reporting facilities, there were only nine cases of malaria, with no deaths.

The delta feels sure that it has licked malaria, but Dr. Underwood is still on the alert. Malaria is still endemic in the area, and there is always the chance of more aggressive forms of it being brought in by returning troops. The development of rice planting is going to offer opportunities for increased mosquito breeding. Dr. Underwood and his board of health will be watching.

[From the Clarksdale (Miss.) Press Register, Jan. 10, 1959]

DR. FELIX J. UNDERWOOD

The death late yesterday of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, 75-year-old "retired" executive officer of the Mississippi State Board of Health, took from the scene a dedicated public servant.

Dr. Underwood's entire life stands as an enduring monument—a credit to the man, to his profession, and to the people of the State he dearly loved and served with an unselfish devotion.

We use the term "retired" in quotes to describe him, because for a man like Dr. Underwood there could be no such thing as retirement as long as there were battles to be fought in man's never-ending struggle with disease and death. The only kind of retirement possible for him came yesterday when he died suddenly while hard at work in an office which he no longer officially held.

For 10 years after graduating in medicine in 1908 Dr. Underwood practiced at Aberdeen, Miss., growing dissatisfied with private practice because he could "never care for more than a few thousand people." So he joined the State health board in 1917, becoming ex-

ecutive head 7 years later at a time when mass killers and cripples like typhoid, malaria, dysentery, pellagra, infantile paralysis, and other mass infectious diseases still stalked Mississippi like the Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

Under his leadership in public health maternal deaths were reduced from 7 to 1 in every thousand births. Where malaria once claimed a thousand lives a year, there is now scarcely more than one case every decade. Swamps were drained and people educated to screening and sanitation under his guidance. Working with the late, great Dr. Henry Boswell he played his part in developing the sanatorium, and tuberculosis no longer claims 4,000 Mississippians every year. Venereal disease has been reduced 95 percent in the past 30 years, and pellagra, typhoid and infectious dysentery are almost unknown to this generation.

Much recognition but little material reward came to Dr. Underwood. He passed up many opportunities to improve his own position in order to fight the good fight for the general health of the people of this State.

Just last month Dr. Underwood was properly honored as man of the year in Mississippi for 1958, and next week he was to receive one of the first annual awards for distinguished service to the State, presented by the First Federal of Jackson Foundation and administered by the University of Mississippi.

Any recognition extended to Dr. Felix J. Underwood, the man who saved a million lives, was more than deserved.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

DR. FELIX J. UNDERWOOD

On the roster of those who have rendered invaluable service to the people of Mississippi in particular and the Nation in general the name of Dr. Felix J. Underwood will stand very high. When he retired, last June, as executive officer of the State board of health he had held that post for 34 years and had won the right to be called the man who saved a million lives.

Dr. Underwood had battled unceasingly against ailments such as typhoid, malaria, and diphtheria until their ravages among the people of Mississippi had been reduced to a minimum. He was of great aid to the late Dr. Henry Boswell in developing Mississippi's highly effective campaign against tuberculosis. In fact, anything that affected the public health was his concern so that he became outstanding in this field.

In addition to his immediate duties, Dr. Underwood worked with professional organizations and had been president of State, regional, and national associations. He was physician to a nation, that is to say.

It is good to know that United Press International newspaper, radio, and television editors had named Dr. Underwood Mississippi's man of the year for 1958 last month. He had also been selected to receive the University of Mississippi's "Missy" Award for Distinguished Service.

Dr. Underwood so employed his talents and energies that he left the world a far better place than it would have been without him, and the fact is an epitaph among the finest.

Washington Sunday Star of January 11, 1959, concerning the recent change in Republican leadership:

STORY OF G.O.P. REVOLT HAS VARIED CHAPTERS

(By Richard Fryklund)

A succession of election defeats, White House standpatism and lack of dynamic leadership all contributed to the Republican discontent which exploded last week in the removal of JOE MARTIN as G.O.P. leader in the House.

So say those who did the deed. The revolution that ended in the dethronement of Mr. MARTIN and the coronation of CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, was really a composite of smaller revolutions, they say, and the only surprise was that the parts fitted together at the right time and place.

The final piece fell into place only half an hour before the fateful party caucus began last Tuesday—but that piece had been ready for years.

As a starting point, one might go back to a meeting of House Republicans at the end of the 83d Congress. Republicans had the White House, both Houses of Congress and peace, prosperity, and progress. They should have been sitting pretty for the 1954 congressional elections, but many of them thought they weren't.

MORE FIGHT DESIRED

They blamed their leaders for a lack of vigor in presenting the Republican case to the public. They wanted, specifically, more fight from then Speaker MARTIN, less friendly cooperation with SAM RAYBURN and his Democrats.

Mr. MARTIN urged caution and then said, it is reported, that if the Republicans did not win the House again in November, he would let someone else assume the leadership.

The Republicans lost, but Mr. MARTIN did not resign.

Floor leader and heir apparent was Mr. HALLECK. He not only didn't get the minority leadership post, or even the assistant's job, but he was given no post at all. The now-public Martin-Halleck feud was well under way.

The pot simmered while the White House cautioned against change.

ANOTHER BEATING DEVELOPED

"Through the 84th Congress we took a beating again," said Representative BOB WILSON, of California, one of the active leaders in Tuesday's revolt. "We were slow on debate, uncoordinated in our actions. Our floor management gave all the advantages to the Democrats."

Again, in 1956 congressional Republicans lost seats in the election. Again the word circulated on the Hill that Mr. MARTIN would step down. Again the White House advised against change. Again Mr. HALLECK was passed over for the post he thought he had earned.

During the 85th Congress, some of the newer Congressmen tried to provide new vigor on their own hook. A half dozen of them organized a research group and without any active help from Mr. MARTIN, began digging out ammunition with which to arm their colleagues in fights with the Democrats.

This was an inadequate, but significant prelude to more positive action.

LAST NOVEMBER LAST STRAW

When the Congress adjourned, Mr. MARTIN again talked of stepping down or at least naming an assistant leader. But again, no action.

The heavy loss of seats last November was the last straw. Mr. HALLECK told friends he was determined to make an open fight for the minority leadership in January. Large numbers of House Republicans obviously began to think of ways of removing Mr. MARTIN. And White House aides said quietly that the President would take no part in the fight.

New Republican Leader in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record a story from the

There was an uncoordinated seething on the Hill, reported by many correspondents, but taken seriously by almost no one.

An organized movement was still needed. This was provided in mid-December when members of the research group decided to organize.

On December 15 Mr. WILSON, a member of that group, started to call every House Republican in town to invite them to a meeting in his office to discuss the House leadership. He rounded up only 14 men, most of them young eagerbeavers, men who had been in Congress less than 10 years.

NOMINATIONS DIVIDED

They found they agreed only that a new leader was needed. They divided their nominations for the job among Mr. HALLECK, JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., of Michigan; and RICHARD M. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania—a variegated group alike only in their comparative youth and vigor.

But they decided to stick together and drum up more support for a change.

In a canvass of Members they found plenty of sentiment for a change but only one active campaigner for the position—Mr. HALLECK. They decided he would be their man.

Their canvass showed that of the large State delegations, they could carry for Mr. HALLECK, New York and California but would lose Ohio, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois.

The anti-Martin States are significant. They encourage MARTIN forces now to say the old leader was the victim of a Nixon-Dewey-White House plot. The Halleck side says New York and California Congressmen were for him because they liked him—and had no important MARTIN friends to lead them in the opposite direction.

On New Year's eve the Young Turks aligned themselves formally with Mr. HALLECK and went into the fight on the assumption they could win.

On Thursday, January 1, they started committing members to vote for Mr. HALLECK. There were only about 20 active solicitors, but they soon had the 75-odd votes necessary in their pockets—they thought.

On Saturday they sent a spokesman to Mr. MARTIN to tell him he could be defeated and to offer a compromise: Mr. MARTIN was to accept an assistant leader and he was to give up his second high post of chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MARTIN said he knew all about the revolt and he also knew it didn't have the votes. He could win. He wouldn't bargain.

GIVEN ANOTHER CHANCE

On Monday the rebels approached Mr. MARTIN again. This time, they say, he did offer to take an assistant, rotating the job frequently among several Congressmen. This did not satisfy the Halleck side.

Later Monday, after another assurance that the White House was keeping hands off, the rebels met for the final time. About 35 Members went to the Congressional Hotel to plan for the following day's Republican caucus.

They named a strategy committee, headed by JOHN RHODES, of Arizona, and including Mr. WILSON and Mr. BYRNES, JACK WESTLAND, of Washington; MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin; and ELFORD A. ODERBERG, of Michigan. This group decided first to try for a secret ballot. In the open, they reasoned, Mr. MARTIN's personal friends—and the timid—would not vote for a change.

They decided also to ask for a split in the leadership: Mr. HALLECK for floor leader and Mr. BYRNES for chairmanship of the Policy Committee.

MARTIN SLOW TO SEE LIGHT

Monday night Mr. MARTIN still said "No." He said he could win. Most Capitol Hill observers agreed with him.

But Tuesday morning, before the Republican caucus, Mr. MARTIN apparently had his

first doubts. The rebels say he offered a compromise—the same compromise the Halleck group had offered in their first meeting with Mr. MARTIN.

But by this time it was too late. The insurgents felt they could not turn back—and they felt they were winning.

A rebel spokesman called archconservative NOAH MASON, of Illinois, and asked him if he would nominate Mr. HALLECK for the floor leadership. He said he would. He was not a part of the movement but, he said later, he had long wanted a change and would have nominated any one of several men.

All of the pieces were in place. The fateful meeting started a half hour later.

On the issue of secrecy and splitting the leadership jobs, the rebel motion won, 98-50. Since all of the Members knew a secret ballot would help Mr. HALLECK, the rebels thought this was a good count of their strength but on the actual ballot for floor leadership, Mr. MARTIN's friends rallied enough support to hold Mr. HALLECK to 73 votes—1 short of the necessary majority. Mr. MARTIN had 72 votes. One ballot was invalid.

On the second try, the Halleck forces won, 74-70, and as one rebel put it, "We had regretfully repudiated Mr. Republican."

Today there is surprisingly little bitterness. Mr. MARTIN himself is understandably angry and deeply hurt. But even as close a colleague as CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, says both sides should now join ranks and heal up last week's split.

Mr. HALLECK himself has gone to Mr. MARTIN's closest friends with offers of good will and promises of fairness in future party work.

Member after Member summed it up in this phrase last week:

"The king is dead. Long live the king."

A Great American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call attention to a great American family which now resides in Chicago and which perhaps exemplifies the very spirit which has built America.

Alexander and Mary Krol have fought hard to guide their nine children toward one uncompromising goal: to be worthy American citizens, even though Mr. and Mrs. Krol themselves came to this country as immigrants from Poland. I am inserting an excellent article by Mr. Paul Friggens which appeared in the January 11, 1959, issue of the Chicago Tribune about this remarkable family.

I am inserting this article so that we as Americans of second and third generation, and perhaps fourth, fifth, and sixth generation of immigrant parents will be reminded that this Nation today is prosperous, free, and strong only because immigrants from all over the world came here with a spirit of dedication to the dignity of man.

Too often we look upon the immigrant as a second-class citizen or even perhaps an interloper upon our shores. I am convinced that all who read this excellent account of the Krol family and the sacri-

fices this gallant man and woman made to make their children worthy citizens would be inspired with a new respect for these wonderful immigrants who build America.

But most important, I wish that every young American mother and father could read this article and see what great sacrifices—what determination and dedication and great responsibilities—go with parenthood. The Krol family indeed could well serve as a symbol for American parents today.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Krol, Chicagoans of foreign birth, were awarded a citation for distinguished achievement in the field of family living by the Immigrants' Protective League of Chicago.

This particular family happens to have come from Poland but it exemplifies the spirit of immigrants who came here from Italy, Ireland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, the Ukraine, the Scandinavian countries and many other nations.

The article follows:

REPORT CARDS FOR MAMA

(By Paul Friggens)

In Chicago recently a modest pink-cheeked Polish couple in their seventies were hailed as the outstanding example of family life among the city's foreign born. Mama Krol looked down the speakers' table at the civic banquet—Adlai Stevenson and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas were among the dozens of national and civic leaders present—and was overcome. "Never in my life so many look at me like this." She slipped her hand through the arm of her husband, Alex, and stood up to receive the distinguished-achievement award.

This immigrant couple had sent all nine of their children through school and college and had given Chicago four doctors, two engineers, a chemist, an electrical contractor, and a dental nurse. Later Mary Krol found words to explain something of their accomplishment:

"For more than 40 years I save my children's report cards. Always my biggest thrill was when they come home from school with fine report card. But I tell them America is a good country. They must do better because the country is better."

Alex and Mary Krol have made the most of their opportunities and have repaid America many times since the day, 51 years ago, when they took their wedding vows in St. Mary's of Perpetual Help in Chicago and entered on their new life in the United States. Alex was a skilled cabinetmaker; Mary, pretty and dark eyed, a seamstress, who earned 17 cents an hour in a garment factory. She walked 20 blocks to and from work daily to save two 5-cent car fares.

Like most immigrants at about the turn of the century, the newlyweds had no place to live except among their own people in the segregated foreign section. In this polyglot neighborhood—of which the Krols are still proud—their first four children were born—Henry, Walter, and the twins, Adam and Edward. The young mother wheeled her babies along the wooden sidewalks and dreamed of the day when her children's education would begin. Alex had to work hard for small pay. Thinking of her own pitifully poor education, Mary prayed, "God help me to raise mine different."

And so began the story of the Krols and their report cards.

Henry was the first to bring home the wondrous piece of paper. Mama had never seen one before and had difficulty deciphering the marks and symbols. "You sure it says good?" she pressed her first grader.

Henry nodded. Mama proudly showed the card to Alex.

When Henry completed the eighth grade Mama was triumphant. The Krols dressed in their homemade best and sat up front for the exercises at St. Mary's. The children wore a colored ribbon to denote promotion. Henry sported one, too. Mama nudged Alex: "Now, you see, our Henry is as smart as anybody."

In time there were other babies—Alex Jr., Zenon, and Leonard. The cabinet maker scraped together enough for a downpayment on a modest bungalow in the same neighborhood. By now Papa was making \$20 a week, and Mama supplemented this by sewing at night under the new gas light.

With Henry in high school and six other young Krols following him, Mama became an authority on report cards. As the children raced home with them, she examined each card in turn. "Good. See what Walter has done, and Eddy. Now, Adam, you do it, too." One of the Krol sons told me: "Mama was always raising our sights." But she never censured because of a poor grade. "Do the best you can," she urged. At year's end Mama kept the precious cards in a cookie jar and reviewed them.

Report card day was always an occasion for celebration. For the best grades Mama awarded a new shirt, or mittens or shoes, whichever the children needed most. Then everybody scrambled for a special treat—Mama's homemade Polish pastry. Sometimes while the children were eating, she pictured how they would all grow up to make their way in the professions. "You should get good report card, and you can be anything."

Study nights for seven children became a highly organized affair. As soon as supper was over, Mama cleared the big kitchen table and work began in earnest. Papa and Mama did homework, too—Alex taking on extra jobs in his carpenter shop and Mary singing over her secondhand sewing machine. Probably no family in Throop Street in those days was happier. Neighbors recall Mama's favorite saying: "God is good to us. We are strong to work, and such a good country to raise children and make friend."

By 1930 Henrietta and Arthur, their two youngest, had arrived and Alex now had nine children to support. Then the depression struck and Alex was among the first to lose his job. He walked the streets for months, job hunting. When he dragged himself home one night he learned that they were going to lose their home because they couldn't keep up the payments. He had paid \$3,000 and only owed a few hundred dollars, but a mortgage was foreclosing on several Throop Street homes.

Papa and mama discussed having the older boys quit school and work to save the home. At that time there were three in college. Mama decided, "They can take home away but never education. Alex, we keep boys in school."

The Krols moved their scanty furnishings (including a set of Shakespeare) to an \$18 a month, second floor walkup flat in a seedy neighborhood. The children slept three in a bed, helped lug coal up two flights of stairs. In Chicago's bitter winter the Krols' only floor covering was newspapers—mama good naturedly called them Polish carpets.

Now the entire family pooled its efforts and carried on. Alex was able to pick up odd jobs and mama sewed heroic hours. The boys hustled as grocery clerks, delivery boys, and newspaper carriers. Leonard Krol recalls: "When we started out on our paper routes at 3 o'clock on winter mornings, mama put hot baked potatoes in our pockets to warm our hands."

Walter was the first of the family to earn a degree. He was graduated in architectural engineering. Mama's brown eyes still get misty when she talks about it. "I tell you

it was a miracle. Come night before Walter register and still we need \$50 to pay schooling. I go down on my knees and pray. And you know, next morning a neighbor come and squeeze \$50 in my hand."

Not all of the neighbors were as charitable. A few ridiculed mama for keeping her oldest sons in school when they might be earning, and street gangs jeered the studious Krol children. Sometimes the Krol youngsters went to school with mustard sandwiches, while the family's mainstays were potato pancakes, Polish dumplings, and stew.

Mama Krol looks back on this period proudly. "We were happy. Always they bring home good report cards. It was better than money."

With three boys at home doing college work now, Mama arranged a double study shift. While the younger Krols did their homework, the future medics and engineers slipped off to bed. Then when the house quieted down they got up to study until the early hours of the morning. Mama, the alarm clock, stayed up ironing, sewing, or baking. Some nights she never went to bed. These study nights became the talk of the neighborhood.

Come weekends and holidays, Mama relaxed the study discipline. The family gathered around the piano and sang, and the drab flat became a festive place. The Krol children, encouraged to bring home their friends, sometimes invited a dozen guests. Mama cheerfully set the table three times. "I always know what kind of company my children keep. No saying, 'I'm going out' as they do these days and then disappear." The Krol home welcomed Japanese, Jewish, Italian, Ukrainian, Irish, and Slavic friends of the children.

In the late thirties Papa finally found steady work. Putting the rest of the children through school proved a bit easier. And now every June found a Krol graduating, and sometimes two or three—from grammar school, high school, or college. By 1940 the determined couple had seven of their nine children through college.

The Krols saw four sons off to war, while two others gave outstanding service to their country. Edward joined as a surgeon in the Air Force Medical Corps; Henry, who used to sit up half the night studying languages, served as an interpreter for the military government in Germany; Zenon was in the Army Dental Corps in Japan; and Arthur in the Army dental school. Engineer Walter worked on the Manhattan project, helping to build the atom bomb, and Adam was called to do top secret chemical work for the Government.

"It was most happiness day," Mama recalls when, at the war's end, all returned to Paulina Street.

In 1947 Arthur finished dental school, and Papa and Mama Krol had their final victory. Mama looked wistfully at the cookie jar with the accumulation of nine children's report cards. "Those best days of all. What I give now to have few more report card." As a parting reward, the children arranged to move Mama and Papa out of Paulina Street into a newer section of Chicago.

It had been an unbelievable struggle. For years Alex and Mary never afforded a 20-cent carfare to the Loop. They never went to a movie.

They never bought an automobile and drive none today.

But there were bright memories, too. Senior prom night, for instance, when the twins had saved only enough money to rent one tuxedo. Eddy rushed home mid-evening, repressed the suit, and Adam donned it and took his turn at the affair. There was Sunday when the family faithfully attended church, but in twos and threes so as to change coats with each other. Mama was proud that there was always a Krol as altar boy.

And there was Papa's incredible Christmas tree.

Papa Krol always waited until Christmas Eve when the tree sales were over and he could get a leftover tree for nothing. Then, picking up loose branches, he went home and glued them into the trunk. It turned out the most beautiful Christmas tree in the neighborhood. Afterward, the family shared the sacred Polish wafer, opiatek, and wished each other God's care for the coming year.

Thus a Polish Immigrant family grew up in the Chicago tenements and found lights to live by. "The miracle is that none of them turned out to be delinquents," declares an authority who knows the district well.

But it was never a miracle to Papa and Mama Krol.

This last year brought crowning events for the Polish couple. They celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary with their 9 children and 19 grandchildren. Mama flew to Poland to unite with brothers she had not seen since sailing to America 52 years ago. "I came back glad to kneel and kiss ground in the United States." And the Immigrants' Service league, foremost organization of foreign born in Chicago, nominated the Krols for the best example of family life among Chicago's immigrants. Papa and Mama were whisked off to a plush Loop hotel for the recognition ceremonies. Waiting in the audience were proud sons and daughter.

Mama shushed Papa in order to hear Adlai Stevenson. He was reading the children's list of achievements—Edward, senior surgeon and president of the staff of Holy Cross Hospital; Zenon, senior oral surgeon in the same hospital; Adam, fellow of the American Institute of Chemistry; Arthur, professor of dentistry at Loyola University Dental School, and down the list.

Stevenson concluded: "All I have to do is look at you and your family and I am convinced that if the United States ever loses its vitality, history will fix the date as May 1921—the year Congress passed restricted immigration quotas."

Now Justice Douglas gave the final salute. Addressing the honored couple, he told them:

"You are part of the American dream. You have been as distinctly human, as markedly individualistic in thought and achievement as Einstein, Fermi, or Toscanini."

Alex and Mary were too moved to reply. But, as a Chicago newspaper said, it didn't matter, because the standing ovation would have drowned out any thank you's.

When it was all over, reporters crowded around the Krols and Mama summed up their formula for families everywhere.

"Go to church every Sunday.
"Don't let them get sassy.
"And make sure they bring home good report cards."

The Question of German Reunification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most realistic articles that has come to my attention on the difficult question of German reunification is the article in today's Washington Post by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I believe that this distinguished commentator's views on the German question will be of interest to the Members of Congress. I include the

article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1959]

MR. DULLES MOVES

(By Walter Lippmann)

At his press conference on Tuesday, Mr. Dulles opened the door to negotiations on the future of Germany. He was scrupulously careful to say that he was not now negotiating with Mr. Mikoyan. But he has made it possible for Mr. Mikoyan to report back to Moscow that there is a desire on both sides to get together and talk.

Mr. Dulles did this by making two points. Neither of these points is entirely new. But the emphasis upon them, considering the circumstances, gives them a new importance. The first point is that while the formula of reunification by free elections is the "agreed formula" and, while we think it is "a natural method," he "wouldn't say that it is the only method by which reunification could be accomplished." The second point is his acceptance of the principle that for a reunited Germany there must be military guarantees to reassure the Soviet Union—"if there is going to be any reunification of Germany, it has got to be under conditions which take into account realistically some of those very elemental, primitive facts of life."

The record shows that the point which Mr. Dulles made about free elections was first made in our note to the Soviet Union on September 30 of last year, and was reiterated in our note of December 31. For some months at least we have not regarded free elections as the necessary first step to German reunification. And the record shows also that we have long recognized that if the Soviet Union withdraws from a reunified Germany, it is entitled to have military guarantees against the possibility of German aggression.

Nevertheless, it is important that Mr. Dulles emphasized these two points on the eve of his second round of talks with Mr. Mikoyan. It was evident at the press conference that he was acutely aware that there would be a reaction in Bonn, possibly in London and other West European capitals. To soften this reaction, he dwelt on the thoroughness of our consultations with our allies, and he spoke at length on his agreement with and admiration for Dr. Adenauer's conception of European policy.

But his remarks that free elections are not the only method by which reunification can be accomplished have, as the dispatches show, aroused Dr. Adenauer. It remains to be seen whether once again, as on several previous occasions when Mr. Dulles tried not to be entirely inflexible, Dr. Adenauer will compel Mr. Dulles to retract and reverse himself.

The real question about free elections is whether they must come first, whether they are the necessary first step to German reunification. Those who hold this view are, in effect, demanding the liquidation of the East German state and the absorption of the East Germans into the West German state. The trouble with this view is that it is absolutely impossible to achieve it in any foreseeable time. For it demands an unconditional surrender of the Soviet position in the whole of Germany, and unconditional surrender by the Soviet Union is a pipedream.

I think it is not unfair to say that those who demand free elections as the first step to German reunification are not urgently interested in bringing about reunification. Some of them want to believe, hoping against hope, that the Soviet Union will somehow collapse. Many of them do not want to have to face the enormously complicated problems which a reunified Germany will pose. In the status quo with a divided Germany there are very powerful interests which would prefer not to be disturbed.

Thus, for example, a reunified Germany with free elections would be far more to the left than Adenauer's Germany. For another example, the whole fascinating structure of the West European political and economic community which Mr. Dulles spoke of would have serious problems if it had to digest the 17 million East Germans. For still another example, a reunified Germany could not long remain the camping ground of the NATO armies, and this would raise the problem of where the NATO forces should be stationed.

Against all these difficulties there has, however, to be weighed the grave and incalculable dangers of the continuing partition of Germany. For, sooner or later, there will be uprisings against the Soviet hold on East Germany and on Poland, and if there are these uprisings, we may all be sucked into the struggle. To avert that it is necessary to proceed to the reunification of Germany which, if I understood him correctly, is what Mr. Dulles has decided that he must try to do.

If that is our purpose, there is no reason why German reunification should not begin with a provisional regime—that of a dual state with some common political institution—under a pact or constitution which promised that there should be a gradual integration over a period of years, culminating in a free election to elect a constituent assembly, which would form an all-German state.

This is only one among innumerable conceivable ways of bringing about reunification of the two Germans. The crucial question is whether on the Soviet side and on our side there is in fact a genuine will to make one German state.

Segregation by Sex Might Ease Fears of Racial Inter-marriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the December 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This editorial presents an interesting theory that perhaps integration of races but segregation of sexes might prove to be the answer to our school segregation problem. I felt this should be brought to the attention of the House since, in my opinion, any possible solution to this issue should be thoroughly considered:

SEGREGATION BY SEX MIGHT EASE FEARS OF RACIAL INTER-MARRIAGE

An obstacle to school integration in the South is local resistance to mingling white and Negro youngsters of both sexes in institutions that are social as well as educational—as coeducational public schools are.

Many southerners consider this the basic stumbling block. However one judges that, the issue bulks large in the southern mind. To remove it might help clear the air and enable all parties, North as well as South, to make more sense on the subject.

Here and there southerners trying to observe the Supreme Court's "all deliberate speed," are experimenting with various methods of integration—for instance, starting it in the first grade instead of high school, the most sensitive area. So far, this

range of integration experiments is missing one trick that could eliminate much of the sex angle from a situation already difficult enough.

Integrate the races, but segregate the sexes. Put all the boys, both white and Negro, in one set of schools; put all the girls, both white and Negro, in another set.

The scheme is not original. The late Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, suggested it a good while ago. Every year or so somebody else dreams it up and mentions it publicly. Tennessee has passed a law permitting school boards to integrate in this fashion. Macon, Ga., revised a school building program with this in mind. But at the opening of schools last September no place had actually tried it. Perhaps they fear that the Supreme Court might discover sociological support for the idea that boys separated from girls, and vice versa, develop inferiority complexes of serious dimensions.

However, separate educational institutions for boys and girls are a long-standing American tradition still persisting in most private and parochial schools and in a few public high schools. Australia, committed to this system, considers that it does much to keep down juvenile delinquency and premature romancing.

The success of the Armed Forces in mingling southern whites and Negroes indicates that somewhat younger southern white boys and Negro boys could somehow make out in the same schools. The arrangement satisfies the Supreme Court's requirements by giving youngsters equal access to the same tax-supported facilities, teachers, courses, and so on, regardless of race. It answers the formula of Mr. Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, that the Negro can go along with any criteria for grouping youngsters for education—I.Q., aptitude, achievement, health, cleanliness—except one, race.

True, a two-ply school system costs more than a single-ply one. But this consideration never moved the South to revise the two-ply white-Negro system permitted, up to 1954, by the Supreme Court's (1896) doctrine of "separate but equal." If segregation by sex proved to be the answer, the South's education dollar would at least be buying her conformity with what now stands as the law.

Communist-Inspired Smear Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent series of scurrilous attacks against the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its highly respected Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

I particularly commend to your attention the underlying forces behind this patterned campaign of vilification and abuse.

For more than a quarter century, Mr. Hoover and the FBI have been targets of malicious smear campaigns launched by subversive organizations. Communists and other unsavory groups, through distortion and deceit, have directed a wealth of misinformation, innuendoes, and smears against the FBI. But, in the light

of its past achievements it is, of course, not too difficult to understand why. Like a stuck pig, they have had good reason to squeal, and are out to get the FBI.

Mr. Hoover is a public servant who has given a lifetime of dedicated effort to unselfish public service. He has dedicated every legitimate resource to an unrelenting war upon the criminal underworld and against those whose ideologies are contrary to our American way of life.

Those whose wish it has been, and is, to unlawfully overthrow our Government are Mr. Hoover's sworn enemies. We all know this. And they leave no stone unturned in their vicious efforts to hamper his effective work. Their malicious smears, however, go on and on.

In 1940 there was a concerted wave of Communist-inspired criticism denouncing the FBI as "an American Gestapo" and a "threat to freedom." Communist demands were heard for a "sweeping investigation of the FBI."

Again in 1947, the Communists spearheaded a vicious drive to slander this agency and undermine public confidence in its operations. Behind this all-out attack were the fear and hatred of subversive groups for the then newly established Government Employees Loyalty Program, a measure clearly designed to strengthen our national security. The attack failed.

In the late 1940's, and early 1950's the FBI's investigative machinery dealt crippling blows to the Soviet spy system here in America. It was during this time, you will remember, that Judith Coplon, Valentin Gubitchev and Harry Gold were arrested and exposed; the Rosenbergs were convicted, and later executed, as atomic spies.

Following these successes, Director Hoover and his staff were subjected to renewed castigation and abuse. Through hate propaganda, and the technique of the big lie, efforts were made to dupe an unsuspecting public into the ridiculous belief that J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were the menace to the citizenry of our Nation, not the Communists and their allies, the pseudo-liberals.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has admirably weathered periodic storms of Communist-directed scorn and contempt. Its record of past accomplishments speaks for itself. But in taking a stand for the preservation of the American way of life, Mr. Hoover has invited upon himself the wrath of experts adroit and skilled in the art of character assassination.

In more recent months, this attack has assumed a well-organized pattern of smear, slander, and hate. The leopard has not changed its spots: As in bygone years, the current hate Hoover campaign is implicit in the forces of the Communist Party, U.S.A., its willing dupes, its sympathizers, and its respectably cloaked apologists and pseudo-liberals.

"THE NATION"

The initial impetus to this rabid anti-FBI drive was sparked by the Communist-line magazine, "The Nation." Its entire issue of October 18, 1958, some 60 pages, is devoted exclusively to a highly distorted and biased attack upon J. Ed-

gar Hoover and the FBI by Fred J. Cook, a writer who has earned the unenviable distinction of being an apologist for Alger Hiss. This article contains many of the same contradictions, falsehoods, and innuendoes characteristic of those hurled at the FBI by Max Lowenthal and others of similar ilk. The Ford Foundation's Fund For the Republic, a tax-exempt organization, was the largest single advertiser in this smear issue of "The Nation."

"The Nation" is edited by Carey McWilliams, a character whose record relating to Communist Party activities extends over a period of more than 20 years. These facts speak for themselves.

COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A.

Blistering criticism, nurtured by a feeling of bitter resentment and hate, of those who would zealously defend the country against its internal enemies, has always been, and still is, an unceasing Communist Party tactic. Yet the very ruthlessness and violence of these attacks are a grudging acknowledgment of FBI vigilance in its relentless fight against the treacherous gules of Communist subversion and intrigue.

One of its latest salvos appeared in the official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., "The Worker," on November 16, 1958, in an article brazenly captioned "Edgar Hoover's Four Decades of Fight Against Peace."

But let us not be misled. Today, the American people are being fed the phoney propaganda line that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is just another legitimate political organization. Of course, what it really is—is just what it has always been: A Soviet-dominated link in the international Communist conspiracy, dedicated to the ultimate forcible destruction and overthrow of the U.S. Government.

Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, himself restated this aim in a television interview in June 1957, when he boasted your grandchildren would live under the heel of Communist socialism.

EMERGENCY CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

Elaborately linked to the current conspiratorial chain of smear forces are the many fronts exploited by the Communist Party, U.S.A. to convey insidious propaganda designed to discredit truth. They are "the marks" of the conspiratorial con-game swindlers: the willing dupes of the Communist "roper" and "inside man."

These are the individuals whose sly and slanted writings oppose urgently needed internal security measures; present the menace of communism as a myth of hysteria, urge that we tolerate the subversive acts of Communists because the Communist Party is just another political movement; and whose outraged cries have been joined in the attack against everyone and everything related to the exposure of the Communist conspiracy.

It was back in September 1957, you may still recall, that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee started its campaign of vilification to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Immediately, the efforts of these Commu-

nist stooges were broadened to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Their motives were all too obvious. The record will show that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was designated a Communist-front organization by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont are its officiating heads.

For some years the name "Harvey O'Connor" has been on the Nation's list of editors as a staff contributor. It was this individual to whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities referred when it stated:

Harvey O'Connor was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Benjamin Gitlow, the Communist Party's former secretary general, in sworn testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on September 11 and October 17, 1939.

And this same committee, in its report on Lamont, states: "Corliss Lamont has been one of the foremost apologists for the Soviet Union in the United States," and then factually recounts his association with many Communist-front organizations.

NEW YORK POST

Next to join forces with the "hate Hoover" campaign was the New York Post whose efforts are being directed by James Wechsler, its editor, a self-admitted former member of the subversive Young Communist League.

The New York Post has probably published more character-assassination attacks on J. Edgar Hoover than any other paper except the Daily Worker. It now has assigned a staff of reporters in the United States and abroad in a farflung attempt to dig up dirt for a professed objective study of the FBI.

We should note that James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, in the 1930's was on the National Committee of the Young Communist League, and was also formerly an editor of the Nation.

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

The latest blast in the current series of vicious attacks to discredit Mr. Hoover and the FBI was launched on December 8, 1958, by the Militant, a weekly organ of the Socialist Workers Party, in a smear bearing the warped caption, "J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of Thought-Police."

But, here again, let us not forget that the Socialist Workers Party is a militant revolutionary group advocating the immediate violent overthrow of our Government. It is an organization which was cited by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450.

Over the years, the attitude toward law enforcement of American Communists, leftwingers, and those skilled in concealing foul and despicable acts behind the fifth amendment, has been one of deliberate hostility, coldly calculated to smear, slander, and hate. Their repeated attacks against the FBI are not rooted in a spirit of honest criticism and fact.

But we do know this: Their hostile smears are based upon wishful thinking. They want the FBI abolished. Therefore, they ridicule and vilify its personnel. They condemn its lofty purposes,

revile its methods, and rail at its lawful techniques employed to cope with their trickery. In essence, Communist hatred of democratic law enforcement is rooted in the fact that our system is a strong bastion against violent revolution by a minority of political gangsters. Because it is such a barrier, it must be destroyed.

The Communists have raised no audible objection to a system in which the whims of each new tyrant and his hierarchy become the law of the land. The citizen who survives the torture chambers, brainwashers, and firing squads is consigned to a slower death in the slave-labor camps. In the sardonic and semantic lexicon of the Communist conspiracy, this system is called the people's police.

The individual who does not recognize Communist techniques may find himself providing grist for the Red Fascist propaganda mill.

The sinister chain of smears currently being leveled against the FBI prompted Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion to issue a statement in which he recently declared, in part, and I quote:

It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leader as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country. . . . The American Legion believes that the American people will not permit their justified confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI to be compromised by scurrilous distortions and half-truths. Nor will they allow irresponsible journalism to blind them to the need for continued FBI investigation of the dangerous Communist conspiracy in this country.

I feel that this statement by the national commander of one of America's foremost patriotic organizations very well summarizes the issue: "FBI smears do not stick."

Public Demands More, Less at the Same Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pasadena Star-News dated December 12, 1958, written by Irving Fang:

PUBLIC DEMANDS MORE, LESS AT THE SAME TIME

As our Nation has grown, the role of government, especially the Federal Government, has expanded until today it reaches into corners of our national life undreamed of a century ago.

Whether this is an overall good trend or bad trend depends on the honest attitude of the American people toward it. The public cannot very well condemn burgeoning Government and in the same breath demand more services from it. In short, our Government is what we ask of it.

Herbert V. Prochnow, vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, in a speech to the American Bankers Association, penetratingly analyzed the double-faced demand for more government and less government at the same time, a demand which is voiced louder and louder as the national budget grows.

He said, in part:

"The Government has now become a vital factor in most of the Nation's major economic decisions, whether they involve business, agriculture, or labor. Furthermore, there seems to be a widespread willingness to have Government assume this role.

"If a strike threatens to tie up a great industry for weeks, the Government is expected to prevent it. If the dockworkers strike and close a port, we turn to the Government for relief. If housing construction declines, the Government is expected to arrange easier credit, lower downpayments and other remedies. If we seek slum clearance, we ask the Government to provide a large part of the funds required. If some businesses grant exceptionally easy installment terms, other businesses believe Government should correct the trade practices of their competitors by installment regulations.

"If metal prices fall, there are instant demands for larger Government stockpiles, regardless of whether present stockpiles are considered adequate for national defense. If the price of an agricultural product falls, there are demands that the price be supported even though large stockpiles result. If drought burns up some farmlands, we expect the Government to deal with the problem. . . .

"We expect Government to provide security for tens of millions of us in old age. We expect Government to determine the number of hours we work, our minimum wages, and our unemployment compensation. We expect Government to provide a vast expansion of our highway system. We seek larger contributions from Government to improve our particular harbor or river.

"Some of these requests are desirable functions of Government. Others are not. We contribute time and money to an infinite number of organizations which seek to get something from the Government or urge Government to expand its activities. In countless areas we now turn to the Government where we did not do so a generation ago. . . .

"We condemn the expanding role of Government over the world, but we encourage it here. With one hand we work to reduce the role of Government in our economic life. With the other hand we work even harder to increase it. We ask for a reduction in Government expenditures, but not where it would affect our business.

"We demand that Government expense be cut, but not for Federal projects in our communities. On one day, we write our Congressman to reduce Government expenses and taxes. The next day we write urging him to bring home the Federal bacon to our communities."

"Nuf said?"

Proposal To Create a Pan American Parliamentary Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution expressing

the sense of Congress that a Pan American Parliamentary Association—PAPA—should be established and that the United States be authorized to participate in the parliamentary conferences of such association.

All of us are well aware of the need to establish the greatest possible measure of understanding, harmonious relations and cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Despite our good neighbor policy of the past quarter of a century, we know that much resentment and dissatisfaction persist in Latin America with U.S. policy toward those countries. Much of this dissatisfaction, of course, is stirred up in recent years by Communist elements who seek to create chaotic conditions among our neighbors to the south in the hope of gaining a foothold in this hemisphere.

The truth of the matter is that the Latin Americans desperately need our help in their efforts to attain a higher standard of living, in the exploration and exploitation of their natural resources, in economic growth, in expanding their agriculture and industry, and most especially in giving them an equal voice and the right of joint participation in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere and in the formulation of hemispheric policy.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to visit several Latin American countries during part of November and December 1958 in connection with my joint resolution on a Pan American Parliamentary Association. A full report of my visit there, as well as my views and findings, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1959, pages A61-64.

It is high time that we look upon the peoples of Latin America not only as good neighbors but also as our best friends, which they are. Here we have a wonderful opportunity to regain some of the ground we have lost in other parts of the world, our moral position and our international prestige in the eyes of all nations, by stressing democratic principles and championing human rights. We can do so by offering the fullest measure of aid possible in order to achieve genuine friendship and inter-American support. We must prove to them that they stand to gain more by aligning themselves with the United States in order to protect their political freedom, their national independence, their economic gains, and the security of the whole hemisphere.

Fortunately, we are in a position to be of invaluable assistance to Latin America in many ways, particularly in helping them with their economic and development problems. The standard of living in those countries is extremely low. The average per capita income for all of Latin America is reported to be only \$312 per year, compared with over \$2,500 average in the United States. We must help them raise this standard of living through economic development and expansion, through increased production and consumption, and by increasing their purchasing power in domestic markets.

The more we help Latin America achieve these goals, the more we too shall benefit in the long run because of increased trade relations. Even now our trade with Latin America is greater than with any other area in the world. About one-third of our imports come from this area and about one-fourth of our exports go there. They sell to us half or more of such products as copper, coffee, raw wool, petroleum, and other products, while the value of our exports to them is approaching the \$5 billion mark annually. Thus, by aiding them in their economic growth and in attaining a higher standard of living we can look forward to increased trade relations which should prove mutually advantageous.

What we need today is greater unity of purpose and a program of action which, I believe, should and could best be done on a people-to-people basis. It is for this very reason that I have proposed the establishment of a Pan American Parliamentary Association. My original resolution containing this proposal was offered to Congress in the summer of 1958 when the hectic period of adjournment was approaching and no time left for consideration. Nevertheless, within a few short weeks several of our leaders in Congress approved the idea in principle, it was similarly approved in principle by statesmen from 12 of the 20 Latin American countries, and the Department of State encouraged me to undertake my visit to several South American countries to discuss the proposal in detail with leading legislators there.

Following my visit I reached the conclusion that the idea proposed in my resolution is very timely and very urgent. Thereupon, I revised it and expanded it on the basis of my findings. The resolution proposes the establishment of a Pan American Parliamentary Association which is to meet annually, or as frequently as deemed necessary, in the different capitals of the Western Hemisphere. It is to be attended by the parliamentary representatives of the 21 American nations, since they are the direct representatives of the people having been elected by them as their spokesmen.

The purposes of the association are set forth in the resolution in the form of a 12-point program, which may be expanded upon whenever necessary. This program is as follows:

1. Create better understanding and foster closer personal contact among the elected legislators of the 21 American nations.
2. Stimulate greater public knowledge of, and making more effective, the Organization of the American States (OAS) and other agencies designed to promote the best interests of the American nations.
3. Expand the educational and scientific exchange programs.
4. Develop closer cultural relations throughout the hemisphere.
5. Improve trade relations and reduce the barriers to trade between countries in the Western Hemisphere.
6. Encourage large-scale tourism between the Americas.
7. Help to provide relief in times of disaster and other emergencies.

8. Seek means to dispose of surplus commodities of all sorts in the various countries in order to help their economies.

9. Help to raise the standard of living throughout Latin America.

10. Aid in the development of plans for the sound economic expansion of the Latin American countries, including U.S. public and private investment in their economic development.

11. Assist them in modernization of their agricultural methods.

12. Seek solutions to other problems of common concern to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

My resolution further calls for U.S. participation in the Pan American Parliamentary Association and the appointment of 18 Members of Congress from both Houses and both political parties as the delegation of the United States to the conferences of the Association. The U.S. delegation is to submit a report to Congress each year on the activities and decisions of the Association.

I am convinced that if the elected representatives of the 21 American nations could meet in person to discuss pressing problems of mutual interest to the entire hemisphere, much could be achieved in the way of better understanding and harmonious relations. We must stop taking Latin America for granted. We must develop a positive and direct people-to-people approach in our relationship, treatment and dealings with our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I believe sincerely that my resolution is the key to such improved relations of the future, only we must bring that future closer—not some distant tomorrow, but today. I hope and trust that the idea to set up a Pan American Parliamentary Association, as proposed in my resolution, will soon become a reality. Let us be the first to pave the way.

Amendment Offered to Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, Congress worked its will in regard to Federal aid to highways by passing H.R. 10426 which was an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, and provided for an additional 2 years for advance purchase of rights-of-way. Notwithstanding this fact, a later enactment which was in essence a codification of basic highway law passed and became law. Thus the amendment introduced by me and passed by Congress was nullified by the subsequent passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. In the final form of the codification of the highway legislation into title 23, United States Code, which was a very essential bill and

one which I actively supported, my amendment was not embodied.

It is my desire in reintroducing this measure to have Congress reinstate its approval of the extended term of 2 years so that we may take full advantages of this program and to make the benefits more effective. Last year when this amendment was first introduced I pointed out to the House that additional time is justified and needed between the purchase, not only for construction of the Interstate System but also on primary, secondary, and rural and urban highways, of rights-of-way and actual construction.

The present law provides that a 5-year period is the outside limit of time between the fiscal year in which a request for reimbursement of the cost of acquired rights-of-way is made and commencement of actual construction. Under the present provisions the States are seriously hampered from purchasing rights-of-way unless construction is definitely programmed to begin within the 5-year period. In many States such as Florida, where the cost of rights-of-way is daily increasing and plans for substantial highway construction are being made far in advance of the actual beginning of work this provision is not as fully helpful as was intended.

I am in fact, by introducing my amendment, asking Congress again to do that which was intended to be accomplished on August 6, 1958. Due to provisions in codification of highway legislation in United States Code, title 23, repealing all other previous passed legislation, my bill approved August 6 and becoming Public Law 85-597 of the 85th Congress was repealed by this code which was approved on August 28, 1958.

It being the obvious will of Congress that the rights-of-way time limit be extended from 5 to 7 years, I trust immediate action on my bill will be forthcoming. This being the case, I understand that the Bureau of Roads is holding in abeyance, but on active basis, State requests coming within the 5- to 7-year extension in anticipation of such favorable congressional action.

Broadening the Market for State and Local Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with Mr. HERLONG, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, in reintroducing a bill to broaden and relieve the market for State and local bonds. It will accomplish this by attracting investment companies, both regulated and unregulated, with their ever-increasing pools of investable funds, into the so-called municipal bond mar-

ket. The incentive is that they may distribute or pass through the tax-exempt interest to their shareholders. At the present time the shareholders can invest in these bonds directly, but their corporate funds are effectively sealed off from the market by the fact that the interest becomes fully taxable when distributed to the shareholders.

This bill, except for minor refinements, is the same as H.R. 8702, which I introduced in the last session. Earlier in the last session I had introduced a very narrow passthrough bill, H.R. 4380, which applied only to regulated investments and only if they were 90 percent invested in tax-exempt bonds. Thereafter I became convinced that the narrow bill would extend negligible help to State and local governments. The present bill, however, will provide substantial, essential, and inexpensive assistance by really broadening the market for State and local bonds.

I want to emphasize that we are dealing with an existing exemption. This bill makes that exemption more effective from the point of view of the issuers of tax-exempt bonds. For that reason, the legislation is actively supported by leading national organizations in the municipal, county, and educational spheres, such as the American Municipal Association, National Association of County Officials, and National Education Association.

I have been advised by a prominent economist, Mr. Harry L. Severson, that leaders in the field of municipal finance have been worried for some time about the failure of markets for tax-exempt bonds to increase as rapidly as the supply, and that more recently the underwriters who handle these bonds have been discussing most seriously how and where the ever-increasing volume of new issues can be placed.

The legislation is unique in that it grants substantial assistance to local governments at little, if any, cost to the Federal Government. For this particular reason the legislation has the support of such diverse organizations as the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

State and local governments are finding it increasingly difficult to finance the growing volume of new capital improvements which are required to meet the needs of our expanding economy. Traditionally, large capital improvements, with the exception of highways, have been financed largely by borrowing. Since all of the costs of government are rising, there is little reason to hope that it will be feasible for these jurisdictions to meet a significantly greater proportion of the cost of capital improvements on a pay-as-you-go basis in the foreseeable future. The problems of financing capital improvements are made more difficult by the fact that new bond issues do not sell as well as they did a few years ago.

During World War II the supply of new tax-exempt bonds was not only relatively small but it was contracting at the very time that the demand for tax exemption was expanding due to raises in

the income tax rates. The result, of course, was an extremely favorable market for State and local bonds. As the volume of new issues increased following the close of World War II, this situation has gradually changed until it is now the investors who enjoy most of the advantages at the bargaining table.

Under existing law the large and growing pools of investable funds held by investment companies are effectively excluded from the municipal bond market by the fact that tax-free interest is converted to taxable dividends when paid out to the shareholders of these companies. The need for a broader market is even more pressing now than when I first introduced this bill in July 1957. The volume of new offerings of these securities continues to mount. In 1957 a total of \$7 billion came to the market which was practically the same as the previous high reached in 1954 when new toll road bonds were at the height of their popularity. In 1958 a new high of approximately \$7.5 billion was reached in spite of the tight money conditions in the last two quarters of the year which undoubtedly caused the postponement of some new offerings.

What is more, there is every reason to expect that the volume of new offerings will continue to increase. Our growing economy will make it necessary for State and local governments to install many new capital improvements all of which must be financed. The widely quoted Severson projections show a steady increase in the volume of new offerings. According to these projections the volume in 1959 will be above \$8 billion, increasing to more than \$16 billion in 1968. This represents a lot of bonds to place with investors. The market is choking up periodically on the present volume and this gives us some idea of the task ahead in finding permanent outlets in 10 years for a flow more than twice as large as the greatest we have known.

The enactment of the passthrough would be of material assistance in placing these new issues. Investment companies not only hold large reservoirs of funds but they are growing steadily. An important advantage of the passthrough is the fact that it would open up these new markets without upsetting existing institutional arrangements. Furthermore, the cost to the Federal Treasury would be nominal. If the aspirations of the people for new improvements are to be realized, the volume of new issues must continue to grow. In many instances the failure to sell these bonds would result in the economic strangulation of the area.

Since these bonds will be tax free in any event under existing law to whoever buys them, no tax loss of any consequence is involved. Moreover, certain offsets must be considered. By holding down the rate of interest on new issues the total volume of interest on which tax is not paid is reduced. Also by reducing the cost of debt service the passthrough will tend to reduce or hold down local taxes which are a deduction in computing the income subject to tax.

State and local governments are requesting assistance in meeting their ob-

ligations. Their burdens are heavy. About this there can be no question. In considering these requests for assistance I think it well to give real consideration to those forms of aid which would enable these governments to help themselves, since this type of assistance is likely to be the most efficient. As governments are called upon to perform more services, efficiency becomes increasingly important, and I think we will all agree that keeping the controls close to home tends toward economy. It is easier to waste a dollar which comes from Washington than one which must be raised locally.

In closing, I feel that the broad passthrough should be enacted into law at this session of Congress since it would assist State and local governments in financing their capital improvements by reducing or at least holding down the cost of debt service, and debt service will become an increasingly important item for these governments. The control of the capital improvement programs would be left with local government. The Federal Government would not be concerned over what a local community did or did not undertake. Each locality could build its improvements as simply or as elaborately as it chooses.

The bill follows:

H.R. 2341

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of States and local governments

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) EXCLUSION FOR EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDENDS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, there shall be excluded from gross income an amount equal to the aggregate amounts received during the taxable year as exempt-interest dividends. Any amount excludible from gross income under this subsection shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle as an item of interest excludible from gross income under subsection (a) (1).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (c)—

"(1) EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDEND.—The term 'exempt-interest dividend' means any dividend or part thereof (other than a capital-gain dividend within the meaning of section 852(b)(3)(C)) paid by a corporation and designated by it as an exempt-interest dividend in a written notice mailed to its shareholders not later than 30 days after the close of its taxable year, if such corporation meets the requirements of paragraph (2) for such taxable year. If the aggregate amount so designated with respect to a taxable year of the corporation is greater than the amount of interest received or accrued by such corporation during such taxable year and excludible by it under subsection (a) (1), the portion of each distribution which shall be an exempt-interest dividend shall be only that proportion of the amount so designated as the amount of such interest so excludible bears to the aggregate amount so designated.

"(2) SECTION 103 CORPORATION.—A corporation shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this paragraph for a taxable year if—

"(A) such corporation is a domestic corporation other than a bank as defined in section 581 or an insurance company taxable under subchapter L.

"(B) such corporation files with its return for such taxable year an election to be a section 103 corporation or has made such election for a previous taxable year which began after the effective date of this Act.

"(C) at least 90 percent of its gross income is derived from dividends, interest, and gains from the sale or other disposition of stock or other securities (and for purposes of this subparagraph and subparagraph (D), the terms 'gross income' and 'interest' include interest excludable under subsection (a) (1), and

"(D) less than 30 percent of its gross income is derived from the sale or other disposition of stock or other securities held for less than 3 months."

SEC. 2. Section 265 of such Code (dealing with nonallowance of deduction for expenses and interest relating to tax-exempt income) is amended as follows:

(a) In paragraph (1) by deleting the period at the end thereof and substituting the following: ", or any amount otherwise allowable as a deduction which is allocable to interest received and distributed as an exempt-interest dividend by a corporation meeting the requirements of section 103 (d) (1)."

(b) By adding at the end of the section the following new paragraph:

"(3) INTEREST RELATED TO EXEMPT-INTEREST DIVIDENDS.—Interest, on indebtedness incurred or continued after the effective date of this Act, to purchase or carry stock of any corporation, for any period during which such corporation meets the requirements of section 103 (d) (2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to distributions by corporations with respect to taxable years of such corporations which begin after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Comments on the Visit of Anastas Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress gets a lot of mail. Part of this mail is largely inspired by the press, radio, and TV; some of our mail is due to propaganda campaigns put on by pressure groups. Once in a while we get mail that we feel is deeply sincere and an honest expression of opinion. Recently I received a lot of letters from members of a senior high school located in my district. The name of this town is Damar. The population is listed as 305. Just a small rural community but from the tone of their letters they are deeply disturbed at attention that has been given in our country to the bloody-handed "traveling salesman?" from Communist Russia, namely Anastas Mikoyan.

I append hereto the comments from their letters:

We are informed by newspaper and television that we have a Commie over here to talk (possibly about a loan). * * * I don't understand why we have to play "footsie"

with them in the first place. Are we so impressed and frightened by them that we must jump to oblige their every whim?

We Americans have the privilege of petitioning our Congressmen and this is certainly a matter of national importance. * * * I am speaking of the Russian beggars coming over here on a "good will tour" in order to [probably] try to wheedle us into a trade agreement involving our extending some credit to a country whose alleged aim is to destroy us. * * * I do admire their nerve, though.

Why do we giveaway money to all these foreign countries? Surely past experience shows this is not loaning but outright giving. * * * When will our leaders find out we can't buy friendship? We've already aided Yugoslavia, a Communist outfit if there ever was one, to buy their friendship against Russia, now is there really a chance we will aid Russia? Say it isn't so, please. When is it going to stop? Only you, our Representatives, can stop it.

I think our giveaway program is getting quite disgusting, especially in actually giving to communistic countries—already Yugoslavia, and now possibly Russia. * * * What are we doing? * * * It seems our Government could give a little more thought to some of our own people who could use a little aid.

When are we going to quit playing "chicken"?

In debt \$280 billion and helping the worst enemy to democracy that the world has ever seen. It's bad enough the way we throw it [money] around to our allies, but it's impossible to think we'd give it [money] to our worst enemy.

Couldn't this money be used just as well to build the needed schools, support war widows and orphans, our own poor, and help our American Indians in the Southwest; or do we just figure they're no threat so we needn't worry about them? * * * As our Congressman, please do what you can. Thank you.

In regard to a possible loan to Russia, please tell me it's out of the question.

I am writing to you to appeal to you to do everything in your power to stop this giveaway, especially to Russia. * * * If something has to break it may as well be before we help make them stronger. * * * As for some of these other "hand-grab" countries, I think we should turn our head when we meet them on the street.

To give aid to Russia would be just like putting a knife in your worst enemy's hand. As soon as your back is turned he can kill you with this knife.

Basketball and Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article entitled "Basketball and Stamps" by Kenneth E. Crouch, which appeared in

Weekly Philatelic Gossip on December 27, 1958.

Basketball and baseball are two games which originated in the United States. The latter game has been recognized by the United States and various other countries by the issuance of postal stamps. According to this article basketball, which originated in Massachusetts, has spread throughout the world and received widespread recognition philatelically, yet our own country has not so honored the game.

The article follows:

BASKETBALL AND STAMPS

(By Kenneth E. Crouch)

Records state that in mid-December, 1891, the game of basketball originated in the Y.M.C.A. Training School at Springfield College in Springfield, Mass., the originator being Canadian-born Dr. James Naismith.

The game was created because of a desire for a new game for the students at the training school. Naismith was given the assignment by the dean of the physical education department, Luther Gulick, to see if he could come up with any ideas.

The new game was to be one which could be played in the winter season, between the football and baseball seasons, and one that could be played indoors or out in the open.

Dr. Naismith drew up a set of rules, assembled 18 students into which he made two teams of nine men each. He carried with him a soccer ball and asked the janitor to find two boxes to be used as goals. The janitor found two half-bushel peach baskets and thus the name of the game was established.

In the original game a man was stationed at each goal in the balcony to retrieve the ball from the basket after it had been scored and to put the ball back into play.

The first game was played between students of the "secretarial" and "physical" classes and as it was intended only as a new game at the school, the date it was played was never noted but has been established as in the middle of December.

Newspaper accounts state that the first game played as a public contest was on March 11, 1892, between the secretarial class of Dr. Naismith and the faculty, with the secretarial team winning five baskets to one.

James Naismith was born November 6, 1861, in Almonte, Ontario, Canada, a son of John and Margaret Young Naismith. He was an orphan at the age of 8 and in 1883 graduated from the Almonte High School.

In the fall of 1883 he entered McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, and in 1887 received his A.B. degree from that university. That year he enrolled at the Presbyterian College in Montreal, Canada, graduating in 1890 and that same year was ordained into the Presbyterian ministry.

Naismith played football at McGill University and from 1887 to 1890 was director of physical education at that university. In the fall of 1890 he enrolled at the Y.M.C.A. Training School at Springfield College, graduating in 1891. He served as director of physical education at the school from 1890 to 1895.

In 1895 he became a physical director at the Y.M.C.A. in Denver, Colo., and attended the Gross Medical College (later to become the University of Colorado Medical School) in Denver from which he received his doctor of medicine degree in 1898.

In 1898 he joined the faculty of the University of Kansas at Lawrence, where he remained until his retirement as professor emeritus in 1937.

In 1939 the Presbyterian College in Montreal, Canada, awarded him the doctor of divinity degree honoris causa.

The game of basketball was included as a regular part of the Olympics in 1936 in Berlin, Germany and Dr. and Mrs. Naismith were sent to the international event.

He was the author of numerous articles on physical education and of the books "The Basis of Clean Living" in 1918 and "Basketball: Its Origin and Development" in 1941.

Dr. Naismith died November 28, 1939, of a heart attack at his home in Lawrence, Kans. Funeral services were conducted December 1 from the First Presbyterian Church in Lawrence, Kans., with burial in Memorial Park Cemetery in that city.

There is living today one man who played in the first game of basketball that memorable day in 1891. He is Raymond P. Kaighn, 89 years old, who was a member of Naismith's "secretarial" team, and lives in Chapel Hill N.C.

A memorial to the founder of the game and to honor stars, past and present, is to be erected on the campus of Springfield College. This is to be known as the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame for Basketball and the executive secretary of that committee is 80-year-old Edward J. Hickox.

The sport has received recognition in the philatelic world in the issuance by 19 nations of 28 postage stamps—these coming from every continent but North America (where it originated) and Australia. These postal recognitions range from 18 regular issues to 7 airmail issues and 3 semipostal issues.

CHECK LIST

Philippines, 1934, Scott, No. 382, issued to commemorate the 10th Far Eastern Championship Games.

Panama, 1938, Scott, No. C43, issued to commemorate the fourth Central American Caribbean Games.

Lithuania, 1939, Scott, No. B52-B54, issued to commemorate the third European Basketball Championship in Kaunas, Lithuania.

Ecuador, 1939, Scott, No. 379, issued to commemorate the first Bolivarian Olympics in 1938.

Bulgaria, 1947, Scott, No. 579, issued for the Balkan games.

Bolivia, 1948, Scott, No. C151, issued for the fifth Athletic Championship Meet in La Paz, Bolivia.

Bulgaria, 1948, Scott, No. 606.

Peru, 1948, Scott, No. C79, issued to publicize Peru's participation in the 1948 Olympic Games in Wembley, England.

Nicaragua, 1949, Scott, Nos. 725 and C301, issued to publicize the 10th World Series of Amateur Basketball in 1948.

Hungary, 1950, Scott, No. 923.

Yugoslavia, 1952, Scott, No. 363, issued to publicize the 15th Olympic Games in Helsinki, Finland.

Monaco, 1953, Scott, No. 295, issued to publicize Monaco's participation in the Olympic Games in Helsinki, Finland.

Brazil, 1954, Scott, No. 813, issued to publicize the second World Basketball Championship Matches.

U.S.S.R., 1954, Scott, No. 1715.

Poland, 1955, Scott, No. 702, issued to publicize the International Sports Games.

Ecuador, 1956, Scott, No. 308-C309, issued to commemorate the sixth South American Women's Basketball Championship.

Japan, 1956, Scott, No. 629, issued to commemorate the 11th National Athletic Meeting in Hyogo Prefecture, Japan.

Bulgaria, 1956, Scott, No. 944, issued to publicize the 16th Olympic Games in Melbourne, Australia.

Czechoslovakia, 1956, Scott, No. 743, issued to publicize the fifth European Women's Basketball Championship.

Hungary, 1956, Scott, No. 1167, issued to publicize the 16th Olympic Games in Melbourne, Australia.

France, 1956, Scott, No. 801.

Somali, 1958, Scott, No. C56.

Spanish Guinea, 1958, unnumbered (two stamps).

Statement by Andrew T. Walker With Reference to a Post Office Department Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, statement made by Andrew T. Walker, president of branch 1 of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, with reference to an unfair and arbitrary Post Office Department ruling:

POSTAL BULLETIN OF NOVEMBER 20, 1958, RUPTURES EMPLOYEE MORALE—NEW POSTAL SCHEME PASSING MARK MOST UNFAIR STATES UNAPOC OFFICER

(By Andrew T. Walker, president, branch 1, UNAPOC)

The personnel division of the Post Office Department in Washington has dealt employee morale a most damaging blow causing discontent among postal clerks by its Postal Bulletin of November 20, 1958. The bulletin sets a high qualifying mark for clerks to attain in taking regular scheduled postal scheme examinations. A qualifying mark, postal clerks state, not alone high but because of it, is causing greater tension and nervous strain before and during such examinations.

For a number of recent years clerks have had to distribute 100 representative cards bearing the names of various cities out of an assigned total of 1,000 cities. These 100 cards must be distributed within 8 minutes to comply with the examination. In all of this the clerk must attain 95 percent having a margin of 5 allowable errors. In the case of schemes devoted solely to the distribution of mail according to station carrier routes the total number of numbered buildings and streets are 600. Out of this total the clerk has to distribute 100 cards to pass with a margin of 5 errors.

With the issuance of this bulletin the requirement for passing the test rose to 97 percent thereby giving the margin of three errors out of a possible 100 percent. The measure of tension and nervous strain engendered by the upward revision of the passing mark has mounted tremendously causing great discontent among the clerical force. The issuance of the bulletin was certainly ill advised or issued by someone in the department who had never taken an examination or else he would have been well aware of the tension a required passing mark of 97 percent would create.

Some years back the system had been whereby the clerk taking the examination had had to distribute all of the 1,000 cards in the examination, taking over an hour to do so, and was allowed five errors for every hundred cards. This system had been in force for a great number of years previously. With the introduction of the 100-card system by the Postal Department the general clerical force accepted it in a cooperative spirit, for the percentage-wise breakdown was fair and equitable. Without a doubt the conversion from the 1,000-card system to the 100-card setup certainly saved for the postal department thousands of dollars in man-hours. The former hour-long test was reduced to 8 minutes and thereby released the clerk sooner for mail distribution. It also saved man-hours of the scheme examiners. All in all the transition was orderly with finest cooperation from the clerks. However in the issuance of the November 20, 1958,

order raising the mark without any obvious savings or benefit to the department or to the postal employee has raised resentment and critical comment from the dedicated and sincere postal clerk.

My office has been besieged by phone calls, personal letters, and visits to headquarters by delegate and members objecting strongly to this new scheme requirement directive. Without a doubt this is being repeated in every UNAPOC branch throughout the Nation. Mr. Joseph F. Thomas, national president, and Joseph V. Silvestri, national secretary, have made strong representations to the officials of the personnel department of the Post Office Department. The only response has been that the matter is being given further study; however, the order is in force and every clerk has to attain 97 percent right out of studying 1,000 cards and distributing 100 cards for the test.

The spotlight of congressional interest in this matter could only result in a beneficial effect. The controversial order also contains a section setting up individual production standards, which have certain quotas also causing great concern.

The need for complete union recognition is pointedly highlighted by the fact that prior to the issuance of this order there had been no thorough consultation with employee organization representatives. The introduction of this November 20, 1958, bulletin regarding scheme passing was so far reaching, in that it touches the service life of each and every clerk, that it should have been considerably discussed before its issuance.

Again in the 86th Congress postal organizations will endeavor to secure the enactment of a suitable union recognition bill, guaranteeing full and complete discussion of all contemplated personnel orders between labor and management before these orders are activated.

Congressman PAUL A. FINO has been one of our foremost congressional friends in all of our equitable requests. When we were wrong in our requests, Congressman Fino has advised us so. Many of the Congress have been very helpful to us in a similar fashion.

Perhaps in time this objectionable order will be rescinded, but up to that time the degree of tension will continue to exist. We hope that the Department will call a meeting soon of organizations and rescind its individual production standards, along with the new scheme passing mark.

Reporting the News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the January 12, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 549, there appears an item I clipped from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch news section which if it deserved reporting at all belonged on the editorial page as editorial comment.

I am inserting into the RECORD the pertinent portions of an item appearing under a banner headline on page 1 of the Washington Post, Thursday, January 15, 1959, which purports to report what President Eisenhower said on the subject of his attitude toward the Republican presidential candidate in 1960. I am then inserting what the President is reported to have actually said in toto on this subject, from the transcript ap-

pearing on page A18 of the same newspaper.

The question I raise is this: Is the alleged news article under these headlines, "Ike Says He Will Oppose Isolationist for Republican Nomination in 1960—Modifies Policy of Hands Off—He Makes It Clear Support Will Go to World View Sharer," news or editorializing on the news? The conclusion seems to me quite obvious that it is editorializing of an extreme and partisan nature. If this is so what do those in the newspaper profession have to say about the ethics of this kind of reporting? Both the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Washington Post are held up as examples of the best in the newspaper world and yet the two specific articles that I have called attention to are rather common examples of the manner in which both these newspapers handle political news reporting. Nor do I wish to point a finger at these two newspapers simply because the examples I have used happen to refer to them, because this type of reporting is so common today that the ordinary citizen simply shrugs his shoulders when it is called to his attention.

The following is what the news story reported:

(By Edward T. Folliard)

President Eisenhower said in effect yesterday that he would veto the choice of an old guard isolationist for the Republican presidential nomination in 1960.

His statement was a modification of his earlier stand that he would maintain a hands-off policy with respect to the 1960 nomination.

In a 50-minute televised press conference at the National Press Club, the longest he has ever held since moving into the White House, the Chief Executive made it clear that he would give his support next year only to a Republican presidential nominee who shares his views on cooperation with other governments of the free world.

He also made it clear that he would withhold his support from any like the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who voted against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949, and who was his rival for the GOP nomination in 1952.

The President said he could write out a list "of half a dozen, or 10, or maybe a dozen fine, virile men in the Republican Party that I would gladly support."

But if a man didn't go along with his own ideas on cooperation between the United States and other countries for preservation of freedom in the world, he said, he "couldn't possibly support him, if my influence had anything to do with the matter."

Now here is what President Eisenhower said:

QUESTION ASKED ON NOMINEE CHOICE

Mr. HORNER. Mr. President, if you will take just one more on politics, I will let you go at the press. You have indicated, sir, you will follow a strictly hands-off policy in selecting the Republican presidential nominee next year. Does that not run the risk of selection of a man with whose Republican political philosophy you do not agree?

The PRESIDENT. I'm quite sure, Mr. President, that everybody would know that if a nominee were possibly made whose basic philosophy I could not go along with, whose general attitude toward the relationship of Government to the private citizen and to the State and to the community—who did not go along with my basic idea that only in a coalition of strong governments or at least

an association through cooperation with strong governments can we make certain that freedom is not lost in the world.

If any man could not go along with that kind of basic thinking, well, I would say this: I couldn't possibly support him, if my influence had anything to do with the matter. Therefore, I could—I won't, but I could—write out for you a list of half a dozen, or 10, or maybe a dozen fine, virile men in the Republican Party that I would gladly support.

But I do say this: Those are men that I'm thinking in my mind—who really want to see America go ahead, its economy sound, and to be very, very careful that our security is maintained, not only by our building, own building of armaments, with support, the cooperation of other governments that want to live in independence and in liberty.

Castro Not Fit To Rule Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have long sought and hoped for a democratic and peaceful change in dictator governments like Cuba. The revolutionary change in Cuba, commencing with uncivilized bloodbaths, does not seem to be a change for the better. Today violence reigns in Cuba, instead of order and democracy for which the people have long prayed.

Already some 200 lives have been needlessly taken, while many hundreds more are reported facing secret trials and possible death. Although executions have been temporarily suspended by the new regime, rebel leader Fidel Castro has defended these mass executions as "necessary to purify the nation." The civilized and free world had high hopes that the Castro movement would establish a government of freedom and democracy for the Cuban people, but it has been disillusioned.

On the basis of what has taken place in the brief period since the Castro regime has come to power, we can only reach one conclusion and that is: Castro is no better than Batista. The methods he has used to attain power—and I am thinking of his kidnaping of U.S. military personnel and civilians in Cuba—and his conduct after the bloody revolution clearly demonstrate that Castro has little or no regard for human lives or human rights. In less than 2 weeks he has authorized the murder in cold blood of 200 human beings under public view and without any semblance of law or order.

At the same time, it is reported that some 500 other persons are being held in Oriente Province alone and they will soon face summary mock trials by hot-headed rebels, lasting perhaps a few minutes per person and with very little chance of defense. And this the Castro regime is trying to tell the world is legal and civilized procedure. In the United States we call these lynchings and murders.

Present-day justice in Cuba under the Castro regime is succinctly discussed in

an editorial in the Washington Post of January 14, where it is stated as follows:

There is a difference between an open trial fairly conducted in a less impassioned moment and drumhead justice dispensed by hotheaded rebel troops. Capital punishment in such a situation too readily becomes lynching. Terror has a way of passing beyond control as the appetite for vengeance increases with use. * * *

According to recent press reports, Castro stated that he has no desire to run for the office of President of Cuba. By his own admission, the job of governing Cuba is too big for him and he ought to resign from active leadership or perhaps taken on some kind of professorship at the University of Habana and bide his time.

Castro cannot, by self-appointment, be the commander of the land, air, and sea forces of Cuba which by removing conscription, as he has promised, will eventually be composed of volunteers who are actually his followers. In this way he will succeed in entrenching himself in power and as such become just as dangerous and threatening as any dictator. Under such circumstances it is difficult to see how free elections can be held, except at the point of the bayonets of these self-appointed liberators. No President and no member of congress could possibly be elected or serve in office without Castro's approval.

Furthermore, Castro admits that his brother Raul has Communist leanings, having been trained in Moscow. Simultaneously, it is reported that a large number of Castro's followers are Communists, but Castro himself protests that he is not a Communist and is willing to align himself with the United States. Here again, however, he throws in a proviso that we first show our respect for him. I should like to ask: Respect for him as what? As a kidnaper of American citizens? As a brutal murderer of his own people?

No matter how flushed he may be with victory, Castro should quickly come to his senses and realize that the United States will not take any bluff from him, just as it had not taken and still refuses to take any bluff from other dictators. He would do well to study the map of the Western Hemisphere and learn the facts of life, particularly as they affect the economy of his own country, before he makes demands on the United States. We will not stand for a Nasser or a Hitler so close to our shores.

Whatever justification may have existed for the Castro revolution has now been completely annulled by his most recent threat to kill 200,000 gringos, or Americans, should we decide to send marines to Cuba, although there has been no such suggestion on our part.

I have never forgotten Castro's unwarranted seizure of American soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilian workers, holding them as hostages for a considerable period of time, and thus humiliating the United States in the eyes of the world. I am sure that many other Americans have neither forgotten nor forgiven him for this deed. Nor do we in this country particularly like his treat-

ment of U.S. citizens who presently have to travel to Cuba for business or pleasure. Authentic reports show that Americans are forced to wait long hours at airports under the restraint of armed men and that before being admitted their bags are searched and their bodies frisked like criminals.

I think we ought to make it clear to Revolutionist Castro, for his own good and before he gets any more wild ideas, that it is we who demand respect from him. I think we should tell him in no uncertain terms that we will not tolerate any further mistreatment, friskings, kidnappings, and other indignities to U.S. citizens residing in, or traveling to, Cuba.

At the same time, let us state unequivocally that we are opposed to dictators in any form. Castro and his revolutionists in Cuba must realize that government of the people, by the people, and for the people—as the immortal Abraham Lincoln has so correctly defined the democratic form of government—must be sustained by ballots and not by bullets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that unless a democratic form of government is soon established in Cuba and free institutions are allowed to flourish there, I shall be the first to move before the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, and before the Congress of the United States to drastically reduce the sugar quota for Cuba. Perhaps Castro will be able to understand that kind of language better, since appeals based on justice and morality do not seem to have the desired effect on him.

Bill To Repeal Certain Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker on January 7 I introduced H.R. 388, a bill which will directly benefit the great majority of our people and will make greatly needed revision in our tax structure. Everyone wants a simpler and fairer tax structure. My bill goes a long way toward effectuating this desire. It accomplishes this goal by providing for repeal of the Federal retailers' excise taxes, the manufacturers' excise taxes with the exception of those levied under our highway financing program, and the excise taxes levied on facilities and services.

At the present time, the federally imposed excise taxes create a heavy burden on the American people. True, we must impose burdensome taxes to pay for our heavy expenditures needed for defense, public welfare, interest on the debt, and other necessary Government functions. But a tax structure which imposes such a hodgepodge of taxes as the excise taxes requires substantial revision. These excises have been imposed indiscriminately, largely in emergency times, without much consideration of whom

they are hurting or discriminating against. Subsequently they have been repealed, restored, revised, and amended many times, but in no systematic fashion. As a result, a host of inconsistencies, incongruities, and anomalies have become imbedded in the tax structure.

Although I would like to see all the Federal excise taxes discarded immediately, I have restricted my bill to the retailers' taxes, the manufacturers' taxes which are not used to finance the highway program, and the taxes on facilities and services. My bill, therefore, will repeal the retailers' taxes imposed on toilet preparations; luggage, handbags, and other leather articles; jewelry and related items; and furs. It will eliminate the manufacturers' taxes imposed on automobiles, parts and accessories; lubricating oil; automotive and related items; household type equipment; entertainment and recreational equipment; business machines; pens, mechanical pencils, and lighters; and matches. And, it will repeal the excise taxes imposed on telephone and other communication facilities and services, which include also those levied on admissions, club dues, transportation of persons, and safe deposit boxes. Repeal will be effective after the date of the enactment of the act.

The manufacturers' taxes which are used to finance the highway program and which will not be repealed by my bill are those automotive taxes imposed on gasoline, trucks and buses, diesel fuel, tires and inner tubes, and tread rubber. These taxes provide funds which benefit the highway users, and consequently can be justified from that standpoint. Furthermore, it is a fair and expeditious way to finance an accelerated highway construction program. The bill does not affect the taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco, although I do believe some adjustment should be made with respect to the taxes on alcoholic beverages for it is my understanding that the additional appropriations needed to police this law offset the revenue received. Some of the miscellaneous excise taxes which impose relatively small general burdens are excluded.

Many of the excise taxes were imposed as temporary measures during emergency periods but are still with us today, many of them at even higher rates. Many industries have been hurt by the imposition of these taxes. Occasionally, after a long and bitter fight by the affected industries and individual businesses, some of these taxes were repealed or modified, but in many cases considerable damage was already done. What we need is the removal of the excise taxes that are imposed indiscriminately with no regard of the effect they have.

An important reason for my desire to repeal at least some of the excise taxes is that these taxes are contrary to our generally accepted principle of taxation in accordance with ability to pay. The greatest impact of the excise taxes falls on the consumers with the low incomes. They are regressive taxes. Through its various features, such as the progressive income tax rate schedule, our tax structure attempts to lessen inequalities in

income; but the excise taxes work contrary to this objective. Regressivity results not only from taxes paid directly by the consumer on commodities and services they purchase, but also from the taxes paid by business on commodities and services it purchases. The impact of these latter taxes is felt indirectly, because they are a cost item which are reflected in higher prices charged to the consumer. We should, therefore, reduce our reliance on these regressive taxes and place more reliance on the other forms of taxes, principally the income tax which imposes tax burdens in accordance with our ability to pay.

Elimination of Federal excise taxes will be an important stride toward simplifying the problems of our Federal-State-local relations. In spite of all the studies, both official and nonofficial, on the problems of overlapping taxes in the United States the basic problems still remain with us. Essential to the solution of these problems is the removal of at least some of the Federal excise taxes. The Federal Government imposes numerous selected excise taxes on top of those imposed by the States and local governments. As a result of these multiple levels of taxation, State and local governments must limit their taxation of these sources, although they, too, are faced with increasing costs of financing their government activities. Withdrawal of the Federal Government from some of these sources would enable the States to tap some of these sources of revenue to help them be more self-sustaining and less dependent on aid from the Federal Government. This will help restore some of the sovereignty and independence which the States formerly had and should continue to have.

Some of the Federal excise taxes are imposed on what are essentially local services, such as local telephone calls and admissions. Others discriminate largely against certain sections of the country. Some discriminate against industries which are located largely in only a few geographic areas. Such discriminations should be eliminated, or at least mitigated by repealing the excise taxes enumerated in my bill.

We have recently experienced a serious economic downturn, from which we were fortunate in recovering before it reached a critical stage. One of the hardest hit areas was Detroit, the center of automobile production. This economic doldrum in Detroit had its repercussions in many sections of the country where parts and materials going into the production of automobiles come from. In spite of a serious curtailment of automobile production, no legislation was passed to reduce or repeal the 10-percent Federal excise tax on automobiles. Such action would have made it possible for the automobile industry to reduce car prices, and thereby stimulate automobile sales and general economic recovery. Repeal of this onerous tax on automobiles will be a welcome supplement to other Government action taken to avoid any recurrence of a similar depression of economic activity. The tax saving to the consumers will, I earnestly believe, help to maintain a thriving automobile industry, and, consequently, a

thriving general economy through its effect on all industries concerned with supplying automotive parts and materials.

On the whole, repeal of the taxes included in my bill will increase business activity and generate higher incomes which will provide higher income tax revenues to the Government. It will do this because it will lead to a reduction in the prices of goods and services to the consumer. Lower prices will stimulate demand for more of these products. Greater sales by these businesses will in turn have favorable effects on other businesses. Resulting higher business incomes will provide a larger income tax base. Thus, any loss in revenues from the repeal of these excises will probably be largely offset or even possibly exceeded by additional income tax revenues to the Government.

In conclusion, let me urge every Member of Congress, particularly those on the Ways and Means Committee, to act favorably on my bill. Removal of these excise taxes will correct some of the undesirable features of the present complex and unreasonable "system" of excise taxes. It will alleviate some of the burden which falls heaviest on the low income groups. And, it will contribute to a simplification of Federal-State-local relationships. Although the Government will in the short run lose revenues from the repeal of these taxes, it will recoup the loss largely from additional business induced by the removal of these taxes. At the same time, it will promote a healthier economic climate for industry. In view of these desirable benefits which will result from enactment of my bill, I urge immediate and favorable action on it.

Mikoyan, Master Spy, Is Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the American people are wondering why Anastas Mikoyan is in the United States. Past experience proves that there is usually an ulterior motive to a visit such as this. It behooves us to be wary.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the *Waterbury American* of January 5, 1959, written by Julius Epstein, which gives a good background on the activities of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues as I believe that it will give them a good picture of Mikoyan and what may be expected of him.

The article follows:

MIKOYAN, MASTER SPY IS COMING
(By Julius Epstein)

Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan has arrived in Washington, somewhat sooner than he was expected. The Soviet Government declared that it wanted Mikoyan to

come to Washington in order to confer with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov. This, of course, is just a crude hoax. If the Soviet Government, meaning Khrushchev, really wants Mikoyan to confer with the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, one cable or long-distance call would have sufficed to order Mr. Menshikov by jetplane to Moscow.

The reason for Mikoyan's visit is quite another one. It is a political maneuver to probe into Washington's political climate, with the Berlin crisis looming dark over the world. What Mikoyan really hopes to discover in Washington are those "soft spots" which eventually might be skillfully used by Mr. Mikoyan's boss, Nikita S. Khrushchev. Mikoyan is an old hand in the business of Soviet espionage in the United States. His experience dates back to the year 1943.

ESPIONAGE

At that time, the Soviet Politburo of the purchasing commission had its vast offices—with more than 1,000 employees—behind an iron door at 3355 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. There, a group of top Communists, well trained in espionage and other subversive activities, worked closely together.

The group consisted mainly of the chairman of the purchasing commission, Gen. Leonid Rudenko, who later became Soviet chief prosecutor at Nuremberg; Mikhail V. Serov, the infamous organizer of countless mass and individual murders, whom Khrushchev just purged recently; Gusev, head of Amtorg (the Soviet's trading corporation in New York), a specialist in setting up covers for Soviet spies who was later expelled by the U.S. Government after the FBI had him trapped and caught redhanded in the act of espionage. There also was a special department within the purchasing commission. Its chief was Mrs. Arutunian, the daughter-in-law of a Moscow high official. All secret papers passed through the hands of that lady.

Victor Kravchenko, who was then himself a high-ranking official of the purchasing commission, testified later before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that, "all of us knew about the functions of the special department, but we never knew who the representative of the Soviet secret police was in the purchasing commission." Today, we know who it was: Mikhail V. Serov.

Anastas Mikoyan was at that time, as he is today, a member of the Moscow Politburo and people's commissar for foreign trade. He alone was the real boss of the purchasing commission and its spies under Serov. As head of the foreign trade commissariat, Mikoyan directed the whole Soviet espionage apparatus in the United States.

AUTHORITY

One of the great authorities on Soviet espionage is David J. Dallin. He has spent a lifetime studying Soviet subversive practices all over the world, and he has written a standard work on the subject, the book "Soviet Espionage" (Yale University Press, 1955). Here, Dallin writes about Mikoyan's American espionage activities as follows:

"One day in late 1943 or early 1944 all employees of the purchasing commission who were actual members of the Communist Party were summoned to a meeting behind closed doors. Mikhail Serov presented cabled orders from Anastas Mikoyan in Moscow, which directed every Soviet Communist working in the commission to gather information on industrial developments in the United States, especially in the war industries. After the cable was read, each member of the cell signed his name to a statement that he had been informed of the order and would make every effort to carry it out.

"An orgy of information-grabbing began; among the items obtained were designs of industrial plants, special machines, parts and details; photographs and blueprints of technical processes in the aviation, arms, oil,

submarine-building, and many other industries; long-range plans for the development of large industrial units; hundreds of maps of the United States, the individual States, industrial sites, bridges; descriptions of railroads; reports on the building of cities and highways."

Victor Kravchenko described in his testimony before Congress some of the activities as follows:

"We transferred to the Soviet Union, not just this one package; we transferred dozens of tons of material, not just by airplane. We also were using Soviet ships that came from lend-lease for the Soviet Union."

It was under Mikoyan's orders that members of the purchasing commission persuaded Henry A. Wallace to let the Soviets have samples of American uranium ore. Long before Klaus Fuchs betrayed to the Soviets the secret of our atom bomb, we ourselves had already helped them in their early experiments to develop the bomb.

In view of Mikoyan's forthcoming visit, it may be useful to our administration not to go overboard, but to keep these facts in mind.

Congress Should Attempt To Understand South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous materials, I request that the attached editorial entitled "Congress Should Attempt To Understand South," which appeared in the January 5 issue of the *Florida Times Union*, be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD ATTEMPT TO UNDERSTAND SOUTH

The 86th Congress convenes Wednesday, making this the season for considering possible legislative programs. Here is a conservative 11-point program that would do credit to the new Congress:

1. In the area of civil rights, the Congress should make an honest effort to understand the position of the people of the South. The legislators have the power to ease mounting tensions in the Nation's most critical domestic problem, but it can only be done with a full knowledge of the attitudes, customs, and will of the southern people.

2. Congress must address itself immediately to a labor union reform law. Such a law should apply antimonopoly regulations to unions to head off the threat of a super-union under James Hoffa. The law should return equilibrium to the business-labor relationship, protect members from gangsters and corruption, and prohibit the spending of union dues for political purposes.

3. The Congress should restore balance to national defenses by assuring necessary appropriations for ground and naval forces as well as air and missile programs. A careful eye to profiteering in gadgetry must be maintained.

4. An investigation of the Nation's economy should be originated with the purposes of arriving at the basic cause of price-push inflation and of strengthening the economy for the promised period of economic competition with communism.

5. Congress should pass a law specifying rules of conduct for legislative, executive

and regulatory officials in accepting gifts and favors.

6. The lawmakers should seek by example to rededicate this Nation in spirit and its Government in practice to the basic principles of Christianity, democratic capitalism and private enterprise.

7. The only logical approach of Congress to taxation problems is a firm belief that any program worth having is worth paying for.

8. Congress should reconsider the U.S. role in the United Nations and other foreign affairs fields with the purpose of increased emphasis on effective military arrangements.

9. New laws are required to stiffen the Nation's defenses against internal communism to repair damage done by the Supreme Court.

10. A realistic agriculture policy is long overdue. That policy should replace subsidy thinking with business logic.

11. Congress should set in motion machinery to amend the Constitution to abolish the electoral college.

Action along these lines would be to the everlasting credit to the men and women of the 86th Congress.

**Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers
Confers Honorary Membership Upon
Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the
Federal Bureau of Investigation**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me today by the House, I include the following statement of Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, upon the bestowal of honorary membership in the brotherhood a few days ago to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover.

Also included is a statement made by Mr. Hoover at the time of his acceptance of his honorary membership in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The statements follow:

Mr. Guy L. Brown, grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, today conferred upon J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a certificate of honorary membership in division 160 of the brotherhood in ceremonies held in Mr. Hoover's office.

This bestowal of honorary membership is one of the few ever made in the brotherhood's long history. Mr. Brown stated at the time of the presentation that the award is being made to Mr. Hoover, "in recognition of your great contributions to humanity and your great services to our country. We deeply appreciate the magnificent work you have done and are continuing to do in defending the civil liberties and protecting the rights of the average citizen and the laboring man in this country."

Commenting upon the FBI Director's role in America today, the grand chief engineer stated to Mr. Hoover that, "by helping thwart efforts of those who would destroy our Government and our way of life by infiltrating and seizing control of our labor organizations, you have aided not only the individual workingman but also the entire labor movement. For this, we will be everlastingly in your debt."

Making specific reference to Director Hoover's role in law enforcement, Mr. Brown said, "This country will never be able to thank you enough for your part in seeing that our internal defenses have remained fair and just and that the Nation has not become a police state in order to resist police state tactics."

In addition to the membership scroll in Division 160 of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Grand Chief Engineer Brown presented Mr. Hoover a personalized copy of the constitution and the bylaws of the brotherhood and also the brotherhood's war service lapel pin.

STATEMENT OF JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ON RECEIPT OF A MEMBERSHIP SCROLL, A PIN, AND A COPY OF THE UNION'S CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS IN CONNECTION WITH HIS ACCEPTANCE OF AN HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, JANUARY 12, 1959

It is a privilege to become an honorary member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. The action taken by your board of directors in amending your constitution so that this membership might be granted, has touched me deeply. I am most grateful to all of you.

I take great pride in the fact that the oldest railroad labor organization in the United States—a union created with the objective of securing justice for the individual workingman—sees fit to bestow these symbols of brotherhood upon me. As a member of the law enforcement profession, the word "justice" holds a vital meaning for me and for my associates.

May I add that no one is more aware than I that the recognition afforded me today is based upon the results achieved through the ceaseless effort, dedicated spirit, and devotion to duty of the men and women of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In their behalf, I am proud and happy to accept this great honor.

Depressed Areas Legislation

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the 40 bills I introduced on January 7 was H.R. 830 to establish a program of Federal assistance to those areas which suffer from persistent economic depressions, an area redevelopment program.

In essence my proposal is similar to the legislation that was considered and approved by the 85th Congress.

I was shocked and amazed last year when President Eisenhower refused to sign the depressed areas bill, because the need for that type of legislation is clearly indicated. As I pointed out last year, when one segment of the Nation suffers economically, the entire country is affected. The depressed areas are not isolated islands, alone in a wide ocean with no ties to the mainland; they, like the other sections of our country should be contributing their share to the continuing prosperity of the Nation. These contributions would be not only for the benefit of the total economy but also to the Federal Government which is losing great potentials from in-

dividuals and businesses in such areas, and in addition, is faced with increased costs of unemployment compensation and welfare aid.

It is true that the country appears to be recovering from the depression of last year. However, the picture in Michigan continues to loom dark and foreboding. Last year the unemployment rate was 15.4 percent of the labor force; this year it is being predicted that one worker in eight, or 12.5 percent, will be unemployed all through 1959. One certainly cannot view that situation as recovery. I am sure this condition is repeated in the other major depressed areas in the country.

An area redevelopment program is insurance in the future of America; it will pay rich dividends by aiding the growth and prosperity of this great Nation of ours. I urge the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Congress to take immediate favorable action on this legislation.

Hans J. Hagge

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the insurance industry of America has lost a great leader. The Congressional District which I represent and the city of Wausau, Wis., in particular, has lost a true friend and a great citizen. The editorial which appeared in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald on Thursday, January 8, 1959, sets forth the contribution which the late Mr. Hans J. Hagge made to Wausau, Wis., and our Nation.

The editorial is as follows:

HANS J. HAGGE

Employers Mutuals of Wausau in recent years has keyed its advertising and public relations program to the Wausau Story, an effort which has brought recognition to both the community and Employers Mutuals the breadth of the Nation and even in foreign lands.

The Wausau Story has been one, however, which was brought not only to those outside Wausau but carried an inspiring message to the people of Wausau as well.

The Wausau Story has been one of unique achievement in many respects both for Employers Mutuals and for Wausau, of teamwork, civic consciousness, and of an abiding faith in Wausau's future.

And it has occurred to us many times that the late Hans J. Hagge is as responsible for "The Wausau Story," and epitomizes it as much as is possible for any single individual. The long, distinguished, and highly productive career of Mr. Hagge in behalf of both Wausau and Employers Mutuals constitutes an inspiring chapter in the real "Wausau Story."

Coming to the firm when it was a young and struggling enterprise, he led a team which brought it to preeminence in its field. Of special significance to the people of Wausau, and for which the community should be ever grateful, is the fact that the Employers Mutuals team captained by Mr. Hagge kept in mind constantly Wausau's welfare, well-being, and future as well as its own.

Many another enterprise having grown as big and great as did Employers would have felt that it outgrew a community of Wausau's size and centered its operations in a metropolitan area, a move which has many advantages for a business of its type and magnitude. But Mr. Hagge and Employers Mutuals tied their faith in their own future with that of Wausau and remained here.

What that has meant to Wausau in purely economic terms is reflected in the fact that Employers Mutuals provides employment for more Wausau people than any other business or industry.

Besides playing a vital role in Wausau's economic well-being, the Employers Mutuals team led by Mr. Hagge has played a leading role in community affairs. It would be hard to name a community function, including that of city government, in which Employers Mutuals personnel has not played a leading role. That's not merely because there are a lot of Employers Mutuals people in Wausau, it is because Employers Mutuals is a civic-minded organization—so much so in fact that it has received national recognition for it. And Mr. Hagge, we understand, was largely responsible for that civic-mindedness. He prodded and inspired Employers Mutuals personnel to work for Wausau as they worked for their own organization. His behind-the-scenes interest and activity in behalf of Wausau constituted a highly significant force for the good of the community.

The job of building he did as the leader of the team which has done so much to build both Employers Mutuals and Wausau stands as an enduring monument to Hans J. Hagge.

Bungling Benson and Bad Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, when the machine age increased man's capacity to produce more per man-hour, the 40-hour week was adopted to spread the work instead of keeping some unemployed while others continued to work a 60- or 70-hour week. Farmers still work an average of over 60 hours per week. If farmers reduced their production enough to reduce the workweek to 50 hours per week, the so-called surplus problem would disappear without driving farmers into the cities to replace city workers and increase unemployment. The farm programs, properly administered, helped farmers to be able to make a living by working more nearly a normal workweek. Instead of administering those programs properly to keep farmers on the family-type farm, and instead of working toward a program which would aid in accomplishing for our agricultural economy what the wage and hour law accomplished in helping adjust our society to the machine age, the administration is still doing all it can to cause some farmers to work longer hours and produce more while other farmers are driven into the cities to complicate unemployment problems.

I invite the attention of the Congress and the country to an editorial which appeared January 4, 1959, in the Des Moines Sunday Register. It is a paper

published in the heart of the feed-grain country which is now absorbing increased punishment due to several years of deplorable administration of the programs.

This editorial reviews the administration of these farm programs objectively and cites evidence that Secretary Benson has purposely bungled farm programs. While almost everyone in Iowa considers him the worst and most costly administrator in history, this editorial supports the theory that no one could make so many costly mistakes unless he intended to. Whatever the purpose of his actions, the President has permitted Secretary Benson to do more than any other person in the United States to throw both farmers' incomes and the national budget out of balance.

I commend the editorial to all who are interested in preventing more unemployment and in balanced budgets for both the farm economy and our Federal Government:

THE FARM PROGRAM MESS

The indications now are that in January 1961, after 8 years of Ezra Benson's dedicated effort to master the farm problem, the costs of the Federal programs and the size of the crop surpluses will be two to four times what they were in January 1953, when Secretary Benson came into office. This is the lead sentence of an article in the January Fortune magazine. The article goes on to ask: Why after 6 years of Eisenhower-Benson management, is the farm problem getting worse instead of better?

Fortune's answer is that Benson has made too many compromises and has not pushed harder and more consistently to dismantle the acreage control and price support programs.

Of course, if the farm problem is viewed simply as a matter of reducing the Federal budget, that is the correct solution. If the farm price support programs were abandoned, the cost of the programs would disappear. But not even Mr. Benson has recommended such a stern measure. It would mean a drastic further decline in farm income, which is already down substantially since 1947.

However, the Secretary has recommended consistently that price supports be reduced, and Congress has given him considerable authority to do so. Price supports are much lower now than in 1953.

Why has the cost of the programs gone up while price supports were going down?

One big reason is that weather has been favorable and production high. Secretary Benson hoped that as price supports were lowered, farmers would produce less of the basic crops. But it didn't work out that way. Farmers have been producing more corn and wheat than ever. Even though price supports are lower, it costs the Government more to carry out the program, because there is more grain to be covered.

In the last 2 years, by making corn loans available to everyone, Benson deliberately increased the cost of that program. Farmers who failed to comply with their acreage allotments could get loans about 25 cents below the regular rate.

Crop acreage controls never have worked very well in limiting production, but Secretary Benson has not tried to make them work even as well as in the past. The non-compliance corn loan was a strong incentive to farmers to grow as much corn as possible. The Secretary campaigned to get rid of the allotments, and this has now been accomplished as a result of the farmer referendum last November. In addition, Mr. Benson worked against limitation of production by refusing to require farmers to com-

ply with allotments on all crops if they were to receive benefits on any. So wheat and cotton producers, for example, have been free to expand corn production.

It is paradoxical that the man who was going to get Government out of agriculture has got Government deeper into agriculture than ever before. Surpluses have mounted and are still mounting. Government expenditures for price support, storage, and disposal of surpluses have risen from less than \$1 billion a year to more than \$3 billion a year and are still rising.

The cost of farm programs would have been much lower in the last 3 years if Secretary Benson had done his best to make the crop acreage controls work—and had limited corn loans to those who comply with acreage allotments.

Secretary Benson has been so fanatically opposed to Government farm programs that there is considerable reason to believe that he has tried to make the programs look bad in the way he has administered them.

Baron von Steuben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Col. Pierre Marcel Honnell, Signal Corps, USAR, a professor of electrical engineering at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., on the occasion of General von Steuben's birthday, Richard Barthold Unit, Steuben Society of America, on Saturday, October 11, 1958. I thought this was an excellent address and that others would enjoy reading it. The address follows:

BARON VON STEUBEN, MAJOR GENERAL, INSPECTOR GENERAL, CONTINENTAL ARMY, 1778-84

(Address by Col. Pierre Marcel Honnell, Signal Corps, USAR, professor of electrical engineering, Washington University, on the occasion of General von Steuben's birthday, Richard Barthold Unit, Steuben Society of America, Edgewater Club, St. Louis, Mo., October 11, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, Congressman CURTIS, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to address the Richard Barthold Unit of the Steuben Society of America on the occasion of its patron's birthday, the 17th September 1730. The history of professional service of Frederick William Augustus Henry Ferdinand, Baron von Steuben, is now well known to all, and particularly to the members of this, the Steuben Society of America. Yet this history does bear repetition for the lessons it teaches: of honor; of integrity; of outstanding performance and devotion to duty; of opportunities and rewards in our land of freedom.

Baron von Steuben served with the extraordinary distinction in the Continental Army of the newly born Republic from 1777 to 1784, almost 7 years of continuous active duty. Reporting to General Washington at Valley Forge in February of 1778, he arrived at a time of dire stress for the Continental Army. Soldiers were suffering privations, were poorly fed, poorly clad, and poorly shod. The ranks were depleted by sickness, and from terminations of the short 1-year enlistments of the men. The Army lacked

stores and equipment of all descriptions. The recent campaign of 1777 had been relatively unsuccessful and the Battles of Brandywine and Germantown had been lost. The British occupied Philadelphia, the seat of government, and Staten Island and Manhattan Island.

Although the ranks could and would be refilled by drafts, and military stores and equipment were forthcoming, if slowly, General Washington and his generals well realized that the principal deficiencies of the Continental Army were its defective training, its poor military discipline, and its total lack of doctrine. A plan to remedy this situation had already been proposed: a special agency would be formed on General Washington's staff, to be known as the Inspector General, which would have as its principal function the preparation of a system of drill regulations and supervise their application to the training of the entire Army.

It was therefore a most providential set of circumstances which included his friendship with M. le Comte de St. Germain, the French Minister of War, and the acumen of Dr. Benjamin Franklin and Mr. Silas Deane, and the organization of Hortalaz & Co., operated by M. Baron de Baumarchais, which finally brought the baron to Valley Forge. From his past 20 years of military service, culminating on the operations staff and as aide-de-camp to Frederick the Great, Baron von Steuben was superbly fitted by experience and by education for the office of Inspector General.

The accomplishments of the baron fully justified the judgment of his friend, St. Germain, and his American supporters, Franklin and Deane. The enthusiasm, energy, efficiency, and genius of Baron von Steuben brought a miraculous change in the state of training of the Continental Army. In the matter of 6 weeks, the new Inspector General brought the discipline and morale of the Army to such a state of proficiency that General Washington felt justified in a celebration. This he did by publishing in the General Orders of May 5, 1778, the particulars for a grand review to be held the following day in honor of the official confirmation of the French Alliance. The review was a great success; and details of the new state of training of the Army reached the British through spies.

Baron von Steuben's brilliant success at Valley Forge was known to Congress, which on May 5, 1778, appointed the Baron to the office of Inspector General, with the rank and pay of major general. General Washington communicated the appointment to General de Steuben at the reception held the evening of the Grand Review, announcing him to his guests as Major General Baron de Steuben, Inspector General of the Army of the United States.

The rebirth of the Continental Army as a disciplined, trained, powerful fighting machine is the greatest contribution of General de Steuben to the War of Independence. This he had accomplished almost as a personal tour-de-force; for, although knowing no English at the time, he himself drilled the first squad, then the platoons, then the entire company of the model company of instructors who were to carry to the Army his drill regulations learned in the Prussian *Leistung* Regiment some 30 years before. The example of the distinguished foreign general officer personally drilling troops was a lesson to both the officers and men of the Continental Army.

But these were not his only contributions. General de Steuben personally wrote the first drill regulations for the Army. They were written in French, and translated by his personal staff officers into English. These regulations were later published by congressional authority in 1779 as Regulations for

the Order and Discipline of the Troops of the United States. He also instituted a much-needed system of strength reports, and established accountability and property management in the Army, thereby saving very large sums of money for our Government.

Do any of General von Steuben's accomplishments remain, after these many years? The answer is an emphatic "Yes," and in many areas of the Military Establishment. At the cessation of hostilities, the Baron put his mind to the needs of a permanent system of national defense. His recommendations to the Congress included a regular military force for the protection of the frontiers, a militia on a permanent footing, military schools, and military manufactories.

The United States Military Academy at West Point is a direct descendant of his original plans for the defense of the country. The regular service schools, and in particular the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth also stem from his original plans. It is no longer possible for a single officer, with a small personal staff, to conceive and establish the rules and regulations for a modern military nation; this now requires an enormous staff effort, almost completely unknown to the public at large. The establishment of a militia as an effective military organization did not take place until after the costly experiences of World War I; passage by Congress of the National Defense Act of 1920 provided for a National Guard and a Reserve Officer Training Corps, both indispensable to the success of our military efforts during and since World War II. When one visits a college or university campus and views young men in the military uniforms of the Reserve Officer Training Corps of the various branches of the military service of the United States, we witness again the fruits of General von Steuben's genius.

Full recognition of General von Steuben's achievements for the military security of the Nation has been emphasized only in recent times; but this has now changed. In 1937, John McAuley Palmer wrote: "There were two indispensable military men in the Revolutionary War, Washington and Steuben. When I say," he continues, "that their military services were indispensable, I mean that each of them contributed something essential to final victory that could not have been contributed by any other man then in the American Army. Brilliant as Greene's services were, it is conceivable that Lafayette or Wayne or some other general might have commanded the southern army successfully. But it is not conceivable that any other American soldier could have borne Washington's burden of supreme responsibility. Nor is it conceivable that any other man could have given the technical assistance, essential to military success, that Steuben gave to his chief. Washington was the indispensable commander. Steuben was his indispensable staff officer."

That these views are justified is clear from the famous letter of George Washington dated December 23, 1783, in which he wrote in part:

ANNAPOLIS, December 23, 1783.

MY DEAR BARON: Although I have taken frequent opportunities both in public and private, of acknowledging your great zeal, attention, and abilities in performing the duties of your office; yet, I wish to make use of this last moment of my public life to signify in the strongest terms, my entire approbation of your conduct, and to express my sense of obligations the public is under to you for your faithful and meritorious services.

This is the last letter I shall ever write, while I continue in the service of my coun-

try—the hour of my resignation is fixed at 12 this day—after which, I shall become a private citizen on the banks of the Potomac, where I shall be glad to embrace you, and testify the great esteem and consideration, with which, I am, my dear Baron, your most obedient and affectionate servant.

G. WASHINGTON.

"In all history, no soldier received nobler recognition of faithful and meritorious service." (J. McPalmer.)

In closing this brief account of General Von Steuben's contributions to American military security, I should like to bring your thoughts for a few moments upon one phase of the requirements of our military services for the future, in particular on the education of the officers in whose hands the destiny of our Nation will lie at the times of ultimate stress.

It was possible in Von Steuben's day to train an entire army in a matter of 6 weeks to 6 months, and to bring it to such a state of readiness that it could successfully meet the finest European military force. But that day has vanished. Today there are fission and fusion weapons and their means of delivery, intricate communication and guidance systems, and orbiting vehicles in the heavens. To utilize these military means intelligently and economically for the defense of this Nation, and to neutralize these military means in the hands of an enemy, demands an effort of the utmost magnitude on the part of this country. For, the complexities, that is, the intellectual content, of these new military weapons is extraordinarily great, and increasing at an enormous rate. It is very likely, therefore, that far-reaching changes will ultimately be required in the education of officers, the Regular and the Reserve and the Militia, so that they may better be able to conceive, develop, supervise the manufacture, and finally employ these complex weapons of the future.

The scientific content of the education required for the military services will soon be of an extraordinarily high magnitude and level. And this education cannot be acquired in a matter of 6 weeks or 6 months, but will take long years of preparation and application. Thus I earnestly beseech each and every one of you to consider these needs not merely of today but of the future. The preparations for the defenses of the Nation 20 years hence start today in the kindergarten. It will require men and women of ability, of honor, of integrity, and of education, in all the ranks, backed by a superlative economy capable of producing the complex mechanisms of defense for the future.

Support by each and every one of us of the educational processes, both civil and military, is an essential and all-important ingredient for the protection of our way of life; a way of life for which Baron von Steuben volunteered his services and which he chose to adopt by becoming an American citizen, so long ago.

REFERENCES

"General von Steuben," John McAuley Palmer, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1937.

"Proceedings Upon the Unveiling of the Statue of Baron von Steuben and Upon the Presentation of the Replica to His Majesty the German Emperor and the German Nation," compiled by George H. Carter and printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, Government Printing Office, United States of America, 1912.

"The Life of Frederick William von Steuben," Friedrich Kapp, Mason Brothers, New York, 1859.

"Washington and His Generals," J. T. Headley, Baker & Scribner, New York, 1843.

Inflation: How Great the Danger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following article from the December 1958 issue of the magazine *Nation's Business* entitled "Inflation: How Great the Danger?" by Jules Blackman, an economist at New York University. I feel this article is well worth reading as it certainly presents a careful analysis of the economic problem our country is facing today.

INFLATION: HOW GREAT THE DANGER?

(By Jules Blackman, economist, New York University)

Warnings that we are about to experience a new substantial inflation are tempered now with statements that the immediate prospect is for a lessening rather than an increase of inflation dangers.

An analysis of the forces now at work will help to keep the picture in focus.

Among these forces are:

Psychological factors.

Price trends.

Wage inflation.

The budget deficit.

Analysis of these indicates that present inflation pressures—which are real enough—may have a limited effect.

We may, for instance, be entering another period such as the late 1920's when inflation was reflected in booming stock prices but wholesale and retail prices were relatively stable.

PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

Underlying the present fear of inflation is a conviction that the combination of fiscal inflation, wage inflation, and a national concern over full employment could provide an irresistible combination. Many of our public policies have an inflationary bias.

The failure of prices to decline in the 1957-58 period tended to reinforce this belief as many persons overlooked the fact that such price behavior had also occurred on several occasions in the past. (See *Nation's Business*, July 1958.) The easing of mortgage and installment credit terms also pointed in this direction.

It is claimed that these factors have created an inflation psychology.

The importance of psychological factors cannot be ignored. What is the evidence that such a psychology exists today?

Certainly, no such evidence is available in the actions of consumers or of businessmen. Retail sales or inventory policies have indicated no flight from money.

One Federal Reserve Board official has pointed out that:

"The first signals of inflation can [manifest] themselves in distrust of the dollar and a consequent trend to unhealthy speculative tendencies."

In fact, the only area where inflation psychology can be detected is in the securities markets. Many stocks and some of the stock indexes have moved above the peaks of the summer of 1957.

Even in that area, it is not quite clear to what extent the rise in stock prices represents an optimistic appraisal of the magnitude of business recovery and to what extent a flight from money.

Similarly, it is not clear to what extent the decline in bond prices reflects tightening

money and a reaction to the speculative boom of last spring and to what extent it is a flight from fixed income securities because of fears of inflation.

PRICE TRENDS

The general level of wholesale prices recorded little change between 1952 and 1955. Late in 1955 these prices began to rise. From a level of 110.7 in 1955 (1947-49 equals 100), the index rose to 118.4 in August 1957. After a year of fluctuations within a narrow range the index was 118.5 late in October 1958.

	August 1957	October 1958 (1947-49=100)	Percent change
Total index.....	118.4	118.5	+0.1
Farm products.....	93.0	91.0	-2.2
Processed foods.....	106.8	109.7	+2.7
Industrial.....	126.0	126.1	+1.1

Similarly, the sensitive price index, which reflects the changes in 22 basic commodities, has shown little change. In August 1957, this index was 89.3 (1947-49=100). Since then it has fluctuated between 84.4 and 87.3. Early in November 1958, the index was about 87. In light of the responsiveness of this index to inflationary influences, its failure to record much change during this period is a significant indication that inflation has not yet taken hold.

Most of the headlines dealing with prices have been devoted to the new highs in the consumer price index, month after month. Less attention has been given to the fractional nature of these new highs. Between August 1957 and September 1958, the consumer price index rose only 2.2 percent. Most of this rise had taken place by March so that between March and September, the index actually advanced only three-tenths of 1 percent.

Clearly, the trends of wholesale and retail prices have not yet reflected a new inflationary price spiral, and upward pressures seem likely to be less in the next few months.

In much of the postwar period, there has been an insistent demand for products to overcome the shortages built up during World War II and on a lesser scale during the Korean war. We no longer have large backlogs of deferred demand which create strong upward pressures on prices.

American industry built a record volume of plant and equipment during the 1955-57 boom. In many instances the current capacity far exceeds peak levels of demand in the past. For example, the steel industry has a capacity of about 145 million tons—almost 25 percent greater than the maximum tonnage ever produced in 1 year. In varying degrees a similar situation prevails in many other industries.

Thus, while a considerable volume of plant and equipment will be built for modernization purposes, there will be less eagerness to expand total capacity as such. In this connection, it may be recalled that the vigorous plant and equipment boom created tremendous pressure for price rises from the demand side during the 1955-57 period. The large surplus capacity also presents a barrier to runaway price inflation at this time.

Possible world conflict is another factor which cannot be ignored. The recurrent crises in the Near East and in the Far East provide potential tinder boxes. Should a war break out, inflation is a certainty. However, if war is averted, there should be only minor pressures as a result of these situations. It is interesting to note that the sensitive price index which jumped some 50 percent during the first 6 months of the Korean war and rose about 7 percent during the first weeks of the Suez crisis showed little responsiveness to the developments in the fall of 1958.

Farm prices, too, have begun to decline. The current agricultural crop is the largest we have ever had. It is estimated that the output is about 10 percent above the peak years of 1948, 1956, and 1957. Large supplies of farm products usually are reflected in lower prices—and some declines have already taken place. From a level of 93.5 (1947-49 equals 100) the index of wholesale prices of farm products has declined to about 91. However, this large farm crop has one inflationary effect because it is requiring larger Government expenditures to support prices. Approximately one-fifth of the increase in the Federal deficit is attributable to higher expenditures for agriculture.

The net effect of modifications of the Federal price support and loan programs will be to permit somewhat lower prices for farm products.

WAGE INFLATION

The most important pressure on costs and prices during the 1955-57 period was the increase in labor costs at a more rapid rate than national productivity. Thus, in the manufacturing industries output per man-hour rose by only four-tenths of 1 percent in 1956 and eight-tenths in 1957—substantially below the long term rate of gain. For the nonagricultural economy the average rise for those 2 years also averaged less than 1 percent per year.

In contrast, average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries rose 5.3 percent in 1956 and 4.5 percent in 1957. Inclusive of various nonwage benefits, the percentage increases were even larger. Substantial pressure on prices was created by increases in labor costs in excess of the lagging gains in output per man-hour. The increases in steel and aluminum prices in August reflected this pressure.

The magnitude of wage inflation is likely to be somewhat smaller in the year ahead. Business recovery usually is conducive to greater gains in output per man-hour as the rise in employment tends to lag behind increasing output. There is some evidence that a similar pattern is developing during the current recovery. While precise data are not available, the recent automobile settlement appears to have increased total labor costs by about 4 percent, or less than in the 1955-57 period. Although this rise in labor costs still exceeds national gains in output per man-hour, the net rise in unit labor costs appears likely to be smaller than in recent years. Hence, the wage inflation, while still a factor, could be less important than it has been.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

The fact that the Federal Government is faced with a large increase in deficit financing is the most important single factor behind our present fear of inflation. We properly are concerned about the inflationary effects of a budget deficit.

The Government's budgetary deficits are among the most powerful creators of inflation. However, it is not the effect of a single budget which is important. Rather it is the manner in which the price inflation created by such deficits leads to new increases in Government expenditures and thus to bigger and bigger deficits as spending outpaces tax revenues. It is this spiral which has created the most serious inflationary consequences in the past.

A budget deficit of more than \$12 billion, such as that projected for the current fiscal year (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959) is a serious matter. Such a deficit is inflationary. How inflationary, however, depends largely on how the financing of it affects our money supply.

There have been only moderate changes in the volume of demand deposits and in money in circulation in the past 2 years.

[Billions of dollars]

	Demand deposits	Currency outside the banks	Total
August 1956.....	104.5	27.5	131.9
August 1957.....	105.1	27.8	132.9
August 1958.....	107.6	28.0	135.6

Between August 1957 and August 1958, total demand deposits and currency increased by only \$2.7 billion or 2 percent. A smaller rise took place between August 1956 and August 1957. Thus, our money supply has been expanding at less than the 3 percent long-term rate. However, the financing of the Federal budget deficit will inflate the supply of money and credit to the extent that new Government securities are sold to the banks.

The present outlook is for the commercial banks to carry the major burden of this financing.

It is not certain, however, even if the banks finance the entire budgetary deficit, that it will result in an equivalent rise in money supply. Much of the \$8 billion increase in the commercial banks' holdings of Government securities in the year ending August 1958 did not result in larger demand deposits. However, total time and savings deposits increased by \$10 billion during that period. To the extent that these Government securities can be sold to others rather than to commercial banks, the attending inflationary pressure would be reduced. It is important, therefore, to create the atmosphere which will encourage these and other groups to buy Government securities. Strong measures to improve the Federal budgetary picture would be among the most helpful in achieving this objective.

Meanwhile, some of the danger in this area will be sharply reduced as a result of business recovery.

The increase in the deficit projected for the current fiscal year results from a decline in revenues (\$2.1 billion) and an increase in expenditures (\$7.3 billion). For the following fiscal year, the projected deficit is cut in half due largely to an anticipated rise in tax revenues. The projected large deficit, then, is not expected to pyramid into a still larger deficit in the following year if Government spending for 1959-60 can be restrained.

It should be possible to curtail spending as a result of business recovery.

Economists usually point out that it is the cash deficit or surplus which determines the inflationary or deflationary effects of a budget. The cash budget includes the operations of the various Government pension funds and of the social security and unemployment insurance funds. On balance, the operation of these funds has usually resulted in a net withdrawal of cash from the economy:

[Billions of dollars]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Surplus or deficit		Net cash flow from funds
	Administrative budget	Cash budget	
1956.....	+\$1.6	+\$4.6	+\$2.9
1957.....	+1.6	+2.1	+0.5
1958.....	-2.8	-1.5	-1.3
1959 (estimated)...	-12.2	-13.7	-1.5

During the current fiscal year, in contrast, a net payment of cash by Government is anticipated so that the cash deficit is forecast at \$13.7 billion or \$1.5 billion higher than the administrative deficit.

With business recovery, the deficit in the cash budget should be reduced more rapidly than the deficit in the administrative budget.

An examination of the trend of unemployment compensation payments shows why.

Unemployment insurance

[Millions of dollars]

	January-May		Change
	1957	1958	
Tax collections....	\$1,094.5	\$1,064.6	-\$29.9
Benefits paid.....	851.8	1,875.5	+1,023.7

At the low point of the recession—the first 5 months of 1958—total unemployment benefits rose by more than \$1 billion as compared with a year earlier, while tax collections fell by \$30 million.

As recovery proceeds, the unemployment benefits paid will decline sharply.

At the same time, tax collections will rise because of greater employment and the probability of higher effective tax rates in States with merit rating.

The recently amended Social Security Act provided for larger benefits but also established higher tax rates to go into effect in January. These changes are expected to put the system on a self-sustaining basis. This will also act to reduce the cash deficit.

Thus various funds should provide a moderate deflationary influence instead of adding to the inflationary pressure as at present.

Business recovery through its favorable impact on tax revenues and upon the net flow of cash into the unemployment insurance and other funds also should act to moderate the threat of inflation rather than to increase it. It is vital, however, that new Government spending programs be limited and that old programs be reviewed and pruned to wipe out the deficit. It will make little economic sense of full recovery does not bring about a budgetary surplus.

As for other types of Government action, both Congress and the administration have shown awareness of the inflation problem.

Congress' unwillingness to reduce taxes last year indicated its concern over budgetary deficits.

The President's veto of several measures involving larger Government spending and the order to cut back Federal personnel by 2 percent indicate that the administration realizes the need for economy. The fact that the rise in expenditures stems largely from activities not directly related to defense or to combating the recession indicates that there is room for cutting the \$80 billion projected spending. Government spending can and must be cut.

There is certainly no reason for complacency over the Federal budgetary situation. Nor should we ignore the difficulties of control.

The Federal Reserve Board has already given notice that it will use its powers to curb price inflation. Early in August, margin requirements on security loans were raised from 50 percent to 70 percent. In October came a further raise to 90 percent. There also have been two increases in the discount rate—from 1½ percent to 2 percent, and then to 2½ percent. A year earlier the discount rate was 3½ percent so that these are only mild steps. The Federal Reserve, as part of its easy money policy starting in November 1957, had built up excess reserves at the member banks to about \$600 million as compared with a net deficiency of reserves of about \$500 million before that time. Now, as part of the tightening-up process, this situation has been reversed. Excess reserves have been almost wiped out. Just as the Federal Reserve indicated early in the recession that it would act to make credit more abundant, so it has now indicated early in recovery that it will act to tighten credit.

Many have pointed out that this creates difficulty in marketing Government bonds. They have also pointed out that monetary policy alone cannot curb price inflation, as we have seen in the past.

This is all true. But it seems equally true that we must develop a growing public awareness of the dangers that are inherent in inflation, whether it be fiscal, monetary or wage.

The national objective of a high level employment economy must be supplemented by a national objective to take vigorous action against inflation.

Recognition of Red China

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include in the RECORD the following statement issued by Mr. Harry W. Flannery, president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, on the subject of recognition of Red China.

In view of the suggestions advocated by some people, to the effect that our Government and the United Nations Organization should revise our policy with regard to the recognition of Communist China, I believe that Mr. Flannery's statement is timely and very important. It reviews briefly, but very adequately, the compelling reasons which argue against any change in our policy with respect to the recognition of Red China, and her admission as a member to the United Nations.

I have made my position on this issue clear in the past, and I am in agreement with the views outlined by Mr. Flannery. I therefore wish to commend his statement to the earnest consideration of the membership of this body.

The statement follows:

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA, STATEMENT BY HARRY W. FLANNERY, PRESIDENT, CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

At the present time, there are demands and appeals from many sources for a revision of United States and United Nations policy with regard to recognition of Communist China. Those who are urging that the United Nations accept Communist China as a member, and that the United States establish diplomatic relations with the Peiping regime, should carefully consider the following points:

1. The Charter of the United Nations (chap. II, art. 4) sets forth that its members must be peace loving.
2. The United Nations General Assembly, on February 1, 1951, by a vote of 44 to 7, made it plain that Communist China is not peace loving. This resolution declared that "the Central Peoples' Government of the Peoples' Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea, and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea." Thus, Communist China was declared to be an aggressor against the forces of 17 members of the United Nations. This designation still stands.

3. Communist China also aided aggressors in Vietnam and has attacked the islands of Matsu and Quemoy. In the latter case, Communist China has asserted in Peiping broadcasts and in talks with the U.S. Ambassador in Warsaw that its real objective is the island of Formosa. Communist China declares that it will take Formosa by force if necessary, thus threatening further aggression.

4. The Communists gained control over the 600 million people of China by force. They were able to succeed because the Soviet Union turned over to them the vast military supplies taken from the Japanese in northern China after the United States had defeated Japanese imperialism. These supplies were turned over to the Communist Chinese at a time when the Soviet Union had a treaty of peace and friendship with the Republic of China.

5. The people of China have not been given the opportunity of choosing their own government, even though Mao Tse-tung, in 1937, before the Communists had taken over the China mainland, promised free elections in China.

6. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would threaten the Republic of China, now exiled on Formosa. Communist China, once recognized as the United Nations representative of the Chinese people, would then claim suzerainty over Formosa. It also could demand the seat on the United Nations Security Council now occupied by the Republic of China.

7. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would conceivably threaten British control of Hong Kong. It would make it unlikely that Cambodia, Thailand, and perhaps other countries in the area would remain non-Communist.

8. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would affect the status of 12 million overseas Chinese in southeast Asia. Since these Chinese are influential citizens in Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and elsewhere, the non-Communist governments of these countries might conceivably face a new threat.

9. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would threaten the freedom of refugees from Communist China now in Hong Kong, Formosa, and other parts of southeast Asia.

10. Article 4 of chapter II of the United Nations Charter declares that: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Among the obligations of members of the United Nations are the 18 essential human rights named in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, beginning with freedom of religion, and including, among others, freedom of opinion, speech, assembly, fair trial, property, education, and participation in government. Yet the leaders of Red China have consistently and continually violated the basic freedoms of the Chinese people. One has only to point out the tragic situation of Christian missionaries on the China mainland, and the persecution which they and their people have so long endured at the hands of a relentless and godless regime.

Can anyone seriously believe, on the basis of the record, that Communist China will live up to any of its obligations, and thus meet another requirement of United Nations membership?

Those who propose membership in the United Nations for Communist China cannot ignore the points here set forth, nor the tyranny that denies to the people of China the most elemental of human rights, including religion, and even life itself.

Small Business Tax Adjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 13, the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act, which is an identical bill to H.R. 2, introduced by my esteemed colleague, Congressman FRANK IKARD. These bills are similar to the bills that Congressman IKARD and I sponsored in the last Congress.

The passage of this legislation is urgent if we are to maintain the proper balance in our economy between small and large business. It is urgent if we are to have the growth we need to maintain a healthy and progressive economy.

The bills which Congressman IKARD and I introduced in the last Congress were the subject of extensive hearings by the Ways and Means Committee. The committee in its report accompanying a bill which sought to alleviate some of the lesser problems of small business recognized the soundness of the philosophy behind our bills, which hit at the basic problem.

Now is the time to implement the Ikard-Curtis philosophy by legislation.

What is the philosophy? That traditionally in the private enterprise system economic growth comes essentially from the small and new businesses. That the small and new businesses finance their growth essentially from retained earnings, not from bank borrowings, new equity capital or other sources which are generally not available to it.

This is the seed corn philosophy upon which America has grown great. We plant 1 acre of corn, but we retain enough seed from the harvest to plant 2 acres next year. Yet under our Federal tax structure we have been taxing the seed corn so that we are stunting the healthy economic growth we need.

There are those who are so blind to basic economics that they look upon relief from the seed corn tax as threatening the revenues of the Federal Government. It is quite the other way around. If we do not stop taxing the seed corn we will not have the economic growth from which we have been deriving our increased Federal revenues.

During the last recession we overanticipated our Federal tax revenues by about \$8 billion. Why? Because we were counting upon an increased gross national product for a larger tax base. Instead of the increased GNP we had a decrease. Essentially this decrease came from the new and small businesses not going ahead with their planned expansions, because they did not have the financing necessary to do so.

Congressman IKARD and my theory of removing some of the tax on the seed corn is bound to produce more, not less, Federal revenues. The only basis upon which a business gets the tax credit in

our bills is when it puts retained earnings into growth of the business. What is growth in a business other than increased payrolls, increased expenditures for capital outlays which mean increased payrolls in other businesses? The amount of tax the Federal Government obtains from this kind of expenditure is multiplied several times over.

Furthermore, there is no question but the Federal Government loses revenue when the healthy small businesses are made part of larger concerns through merger and acquisition, particularly when in many instances the purchase price of the small concern is partly paid out of tax-avoidance savings.

Many present-day mergers and acquisitions are not real economic growth. Indeed, many actually are stifling growth. There are, of course, mergers and acquisitions resulting from good economics, but the rate of mergers and acquisitions in the past few years clearly indicate reasons other than good economics lie behind this process. One does not have to look far to find the answer. The answer lies in our Federal tax laws, which discourage economic growth and place a premium on economic cannibalism of larger companies swallowing smaller ones.

The point is not whether the Treasury can stand the enactment of the Ikard-Curtis bill. The question is rather how long can the Federal Treasury stand not to have it enacted.

The bill (H.R. 13) follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Deduction for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable.

(a) ALLOWANCE.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount measured by the additional investment in such trade or business for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—The deduction under this section for any taxable year shall not exceed whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) \$30,000, or

"(2) an amount equal to 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year (computed without regard to this section).

"(c) ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT DEFINED.—For purpose of this section, the additional investment in a trade or business for a taxable year means the amount (if any) by which—

"(1) the aggregate, computed as of the close of the taxable year, of the adjusted bases of—

"(A) all property used in the trade or business of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167,

"(B) all stock in trade and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business,

"(C) all accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, exceeds

"(2) a similar aggregate, computed as of the beginning of such taxable year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.—Limitation on Affiliated Group.—For the purposes of this section:

"(1) All members of an affiliated group shall be treated as one taxpayer, and

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate shall apportion the limitation contained in subsection (b) of this section among the members of such affiliated group in such manner as he shall by regulations provide.

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUP DEFINED.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to it by section 1504, except that, for such purposes, the phrase 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 80 percent' each place it occurs in section 1504 (a)."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

Our Impoverished Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by David L. Cohn, from the January issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

OUR IMPOVERISHED DIPLOMATS

(By David L. Cohn)

The rich United States treats its Foreign Service career officers with pinchpenny niggardliness. It thereby, to its disgrace, exacts heavy sacrifices of devoted men and sharply lessens our diplomatic effectiveness.

Annually, at the expense of their families' welfare, these men spend upward of \$200,000 of their own money in extending official hospitality to foreigners for the Nation's benefit. Large sums are spent by men in such ambassadorial posts as London, Paris, Rome, posts open only to the wealthy because the salaries and allowances attached to them fall far short of the needs. These posts are in effect bought by rich men who contribute liberally to the winning political party in a presidential election. They are therefore nearly always barred to the career diplomat, even though he be the embodiment of Franklin, Talleyrand, Metetrnich.

How does this affect us in the field? In Paris the informed knew that the young officer being removed from our Embassy there was exceptionally able, that his removal was the country's loss. Speaking of him, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "When I was in Paris . . . I had luncheon with some prominent French people; they said what a tragedy it was that this fellow had gone. They said, 'Why did you take this man away?'"

He was removed because he had gone broke doing his job. Mr. Dulles continued: "He just could not afford to live there. He had already gone into debt and had neglected

the education, health, and dentistry of his children. . . . So we had to pull out one of our most effective persons. . . . He spoke French perfectly and was our best at the operating level, the best counterpoise to the activities of the Soviet Embassy."

Thus the land of the \$80 billion budget removed an able diplomat from an important post to one politically inconsequential, because it would not spend money to enable him to do his job well.

Like Paris, like Rome. At our Embassy there an officer recently spent \$1,500 of his own funds entertaining official guests for the benefit of the United States. He is without independent income and has a family of four.

Why do these men make such sacrifices? It is because they cannot bear to see America poorly represented, because it pains them that their country should appear cheap and shabby in the eyes of foreigners, because they are professionals with the passion of their kind for perfection.

The whole difficulty stems from inadequate "representation allowances" appropriated by Congress. These are funds to cover the cost of hospitality tendered for America. They are not compensation for individuals. No personal advantage accrues from them.

For fiscal 1957 these allowances were only \$800,000. But although living costs are rising everywhere and our competition with the Communist world grows daily more intense, Congress sharply reduced the allowances for fiscal 1958 to \$600,000. For fiscal 1959 they will be \$750,000. This is less than the appropriation of 2 years ago, yet more men are in the field, and the need for money becomes acute.

The \$600,000 allowance for 1958 was spread thin. It was distributed among 80 diplomatic missions, 200 consulates, and approximately 1,600 officers. Since it was insufficient, almost no one had enough money to meet his minimal responsibilities. What are these responsibilities?

Our foreign service officer ought to cultivate local leaders in all spheres so that dealings might progress on a friendly, informal basis if the need should arise. Occasionally he must entertain these leaders and acquaint them with visiting Americans. He should, moreover, be able to talk lengthily and informally with local nationals about matters of common interest away from their offices. This is especially important in Oriental countries. In Japan, for example, even businessmen conduct much of their business in teahouses and restaurants, and many Japanese regard as vulgar the foreigner who insists upon doing business in the office.

These activities require more money than the \$600,000 presently provided. Many American corporations spend larger sums entertaining customers and currying good will. Corporate expense spending, it is estimated, is now about \$5 billion a year. This is equivalent to one-sixteenth of the whole Federal budget and is deductible from taxable income. But the same Government that is so lavish with businessmen's expense spending grudgingly grants pennies for the same purpose to the men charged with the awesome duties of discharging the Nation's foreign policy and winning good will for it against intense Communist competition nearly everywhere.

Let us see how this policy affects one consulate general. Its consular area contains 12 million people. It is located in a key city of more than 1 million people, engaged in shipping, manufacturing, trading. Aside from routine tasks such as issuing visas, the consulate interprets to Washington local political and economic trends, advises and entertains visiting American industrialists, calls upon and entertains local officials, businessmen, labor leaders, and all who may be useful to America in its economic competition with the West and in its economic-political competition with the Communist world.

The consulate general has a representation allowance that, in the opinion of Congress, is large enough to permit it, among other things, to maintain close, friendly contacts with hundreds of persons at all social levels. It is \$345 a year, or about 90 cents a day.

Our consul general does not aspire to funds sufficient for the task. He merely longs for ample "lunch money." With it he could take local leaders to lunch and, he says, "do a little brain picking. I could entertain them for entertainment received and develop close contacts with labor leaders, teachers, and professional people, all of whom are important in opinion formulation."

The people here, as in huge areas elsewhere, are largely illiterate. For most of them the purchase of a radio would be unimaginable. "But," observes our consul, "here the personal approach pays rich dividends. Marvels can be achieved provided one enjoys personal friendships in the right places; lacking such friendships, the best laid plans may fail." How much personal approach, in terms of lunches, dinners, donations to local charities, may be had for 90 cents a day?

We compete with the Soviet Union and Red China throughout the continent where this consulate general operates. But our representatives are at a great disadvantage in terms of the personal approach. The Soviet Union, unlike ourselves, does not dole out representation allowances according to rigid formula. It allots them according to the demands of the task. Hence the representation expenditures of its embassies, and those of its satellites, are limited only by the number of people of present or potential importance who will attend their dinners and entertainments.

Look at our pinchpenny policy in the small, strategic southeast Asian country of Laos. We have poured nearly \$150 million of aid funds into it. But our Embassy officers in Vientiane recently dug into their own pockets for \$984 to pay for hospitality extended by them to Laotian and foreign officials.

We have also poured huge sums into neighborhood Cambodia. There we are in direct, open competition with nearby Red China for Cambodia's good will. Officers assigned to our Phnom Penh Embassy recently spent \$1,750 of their own money for official entertaining. Last year a touring American track team visited Cambodia. In order to obtain the maximum benefit from the visit, our Ambassador held a luncheon in the team's honor to which he invited interested Cambodians. This display of patriotism on the Ambassador's part cost him \$92.50.

One of our crucial posts is at Amman, in the beleaguered desert Kingdom of Jordan. In the fiscal year ending June 1957, every officer of our Amman Embassy dipped into his pocket to do his official tasks. In this period, marked by the Suez war, nearly all Americans were evacuated from Amman for 5 months, as were all Britons and many members of our foreign communities. The prevailing blackout and curfew sharply restricted normal contacts, but even under these conditions our Amman Foreign Service officers had to use their own funds to do their work.

We have a new consulate at Kampala, Uganda, a remote African area rapidly growing in importance to us. Uganda is approaching self-government. Hence the demands upon our consulate are the greater because it must deal with the semiautonomous Government and Parliament of the Kingdom of Buganda, which is destined to play a key role in determining the constitutional future of Uganda, as well as with the protectorate Government and National Legislative Council of Uganda. Our two officers at this important, demanding post are granted a total of \$500 a year (about 65 cents a day each) for representation allowance.

During the first 4 months of this fiscal year these officers spent \$525 on essential representation. At this rate they will have to spend \$1,000 of their own money during the year, in addition to their \$500 allotment.

Consider the plight of our consul at Tabriz, Iran. He was senior to his Turkish and French colleagues at a moment when the Shah was coming to Tabriz, and protocol dictated that our man must receive the Shah on behalf of the consular community. Protocol also dictated that he wear morning clothes for the occasion. The Shah could not know when our consul stood before him that the representative of the world's richest people owed his morning clothes to the willingness of a local tailor to wait a year for his money.

Our Government requires its officials to wear the clothes prescribed by protocol, such as tails, morning clothes, and so forth, but it does not help pay for them. Thus recently an officer with a wife and five children was forced to borrow \$2,500 to make essential purchase of clothing and equipment in preparation for assignment overseas. While abroad he must continue to pay income, real estate, and personal property taxes to his domiciliary State of Virginia. How much, then, of his own money can this man afford to spend for the benefit of the United States?

We are the world's largest automobile manufacturers. Yet our diplomats use many broken-down cars. Regulations forbid the spending of more than \$5,000 for an ambassador's car. The need is for a seven-passenger limousine, airconditioned for the hot countries, with a window partition for privacy in talks. Such cars cannot be had for our top price. The State Department is therefore forced to purchase discarded cars of cabinet members, secondhand funeral-home limousines, and the old cars of foreign diplomats in Washington who are buying new ones.

Naturally, the rolling junk we send our diplomats causes them trouble. Some time ago Loy Henderson, deputy Under Secretary of State, was our Ambassador to Teheran. This able officer had been sent an ancient car for his use. "But," he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "we had so much trouble with it that we did not dare go very far from Teheran. I recall that on several occasions when we were going to the airport to meet distinguished guests it broke down on the way and we had to transfer hurriedly to other cars."

Our diplomats must do certain ceremonial entertaining. Everywhere they hold open house on the 4th of July to all Americans and invited local nationals. It may consume a year's representation allowance. The 4th of July reception in London costs the Embassy about \$5,700. This is \$700 more than the Ambassador's \$5,000 representation allowance for a year.

The expense account is a fixed American business institution. But while we believe that it is a good thing for business to make friends by entertaining customers, we are only partially convinced that it is a good thing for our Foreign Service officers to do. Hence, while an American businessman in Rome may be spending hundreds of tax-deductible dollars dining his customers, down the street an American diplomat may be digging into his own pocket to pay for a pedestrian luncheon for an important Italian official. How can we entrust our diplomats with grave responsibilities and yet treat them with such parsimoniousness?

Our diplomatic corps is the basis of the operation of our foreign policy. Personal diplomacy is sometimes effective, and the politically appointed diplomat may be successful. Yet there can be no substitute for the well-trained, devoted diplomatic corps. As Senator LYNDON JOHNSON puts it, "A nation which does not have such a corps does not have a foreign policy." Yet no diplomatic corps can be at its best when it lacks the best tools in abundance.

A Latin American's Idea on Hemispheric Unity—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, an interesting and thought-provoking little book has recently come to my attention which contains some excellent ideas for the improvement of inter-American relations. The author is Jose A. Benitez, a 34-year-old Puerto Rican, whom I consider an up-and-coming Latin American statesman. His major thesis is the urgent need for unity, understanding and cooperation among the peoples of the Americas as a way "to solve among themselves the common problems affecting the destiny of the hemisphere."

Despite his relatively young age, Author Benitez has already achieved a notable career in several fields. He served in the U.S. Army during World War II, was a columnist for a Puerto Rican newspaper, director of a radio program, secretary to the majority leader of the Puerto Rican Senate, assistant to the Secretary of Justice, president of the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico since 1952 and chairman of its delegation to the National Democratic Conventions in the United States in 1952 and 1956, member of the mayor's committee on Puerto Rican Affairs of New York, and numerous other accomplishments.

Benitez cites Puerto Rico as an example of how best to settle hemispheric differences, in order to develop all potentialities and share in the common destiny of the Americas. He stresses the need for breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding. Once this is achieved, he visualizes a united America, free of national complexes and ancestral bitterness, a pioneering America ready to perform unselfish services and provide leadership to mankind.

I have recently had occasion to visit several Latin American countries in connection with my resolution to create a Pan American Parliamentary Association to help unite the nations of the Western Hemisphere for their well-being and security. Because of Puerto Rico's close relationship with the United States on the one hand, and its historic and ethnic origin as a Latin American community on the other hand, Puerto Rico assumes a unique position in inter-American relations and may be destined to play an important role in cementing hemispheric unity.

Mr. Speaker, Benitez' book is entitled "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America." It is a challenging little volume which should be read by our policy framers, Members of Congress, Government leaders, and all students of Latin American affairs. For this reason, I am inserting excerpts from the book and commend these to the attention of my colleagues:

PUERTO RICO AND THE POLITICAL DESTINY OF AMERICA

(By Jose A. Benitez)

PROLOG

The peoples of the Americas—North, Central, and South—urgently need the unity, understanding and cooperation that will help them to solve among themselves the common problems affecting the destiny of the hemisphere. The nationalist idea has become bankrupt, confronted with the changes of a world where geography has shrunk, while a gigantic wave of complications agitate a life already threatened by international pirates. There is no greater problem facing our part of the world than that of obtaining the understanding and cooperation needed to remove the barriers of indifference and to unite us in the objectives that are historically inevitable to the brotherhood of the future.

It is evident that in the great task of establishing an intercontinental understanding, the initiative is in its preliminary stages but is impeded by perhaps too much dialectic and a too laggard approach toward the fruits that the unity of America (and by "America" I mean all the countries of the Western Hemisphere) must yield. I hope I will not be accused of meddling censure when I say that North America as well as South America has turned its back on the responsibilities of their common fate. This lack of rapport among American communities creates, feeds, and expands prejudices, which operate against the interests of these communities, thus retarding the benefit that they may obtain through their association and understanding.

I know personally many heads of governing bodies who lead the affairs of American peoples. I have talked to politicians, to individuals in various professions, to newspapermen, to people who influence public opinion in the United States and Latin America. I have found in them a feeling for intercontinental understanding, a belief in a genuine American creed, and I dare to say that the furrow is ready for the seed that will bring forth the harvest.

I am a humble student of politics, who seeks to take advantage of its teachings—of the domestic type as well as the universal. My experience has taught me to believe in the virtue of honest communication. This is a thing most likely to prevent misunderstandings and to destroy suspicious feelings, thereby giving life to causes that honor mankind and exalt history. Distrust, especially unfounded distrust, is the product of sterile passions that impel toward the renunciation of human usefulness and greatness. To my way of thinking, the American peoples are separated by imaginary barriers, by surface puerilities, whose fragile mortar will fall apart when the leaders of the hemisphere accept and act on the idea that they must get closer together and try to understand each other.

I am convinced that our America cannot escape its Americanist destiny, that the people eventually will be in accord and will recognize that they have a common fate. Why, then, delay the natural process of our fruitful understanding? And why not speed the action with catalytic agents within our reach that will help bring us out of the impasse and into prosperity?

The tendencies that today separate the democratic nations of the free world from the enslaved bloc of the Communist countries call for a calm but rapid reconsideration leading toward the strengthening of our hemisphere. The north needs the south just as much as the south needs the north. The trouble here is not a matter of mistaken pride. The great task is for the serious and real initiation of cooperation among the American nations, and it is a task for everyone to consider. It is urgent to begin the work of creating and understanding, to gather

together in conference and make agreements in an atmosphere of generosity and brotherhood. It is necessary that our fellow men of the north get to understand better our brothers of the south, and that our brothers of the south likewise come to know those of the north.

Puerto Rico is a Latin American country, which preserves its traditions, history, and culture while maintaining a political association with the United States in bonds of brotherly fellowship, which include a common U.S. citizenship. Sixty years of family relations with that great nation give the Puerto Rican testimony concerning North and South Americans and their relationships with each other the quality derived from an exceptional experience. It is obvious to say that we know Latin America, as it is obvious also to indicate that we know the United States. With this knowledge, deriving from our origin and from the understanding that has flourished in the development and promotion of our country in the friendly orbit of the United States, we Puerto Ricans are puzzled somewhat by the state of things where, time and again, nations of warm, human qualities which, despite differences in race and language, could complement one another, nevertheless are somehow driven apart. It is sad to observe when it is so clear that by the gathering together of their respective virtues they could achieve mutual greatness.

Puerto Rico provides the best example of how the two main hemispheric sections could settle their differences, so as to attain the greatest good of their respective potentialities and share their destiny. By examining the experience of Puerto Rico, both the Latin American nations and the United States will find the proof that they can and must do away with their differences and start the work of unifying the hemisphere. Unquestionably, that is the mission of America. Its leaders have the responsibility of shaking off apathy and starting the task at once.

I offer this book as my humble contribution to the great work of bringing a better understanding between the countries of America. I present in it some points which reflect the efforts, the evolution, and the social achievements, economic and political, of the Puerto Rican people during the period of their relations with the United States. Without political or literary pretensions, I submit whatever is usable to the constructive judgment of the leaders who represent the north and the south and who are concerned for the destiny of the hemisphere.

I want to point out that to make possible this contribution I received valuable help from one of the most distinguished writers of Puerto Rico, who, giving freely of his experience, knowledge, and talent, worked with me at all times, guiding me in the ordering and application of my ideas. And so I make especial mention of my debt to my good friend, the writer Luis Antonio Miranda.

If my small effort gives some aid to the mutual interests of the leaders of America, I will feel greatly rewarded. May it be God's will that what I have sown will have some part in the blooming of a great intercontinental harvest.

ANTECEDENTS

Puerto Rico was discovered by Christopher Columbus during his second voyage to America, in the year 1493. The colonization of the island started some years later, in 1508, under Don Juan Ponce de Leon, the poet of the conquistadors, who gave credence to an Indian legend and set sail in search of the fountain of perpetual youth. Don Juan Ponce was the first Governor of Puerto Rico.

The island is by all means a Latin American community; it has the same origin, historical process, culture and political development as all the other Spanish-speaking countries in the New World. Our connec-

tion with Spain was similar to that of all other Latin American countries. However, the circumstances and historical facts that determined the branching off from Spain of the various Latin American countries were different in each case.

At different times, the Spanish colonies in America felt a strong desire for independence, but it was only after much struggling and fighting that they became free nations.

Puerto Rico, with an area of 3,435 square miles, and overpopulated, having few resources to depend on and no possibility of success in an adventure of secession, faced its future realistically and negotiated with Spain the Autonomic Pact of 1897. Shortly after the Puerto Ricans had begun to enjoy their autonomy, war broke out between the United States and Spain, in 1898. The American troops landed on the island under the command of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, who in a historic proclamation told the Puerto Ricans that he had come to bring liberty and to vanquish the oppressors. Although all the incumbent officials kept their municipal or insular offices, a military government was established. This lasted until May of 1900, when a civil government was formed, having a North American governor and an executive council with power to enact laws. The civil government was established by virtue of the Foraker Act, approved by the Congress of the United States without ratification by the Puerto Rican people. The government given to the island constituted a regression to the former colonial status and brought to an end the autonomic powers enjoyed by the Puerto Ricans on equal terms with the other Spanish provinces.

The struggles between Puerto Rican patriots and the authorities sponsored by the United States began here, continuing with much uproar. Increasingly, the relations between the two countries were affected by the difficulties attached to misunderstanding and indifference. This created discouragement among the leaders who fought for greater liberties for the island and whose feeling contributed to divisions in public sentiment. This was the principal cause, as the years wasted away, for the retardation of advancement and of the solution of social, economic and political problems, while our country remained stagnant.

While don Luis Muñoz Rivera, an illustrious and prominent Puerto Rican, was Resident Commissioner in Washington, the Jones Act was approved by the U.S. Congress in 1917. This law gave the Puerto Ricans American citizenship. In doing so, it set up a new regime and established, 19 years after the change of sovereignty, a government that still granted few political concessions and that was quite inferior to that established by the Autonomic Charter obtained from Spain. The improvements came, in short, with snail-like speed.

Under the Jones Act, the executive power was limited to a governor, who was appointed by the President of the United States, and to the similarly appointed judges of the supreme court of the island and several members of the governor's cabinet, among whom were the chiefs of the treasury department and the department of public instruction.

Along with the gift of American citizenship, the greatest political concession to the Puerto Ricans consisted in the establishing of the legislative power formed by two Puerto Rican legislative branches whose members occupied their positions by popular vote. However, the concession was not a great one, for the laws of the legislative branches were subject to the governor's veto and finally to the decision of the President of the United States.

It was expected that the granting of American citizenship would end the extreme estrangement and misunderstanding existing

in the political relations between the two countries. This hope soon began to wane because of the prolonged continuance of restrictive and vexing conditions inherent in the colonial status of Puerto Rico. The culture, patriotism, dignity and libertarian aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico inspired brave but impotent struggles against the powerful tentacles of colonialism. Social and economic evils increased. The interests of land monopoly and absenteeism took hold of the island. The exploiters of the laborers and of the peasants strengthened their position through the practice of vote buying, thus obtaining the nomination of their candidates, who made laws that suited their purposes and favored their personal interests. Many thousands of landholders disappeared under the voracious forces of the absentee corporations, which intensified the monoculture of sugar cane. Over the country spread the evils of unemployment, of misery, of famine, and of illness, until a total impoverishment spread its roots through the island.

Under the protective covering of an unrestrained colonial system, Puerto Rico came to be an enchanted paradise for the vicious alliance of politicians and exploiters, as well as a calvary for the crucifixion of the Puerto Ricans who worked hard and produced the wealth. The axiom that colonialism is not a political system but a system of economic exploitation found its cruel proof in Puerto Rico during that tragic period, which lasted up to 1940. But it should be pointed out in all honesty that the United States did not profit from the prevailing system—as it would have under the imperialists—but the industrial vampires benefited from the inaction and incomprehension existing in the relations between the two communities.

As the island went more and more adrift, due to the indolence of our politicians and to the indifference of our continental government, a new leader arrived on the political scene with a program leading to the repair of our social and economic conditions. This leader had in mind the moral and material vindication of the people of Puerto Rico. His program was first scoffed at as utopian by many of those who now back it and bless it. Their leader is our present Governor, don Luis Muñoz-Marín. Although a Puerto Rican, he was brought up in the United States; he made a study of the political problems of Puerto Rico to promote the island's true welfare. On his return to the island he made all possible efforts to reconcile the obstacles that handicapped the cordiality and good understanding between the United States and Puerto Rico, and that added to the indignity of colonialism.

Having founded in 1938 the Popular Democratic Party, with a numerous, determined, and experienced nucleus of leaders who loved Puerto Rico deeply, Muñoz-Marín traveled throughout the island preaching the need of uniting together so as to obtain justice. He condemned the immorality of vote buying as the most degrading act a citizen could commit. He introduced to the people of Puerto Rico the much-needed reform legislation, the immediate support of which was pledged in a solemn public act by the candidates for the legislature. In the elections of 1940 and during a civic movement without precedent the Popular Democratic Party came into power.

Since 1898, when General Miles announced that the American occupation troops had come to bring liberty to the Puerto Ricans, Puerto Rico, in spite of having enjoyed a dual citizenship since 1917, had done nothing toward the solution of its colonial problems. Up to the year 1950, the Jones Act of 1917 was still in effect. The President of the United States had the power of nominating and appointing the successive Governors who exerted the executive power in our country. These Governors had no knowledge whatso-

ever of our language, of our idiosyncrasies, or of our problems, and they had not lived with the interests and ideals of our people. As was said before, it was the President's task to appoint the judges of the supreme court of the island, as well as several members of the Governor's Cabinet. The colonial status prevailed fully, as did the exasperations and frictions that hurt the self-esteem of our humble but proud people. It was necessary to overcome the lack of comprehension between the two countries in order to establish the mutual trust and cooperation that might and should contribute to both communities as a respectful tribute to their relations as adult, civilized, Christian people.

For reasons that now appear to be naive in a political atmosphere of such dark aspect, with a resentful attitude that shut out all possibility of approach and comprehension, Puerto Rico threw overboard 42 years of precious time. This time could have been increasingly fruitful to Puerto Rico's endless undertaking of development and improvement, if it had been marked by the acts of mutual confidence that today it exchanges with its excellent fellow citizens of the United States.

There is a saying which claims that "through discussion, people get to know each other." Puerto Rico, thank God, conquered its historical scruples, erased its ethnic and idiomatic prejudices and established an honest and fraternal friendship with the people of the United States. Now we can say that it shares a perfect understanding with the great Republic of North America in a communion of a bountiful fraternity which becomes more fruitful each day.

The key to this fraternal understanding rested in breaking off the vexatious and stubborn shell of misconception, the handicaps of which lead only to sterility.

NEW HORIZONS

The first step in liberalizing our government was to be directed toward the full control of public powers, so as to wage without truce on multiple fronts a war urgently demanded by the social and economic problems of the country. The Governors from North America appointed by the President of the United States were sometimes mere beneficiaries of the political sponsorship of the North who, with their lack of interest in the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico, caused the legislative assembly to be too cautious and circumspect toward enacting the needed laws for fear of arousing the opposition and resentment of the great corporations controlling the financial condition of the island. It was necessary to overcome the indolent indifference concerning Puerto Rican interests in the political circles at Washington. A beginning had to be made in cutting a path toward comprehension, and for the stimulus of a sense of responsibility still undeveloped in the apathetic National Government.

It was lucky for the Puerto Ricans that, because of his former literary activities in the progressive press of the United States which brought him into close association with writers of international renown, Luis Muñoz-Marín was well known among the members of President Roosevelt's Brain Trust, as well as to Mr. Roosevelt himself. In this favorable situation, in the fellowship of the writing craft and with reliable collaborators, the great Puerto Rican leader started a personal campaign, beginning the agitation that induced Washington to face up to the Puerto Rican problems and to give attention to the island's claims for social justice.

The first victory of this campaign was the appointment of Rexford Guy Tugwell as Governor of Puerto Rico. He was a university professor and an advocate of the New Deal program. The liberal and just philosophy

of this man who was to be the last North American Governor naturally favored the immediate approval of the laws that were to solve the social and economic problems of our people. To Gov. Rexford Guy Tugwell, Puerto Rico is indebted for the comprehensive and essential understanding of a pioneer labor that made possible the flowering of our ideals. Tugwell assumed the governorship of Puerto Rico on September 19, 1941, and turned it over to Don Jesus T. Pinero on September 3, 1946. Pinero was the first Puerto Rican Governor; his historical appointment was made by President Harry S. Truman, successor to President Roosevelt.

The first steps had been carried out in full. The seemingly unconquerable wall of the island's subjugation was crumbling. At the beginning, necessary reforms were initiated in an organic act, an interim measure for the desired liberalization. The reforms projected therein were later approved by the U.S. Congress and by President Truman and were made law on August 5, 1947. They placed the appointive powers formerly held by the President of the United States in the hands of the Governor of Puerto Rico, subject to the advice and consent of the Puerto Rican Senate. The reforms also granted to the island the power to name its own Governor by popular vote in a general election. The first elected Governor, elected in 1958, was Muñoz-Marín.

As soon as these reforms were approved, other efforts for a more liberalized form of government were started in Congress and in the White House. These reforms demanded the establishment of a complete self-government based upon the exercise of the Puerto Ricans' self-determination. However, the association between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States was to be maintained through a state of reciprocity and by the bonds of the United States citizenship.

It was a case of an extraordinary experiment, this creation of a new form of government within the system of the U.S. Federal Government. It was a product of the ideals and thought of the leading Puerto Rican minds, a raising of a guiding light which has since proved to be the source providing a form of vital political relations for fruitful understanding among the peoples of different races, languages, and histories.

The efforts of the Puerto Rican leaders echoed in the democratic and liberal conscience of the national leaders in North America. It was President Truman, himself, who addressed Congress in three special historical messages, urging it to grant the people of Puerto Rico the establishment of a complete self-government, exercising their own determination and writing their own permanent organic act. The United States Congress approved, on June 4, 1951, the act known as law 600, which was submitted for the approval or disapproval of the Puerto Rican electorate; this act had no precedent in the United States Congress. The public feeling early manifested for the legislative changes brought an overwhelming majority of votes for the congressional law that gave Puerto Rico the right of free determination for the establishment of the official juridical regime which has the name of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

By virtue of his powers, Gov. Muñoz-Marín called the people to hold free elections to pick the members of the constitutional assembly. After the elections, 92 delegates occupied their positions in the inaugural session, which took place on September 17, 1951. The constitution was approved by the constitutional assembly on February 4, 1952. This document was submitted for the approval of the Puerto Rican voters, who approved it on March 3, 1952, by a very heavy volume of votes.

In accordance with U.S. Law 600, the Constitution thus approved by the people of Puerto Rico was sent to President Truman,

who studied the document in all its articles and submitted it to Congress with his recommendation for approval. The Congress of the United States approved the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a treaty. The complete text of the constitution appears in the next chapter.

The new Puerto Rican regime was proclaimed in a solemn public act at San Juan, capital of Puerto Rico, on July 25, 1952, in the presence of the personal representative of the President of the United States, of Congressmen, and numerous other important dignitaries and personalities of North America, as well as illustrious ambassadors, politicians, and intellectuals of Latin America.

The last official act of Mr. Truman as Chief Executive of the United States consisted in addressing a message to the United Nations Organization, stating the fact that the United States was relieved from all further responsibility for reporting to the Economic Council on the social, economic, and political situation of Puerto Rico. This was due to the fact that the island had already established a complete self-government, pursuant to exercising its free determination, and was no longer a colony. President Truman requested the recognition of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by this international organization. After a debate giving vent to continental passions, which had nothing to do with the basic considerations of the foundation and establishment of the new Puerto Rican government, the General Assembly of the United Nations by a substantial majority vote recognized formally the regime recently established by our people.

The beautiful success of the political formula that freed the people of Puerto Rico, enabling them to manage their own affairs and cope with their own fortunes in reciprocal community affairs with the people of the United States, is a splendid living realization, which, in the warmth of a dynamic understanding with the United States, has permitted us to see the miracle of the loaves and the fishes. Our political ideal is on the march, open as a fountain of fraternal cooperation to the Spanish-speaking nations and to the United States to initiate and support to fruitful completion the speedy confraternization of the hemisphere.

The Puerto Ricans stand ready, with outstretched arms.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is the regime adopted by the Puerto Rican people by means of exercising their free determination, establishing their complete self-government in social, political and economic association with the people of the United States.

The formula created and adopted by the island developed as a pact of mutual agreement worked out between the U.S. Congress, with the approval of the President of the Nation, and the Puerto Rican electorate, who expressed their will in free and democratic balloting during three different electoral processes. The first one was held to accept or to reject the law of the U.S. Congress in which that body acknowledged the right of the island to rule itself under its own constitution. The second one was carried out to elect the members of the constitutional convention. Finally, the third one took place on the occasion of the approval of the constitution. Each of the three elections elicited a very decisive number of favorable votes.

This form of government—a new creation—is offered by Puerto Rican political thought to all the people of the world who are subject to another form of government, as a guide for dignified orientation for the working out of local problems for the establishment of liberty in their own government, if the people in the case—as has been

the Puerto Rican case—are prepared for the possession of national citizenship.

The Jones Act of 1917 made the Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States. Notwithstanding this fact, historical causes of a complex diversity maintained the island in a colonial type of structure impossible to modify. There were especially difficult problems of economic or social character which made illusory the aspirations of liberty of our people.

The political parties of Puerto Rico divided their demands and efforts of emancipation between the formula of Federal statehood within the Nation—that is, the United States—and the formula of complete independence, separated from the Nation. This struggle of political tendencies, antagonistic as they were, appeared as soon as the earliest days of the North American domination of Puerto Rico, when the military occupation of the island following the Spanish-American War in 1898 was completed. The civil government of the island, following the occupation, was reestablished and the Puerto Rican political parties reorganized.

Having gone through the period of the Foraker Act, the statute which reconstituted civil government on the island in 1900, and through the period of the Jones Act, which extended in 1917 U.S. citizenship to the islanders, the Puerto Ricans engaged in an ineffectual struggle for independence or statehood. In neither of the two courses did we advance a single step; we simply regressed, losing ground in the direction of self-sufficiency, the economic base upon which the political aspirations of federation and separation had to be considered. The history of this epoch is rather tragic. The dispute between both aspirations produced a deep and resentful division of the Puerto Rican family—although it has been ameliorated—we have not yet been able to eliminate as a whole.

In the hands of the leaders of this dispute, the crippling situation was aggravated to an alarming extent. The economic and social problems were augmented almost until asphyxia was produced, driving off to a remote distance all possibility of facing effectively the political problem. The population increased tremendously. Foreign investments and absentee parasites took hold of the marrow of our economy. The tentacles of the corporate system broke the resistance of our land. The army of peons and unemployed grew like an avalanche. Our astonished eyes saw an enormous increase in the danger of monoculture on our farmlands.

Through such evils, Puerto Ricans suffered maladjustments of income which brought privations, malnutrition, sickness, and misery. Due to the unjust distribution of the riches produced, countless Puerto Ricans in the fields, factories, and workshops were condemned to a prolonged and inhuman misery. The people of Puerto Rico were disintegrating as a living nation. The economic and social cancer was sucking our blood, gnawing our bones and tearing our flesh.

To make more effective their intervention in defense of their interests, the capitalists entered into politics and took hold of the legislative power. Consequently, Puerto Rico became a paradise for the exploiting class and a purgatory of sacrifice for the exploited class. Morally, the U.S. citizenship was strangled. The corruption of the purchase and sale of the vote undermined the strength of our traditional civilization. Puerto Rico met the enormous annual deficit of its budget with Federal help assigned to education, hospitals, roads, and other services of the public welfare.

It was in such chaos that we came to 1940, when the popular Democratic Party, with its program of social, political, and economic redemption, succeeded in destroying the ignominious chicanery of the bought vote

and came to power under the inspiration and guidance of its leader.

Then, seeking ways to support the enormous population on our small territory, our people attacked their traditional hard adversity with the limited means at their disposal. They strongly hoped for a better material life and for a more secure one.

At this point, our political problem was in suspense, without any alternative. The economic and social maladjustment received prompt and industrious attention. The party which the people had created and backed for the winning of justice—as we said before—wrote emancipating laws, solemnly promising the people that these measures would be enacted at the first meeting of the legislature and would be made to take effect as rapidly as possible. This group of laws—which formed the backbone of the material and moral redemption of the island—doubtless constituted one of the most exemplary civic revolutions which a courageous people have won, standing upon the ruins of a community structure and struggling against all the handicaps of a colonial status.

These laws provided the groundwork for the best and most just distribution of the riches produced in the country. They began to redeem the Puerto Rican land and to remake the civic economy. The salaries, working conditions, living standards, employment opportunities, and essential services for the people were improved. The human dignity of the laborers and peasants was restored to them. The laws gave priority to the rescue of the Puerto Ricans as human beings.

For this continuing and dynamic battle the Government created public agencies as instruments for attaining the desired ends, and for them it selected and recruited the best available talent, providing these people also, at the beginning, with the help of wise advisers and indispensable technicians brought from outside the island. The problems that weighed upon the island were, and are still, attacked at their sources, on the basis of careful study and scientific planning.

When initial measures had appreciably improved the general welfare and the black line of the mortality graph had been brought down to a steadily lower level, the signal was given for an intensive battle of production, and, by means of plans and laws that have proved effective, the program for industrialization was begun, which, at its apogee, promises to attain the self-sufficiency of the country.

At this particular peak of the Puerto Rican achievements—let us locate it in 1948—the conflicting independence and statehood blocs were continuing their political contest, with their representative minority parties, the Independent and the Statehood, trying to reconcile their objectives with circumstances, realities and historical facts that were insuperable. Puerto Rico was—and still is, in fact—a long way from having found a *modus vivendi* for economic independence or from the discovery of a means to carry the expensive burdens of statehood. The annual deficit of the Puerto Rican subsistence was being covered at the stage mentioned above—and is being covered today—by the Federal aid previously referred to. On the other hand, the coldness, the incomprehension and the indifference that restricted the relations between the United States and Puerto Rico had been transformed into warm and reciprocal relations achieved by brotherly love, by the vigorous force of human equality, by civilized realism and by diminution of the xenophobia which existed on both sides.

Notwithstanding all this, much of the old colonial restriction continued in effect. The Puerto Ricans could elect their Legislative Assembly; but the President of the United States—it must be repeated—had the power of nominating the Governor of the island,

several members of his cabinet and the judges of the supreme court, and he also had the last word to say regarding the possible reversal of the laws that were approved by Puerto Rico.

There is no need to say that the titanic effort of the Puerto Rican people in their struggle for social and economic emancipation required the means of political liberty, without which the whole plan would be like a ship adrift. Lacking for the time the self-sufficient resources requisite for settling the classic debate of independence or statehood, it was necessary to put aside efforts to solve this riddle. The case demanded political depth, conscientious objectivity and patriotic courage, to say nothing of a profound knowledge of the specific situation of our island. How to obtain then an honorable liberation from this unhappy voluntary confinement? The great convention of the popular Democratic Party approved in 1948 a resolution that authorized its leaders to deal with the problem. These men diligently pursued their task and obtained a substantial success when President Harry S. Truman appointed Don Jesús Piñero as the first native Puerto Rican governor of Puerto Rico. Right after this, further reforms were obtained providing positive liberation in the organic charter for the government of our country, reforms which established the right of our people to elect our own governor, and transferring to him the power of all the erstwhile presidential nominations.

While these achievements were still in the making, the most serious thought of the Popular leadership was centered on the search for the form of liberty that—without exposing to damage or destruction the gains that were giving promise of autosufficiency—would adapt itself, constructively and honorably, to the difficult and specific case of our people. It was in this manner, as though by way of a new road, that the crystallization and establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico came forth, whose constitution—published in the preceding chapter—lets the world see the form of liberty that we, the Puerto Ricans, have chosen, exercising our free determination, in unobstructed and democratic elections, so that we may deal with efforts to find solutions of the problems of our affairs, life, and destiny.

We are at present the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, voluntarily associated with the United States by economic, social, and political bonds, and free to develop the growth that will support the future security of the island. The pact of mutual agreement effected between Puerto Rico and the U.S. Congress is fraternally backed up by the nexus of a common citizenship.

But the political formula that opened a door to the complex condition prevailing in the island has the striking feature that it does not impede the growth or hinder the free will of the Puerto Ricans and the destiny that may be worked out in the future, as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was politically designed for all sorts of growth, on all lines and on all fronts.

God will light the future.

New England Has the Best There Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the January 14 edition of the Boston Herald carried a very timely and interesting article

written by Managing Editor George E. Minot about New England entitled "Great New Era Already Here." Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

GREAT NEW ERA ALREADY HERE
(By George E. Minot)

New England is the best place in the world to live, bring up your children, educate them and do your own business. It is the best place to spend your spare time. Nowhere else can you find the unexcelled stretches of sandy beaches, the craggy rocks where mountains meet the sea, or so many opportunities to hike in summer or ski in winter.

No other section meets the exacting requirements of those who love to pursue the little white ball over fairways or out of carefully landscaped traps. No place you can think of in the United States is better adapted to that great, new and rapidly growing sport, motorboating. Here a score of rivers wind their way seaward, and here literally thousands of safe harbors and lakes beckon those who in the last few years have found perfect weekend outings for their families.

Recreation is only a small part of life in New England. Consider another for a moment—education. If this is something you underwent as a youth, or if your own children are not yet old enough to go away to school, perhaps the tremendous growth in this field has escaped you.

AMAZING GROWTH IN SCHOOLS, COLLEGES

Within your lifetime schools and colleges have shot from under you. Thirty or forty years ago when you thought of education in New England, you considered first Harvard and Yale among the larger institutions and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Bowdoin, Amherst, and Williams among the smaller. Today MIT is one of the great institutions of the world, and right under your nose, almost out of nowhere, has come another technical school—Northeastern—now with a student body approaching 18,000—that is ready to rival it.

Tufts, only yesterday a small college, now is a great university. Brandeis, unexcelled anywhere in America where scholarship and faculty are considered, within the last few years started from scratch on an almost abandoned hillside in Waltham, and now has a student body of 1,200.

Harvard, oldest and greatest university in the United States, is well on its way to raising the unprecedented sum of 80-odd million dollars so it may be an even better place to receive an education. Boston College, which you thought of half a century ago as a small Jesuit school in Newton, now has 9,600 students, including a school of nursing. Boston University, whose dingy quarters were scattered all over Boston, has a magnificent set of buildings along the Charles and an enrollment of almost 20,000.

WORLD CENTER OF MEDICINE

Yet education is only a small part of life in New England. You might consider medicine. Once again the temptation to indulge in superlatives almost overcomes you. Yet it is hard to avoid them. The day never passes in Boston when a trans-Atlantic plane does not bring to these shores patients who have come here in the hope Boston specialists and Boston hospitals can find the answer to their ills.

You pick up your newspapers many, many times a year and read of some new operation that has been performed here, perhaps the transplanting of one organ from a relative or a volunteer to the body of another. If you have read the record of the past, you know that a great many of the "firsts" in this field took place in Boston hospitals.

If you are interested in the record of the present, as is more likely, you should know that these advances are continuing month by month, even week by week. Students from all over the world know that in no other place can you get the training that comes from the Harvard and Tufts and Boston University medical schools or from the Massachusetts General, the Beth Israel, or the Massachusetts Memorial Hospitals, to mention only a few of a great many that do equally distinguished work.

SYMPHONY, CONSERVATORY LEAD IN MUSIC

Hospitals, recreation, schools and colleges all are big businesses in New England. So is music. Critics from many cities have told us the Boston Symphony Orchestra is the best in the country. The New England Conservatory of Music for 50 years has set a standard other institutions continually try to meet.

This is a business and industrial review. It is greatly interested in the things that make New England a good place in which to live. It is equally concerned with the reasons why this is a fine and profitable place in which to work, in which to establish or conduct your business. This section points out some of the remarkable things that have been going on here and it emphasizes where we stand now and where we are headed.

Elsewhere in this section you may read what has been happening in the field of transportation and travel hereabouts. For years motorists complained about getting through Boston. The old Route 1 was a nightmare for those who wished to go somewhere in hurry. Narrow Boston streets, some said to have been laid out by the meanderings of cows pastured on the Common, plagued the unwary.

Boston's highways have gone modern. We have the best that skill and money can produce. Great new expressways lead to the north and the south. The Mystic River Bridge bears an ever-increasing load. Route 128 is a motorist's dream come true.

Or perhaps you are interested in travel by water. Then there is the great port of Boston. Or if it is by air, the Logan International Airport is the easiest to reach of any in the country's major cities. It has the runways to take care of the great new jet transport planes.

Boston is the hub of all this. Legislators from other Massachusetts communities often overlook this. So do officials from other States in this region. Without a growing and prosperous Boston there can be no growing and prosperous New England.

Here are the port and the airport, closer to Europe by air and by water than New York or Philadelphia. Here are the great parent concerns without which many of the new and fabulous shopping centers in the suburbs would be impossible. Thus Boston's rapid transit problems, its commuter problems, and its tax problems are ones that do not concern the city alone but all the rest of the area.

ONE HUGE COMMUNITY

Take your own case. If you live in the suburbs consider how much you take out of Boston and how little you may contribute. Naturally you are primarily interested in the schools, fire and police departments, town employees, tax rate and hospitals in the community where you and your family live. That doesn't mean Boston's problems are not yours, especially if that is the place where you work.

Or if you live anywhere in Maine or New Hampshire, for instance, consider how much the city of Boston influences your life, or how much you depend on what is manufactured, printed, or institutionalized in Boston. Or how often you come to great sport events for entertainment here.

It's one great community. The success of one depends on the success of the other.

Anybody going into business here, or anybody coming from another part of the country to look over the prospects here, is entitled to an answer to his most obvious questions: Why should I place my plant in New England? Why, when the area obviously is far removed from many of the sources of raw materials and from markets for finished goods, should I build in New England and thus be saddled with more costly freight charges?

Why should I situate here, instead of perhaps in South Carolina, where the taxes are lower and where perhaps I can get a better break from local authorities who often are willing to overlook such things as taxes for a period of years? Why should I build a plant in New England where obviously I will have to pay more heating and lighting bills than I would if I built, perhaps, in Florida?

UNEXCELLED SKILLS

Any good chamber of commerce man can give you any number of answers to these and other questions. You will get only the most important answer here. That is that here in New England you can get a supply of skilled labor unexcelled anywhere in America. You can get a diversification of talent undreamed of elsewhere. You can get a know-how, a dedication to the job, and a realization that because of other obstacles the worker here knows he must produce a little more and a little better quality in order to hold his job and keep his employer in business.

Oh, yes, say the unwary, that may have been true 25 or 50 years ago, but in these days of automation, when you have machines that can almost think for themselves, when your laboring man can almost stand blindfolded and punch a hole in a sheet of metal as it passes in front of him on an endless belt, not even knowing what part he plays in the process—today, the unthinking man says, skilled labor isn't as important as it used to be.

There's where you're wrong, brother, and all you have to do is to ask any manufacturer, any employer, any businessman who is running a plant. You will learn that today the percentage of engineers, technicians, scientists, trained personnel is far higher than it ever was. You will learn that ordinary run-of-the-mill labor is plentiful anywhere, but that more than in any other place in the Nation, New England offers an abundant supply of the skills.

They have smart cookies running the great industrial empires in Detroit and Pittsburgh, and they know what they are doing when they sublet hundreds of contracts to the little factories in New England—to the plants that employ 50 or 75 men—that turn out precision instruments, gears, electrical gadgets and complicated bits of machinery cheaper and better than can the big plants themselves.

And if you look at scores on end of small businesses in cities and towns in Massachusetts, southern New Hampshire and Maine and all over Rhode Island and Connecticut, you will find they are working on Government contracts for instruments so complicated, often secret, that they stagger the imagination.

And again you come back to the proximity of the big universities, the technical schools and colleges, where scores of teachers are available on a few minutes notice for consultation—men of national reputation whose services are in demand in Washington and in big plants everywhere.

It's easy to say that in this day of rapid transportation, they can fly from the Atlantic to the Pacific in a few hours, but in New England they are there—Where else is there for them to go?

It is easy but hardly correct to say that Boston and New England stand on the

threshold of a great, new era. The era is here already. Work already has started on the great new Prudential Center—a veritable city-within-a-city. It isn't enough to say that Boston has a great tomorrow. It has a great today. One look at the great new overhead highways, the beautiful new buildings in the process of going up, and you know that without being told. And with this for a start, the only way can only be up and ahead.

Bituminous Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article on the bituminous coal industry. It emphasizes the stability of labor-management relations, an important consideration in a consumer's long-range fuel-supply plans.

I congratulate the executives in coal companies and the United Mine Workers of America for the manner in which they have conducted contract negotiations without work stoppage. They have demonstrated conclusively that coal may be depended upon to serve the Nation in both industrial and domestic capacities. Mine owners have invested vast amounts of capital in mechanizing the mining processes. The UMWA has welcomed this progress, despite displacement of a substantial number of workers, because this union is so practical and farsighted as to realize that scientific and engineering advancement contributes to the general welfare and living standards.

The Saturday Evening Post article describes the costs of some of the machinery that has given the U.S. bituminous coal industry an output per man day of at least four times more than that of any other country in the world. The article also points out that many miners displaced by the advent of mechanization are finding new employment opportunities in plants of manufacturing and processing industries which have come to recognize the advantages of locating in coal areas.

Western and central Pennsylvania, as well as other coal-producing regions, invite industry leaders to take notice of what we have to offer in the way of guaranteed fuel supplies, manpower, and transportation facilities. Unfortunately, even this new trend toward coal will not entirely solve our surplus labor problems. We are going to have to have legislation by the Congress to remove the existing inequities responsible for so much of the unemployment that is plaguing coal communities. Immediate action is required to reduce the excessive shipments of foreign residual oil that inundates east coast markets defiance of an executive department order and an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress must also take steps to prohibit the dumping of natural gas in industrial markets at

prices below those imposed upon the homeowner for this specialty fuel.

One of the other threats to the coal industry is mentioned by Mr. Ben Pearce, author of the Post article. He mentions the high cost of producing electricity through atomic energy as compared with power generated by coal. Congress must be alert to prevent subsidization of an atomic electric industry that would place another heavy burden upon taxpayers and at the same time further impinge upon opportunities for the thousands of families dependent upon coal as a means of livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask special permission to print in the RECORD the article, "The Indestructible John L.," from the Post of January 17, 1959.

The article follows:

THE INDESTRUCTIBLE JOHN L.

(By Ben Pearce)

Twenty years ago the Nation shook when he barked. Today he's a mellow man—but still able to drive a hard bargain.

"John L. Lewis," the headline writer muttered to himself as he skimmed through a sheet of press copy on his desk. "I thought he was dead. Haven't heard of him for years."

The copy announced briefly that the bushy-browed leader of the United Mine Workers of America, very much alive, had signed a new agreement with the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association. A few years before, that would have climaxed weeks of banner headlines about picket lines, court battles and factories shut down for lack of coal, illustrated with the frowning visage of the miners' chief.

But this story said nothing about strike violence, court orders, or shutdown factories. There were no ultimatums, no recriminations. With a shrug, the headline writer gave it routine treatment for wage raises and thumbed on through the copy before him for something more exciting.

Who tamed John L. Lewis? For nearly 9 years now—March is the anniversary month—his union has called no major strike against its employers. Since 1950 most of their wage agreements have been negotiated and signed with so little fanfare that they attracted only passing notice or none at all. The Senate select committee's hearings on the sad state of some labor-management relations ran for more than a year without mentioning the word "coal."

"What is this," one operator said recently, crossing his fingers, "the millennium?"

Except to students of labor relations, the question would be academic but for one surprising fact. Coal is staging a comeback. The industry so often pronounced sick and dying mined 500 million tons of bituminous coal in 1956—the point of some return on investment—and came within 2 percent of hitting that mark again in 1957, despite the recession. Barring a brief flurry during the oil shortage of 1947-48, it hasn't dug that much coal under peacetime conditions since 1929. Coal production last year fell off with the rest of industrial production, especially in steel. But electric utilities are using more coal year by year. By 1975, they expect to be burning about 490 million tons of coal, as much as total production for all purposes last year. Bank brochures recommend coal-company stocks for long-term investment, and L. Newton Thomas, retiring as president of the National Coal Association, declared, "The only thing the coal industry is sick of is being called sick."

It will probably be news to most people that they had anything to do with the industry's comeback or are even concerned. But it takes a pound of coal to make every pound of steel in your car. An increasing

proportion of the aluminum all around you is made with electricity generated from coal. Except in hydropower areas, 7 chances out of 10 anything electrical you own, from your toaster or air conditioner to the band saw in your hobby room, is powered by coal. It comes into your home in other forms you never suspect—nylon stockings, medicines, plastics—and without leaving dust or ashes. Indeed, ashes are now too valuable to throw away or scatter on icy sidewalks. Fly ash makes a superior concrete. Thousands of tons of it are in Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, the huge new span over Straits of Mackinac in Michigan, in highways and in building blocks and soil pipe of new housing developments. If the coal-fired gas turbine now in the testing stage proves successful, you will again be traveling on trains and ships, perhaps even in automobiles, powered by bituminous coal.

The story behind this revolution in the Nation's basic fuel is a documentary in hard-bitten personalities. It is no coincidence that the hazardous, back-breaking business coal digging is should beget belligerent leader on both sides of the bargaining table. But neither is it a coincidence that the peace agreed upon between them in the unofficial treaty of Washington nearly 9 years ago opened an era that has since put the industry in black ink and miners' wages at an alltime high. In this about-face from open warfare to undeclared peace, the hard-bitten personalities haven't changed, except for their stance. Instead of fighting each other, both are now fighting their competition. Their banner bears a strange device, "cooperation," is a word quite foreign to the industry's vocabulary for so many decades.

Several things combined to topple bituminous coal from its 1947 pinnacle, 631 million tons. But one of the most important was the labor turmoil that cost it many of its best customers. Elimination of the strike threat has won many of them back again.

Coal salesmen today, as though they had never heard of a coal strike, are guaranteeing firm delivery schedules on long-term contracts. With, say, a 20 million ton order—1 million tons a year for 20 years—they have learned they can finance a wide variety of machinery and equipment that would be prohibitively expensive otherwise. Under a 15-year contract, for example, the Consolidation Coal Co. recently completed the first coal pipeline that will deliver 1,200,000 tons of coal a year from its mines near Cadiz, Ohio, to the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., 108 miles away. The \$12 million cost will be liquidated by savings in freight. In the old days no coal operator would have had the temerity to guarantee a firm schedule for 1 year, much less 15, or spend \$12 million to meet it. The introduction of new equipment has kept coal prices stable for the past 8 years, despite wage increases and inflation. President W. C. MacInnes explains why the Tampa Electric Co. built the first coal-burning generating plant in Florida and is building another, a 240,000-kilowatt plant.

"We don't buy fuel by the ton, gallon, or cubic foot any more, but by the B.t.u. (British thermal unit). Coal gives us a million B.t.u.'s for 32 cents compared to 38 cents for the competing fuels we've been using. When we start getting coal by barge instead of by rail on a 20-year contract, we expect to get the cost below 30 cents per million B.t.u.'s."

What happened and how long can it last? Could it possibly have been the coal operators, not John L. Lewis, who underwent the quick change that has made dependable delivery the industry byword instead of stabilizing periods of inaction? The answer lies behind the scenes at the last performance they appeared in together in public, when they suddenly laid aside their battle garb to

sign the treaty of Washington, officially the National Bituminous Wage Agreement of 1950. This climax came after 10 months of spirited skirmishing at the bargaining barricades, in the courts and across the front pages of newspapers from coast to coast, that accomplished nothing, but did raise blood pressures on both sides to a common high. With the mines shut down completely the blustery first week in March, President Truman asked Congress for authority to take over the mines again—for the sixth time in 7 years. The last act of this drawn-out melodrama was short.

As the curtain rises, the operator representatives, red-eyed from lack of sleep, are sitting around a conference room in a downtown Washington hotel, chewing their cigars and cussing and discussing the proposed Government seizure. A telephone rings with a call for George H. Love, who was acting as chief negotiator for the operators, exit Love. Thirty-five minutes more of cigar chewing, cussing and discussing. Enter Love, who announces that he and Lewis have agreed on terms that he will sign for his company, the largest in the industry. A pin drops. Then there is a sudden exodus for long-distance telephone booths—one operator guessed the tolls reached \$10,000—as the curtain falls. The final tableau—set portentously on a sunny Sunday afternoon, as I remember—shows operators and union representatives queuing up to sign the contract that ushered in what is now frankly proclaimed as a new look in labor-management relations.

What went on offstage? Without any shouting, shooting, or hullabaloo, Lewis and Love settled a 10-month deadlock in 20 minutes—allowing 15 for the walk to a nearby hotel and back. Neither of them elaborated on their conversation at the time, but the late Harry M. Moses, head of United States Steel's captive mines—an ex-coal miner whose father and grandfather were miners before him—filled it in afterward.

"Since the first Federal commission made the first investigation of labor relations in coal back in 1902," he said, "we have been mediated, conciliated, legislated, and regulated. We had been partially seized, wholly seized, unseized, and resealed. We had been beaten over the head in all sorts of fancy places, including that famous oval-shaped office on Pennsylvania Avenue. We wanted to keep the Government out of our business."

On several past occasions, Lewis had benefited from Government intervention—the union's welfare and retirement fund was established while the mines were under Federal control—but the two fines totaling \$2.1 million that had recently been imposed on the union were enough to convince him that Government intervention was a fickle thing. He wanted no more of it either. The settlement was a surrender by neither side to the other, but by both to a mutual ogre, Government control.

To make the new look permanent, Moses took the lead in organizing the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association with a permanent staff in Washington to replace the old once-a-year conference. His colleagues called him "the man who worked out a way of doing business with John L. Lewis." His formula was simple.

"Under the old joint wage conference procedure," he explained, "almost every coal operators' association and every union district were entitled to a representative, and enough of them always showed up to fill a good-sized hotel ballroom. Lewis would kick off the meeting by presenting outrageous demands and vehemently castigating the industry's shabby treatment of its underpaid and underprivileged employees. Then whoever was in best voice among the operators would arise to reject each and every one of the union's demands and plead that the industry was no more than a few days away from total bankruptcy. Finally, after sev-

eral days of speeches everybody knew by heart, a couple of the leading operators would get together with Lewis and Tom Kennedy, U.M.W.A. vice president, in a hotel room somewhere and work out a deal that could be ratified by everybody.

"The new system merely eliminated the speeches. Both sides had instructions from their membership. Both sides had frequent meetings with their policy committees before and during negotiations. This businesslike method of arriving at a contract was best for all parties concerned, including the public."

He proved his point the following year, when, without any public disclosure that negotiations were going on, a new contract was signed 2 months before the old one expired.

Peace did not immediately lead the coal industry out of the financial woods. Dieselization of the railroads after World War II cut their coal consumption nearly 90 percent in a decade. The swing to oil and gas for home heating cut that market in half during the same period. Operations held up through the emergency in Korea, but in 1954 fell abruptly to the lowest point in 20 years, only 392 million tons. Labor peace did, however, lay the groundwork for the upswing that came in 1955, and has continued since, because it gave a new impetus to mechanization.

Mechanization was not new in the coal industry. Cutting machines were introduced early in the century, and loading machines in the twenties. Productivity rose gradually from 3 tons a day per man in 1900 to about 6½ tons by 1950. But in the late forties came the first continuous-mining machines, that drilled out the coal without cutting or blasting, carried it to the surface on belts and automatically dumped it onto railroad cars or barges ready for shipment. For surface or strip mining, more powerful equipment became available—45-ton trucks, for example, and a huge shovel that lifted 90 tons of overburden at a bite to a height of 100 feet or more. For mining in hilly sections augers up to 6 feet in diameter were developed that bored 200 feet into a seam and reamed out the coal like shavings from a carpenter's bit.

The only trouble was, this machinery was expensive. One continuous-mining machine cost about \$100,000. That 90-ton shovel cost \$2,500,000. To equip a mine of 2 million tons a year capacity with machinery like that might run up to as much as \$10 million. And money tied up in machinery doesn't earn dividends unless the machinery runs steadily. Thus, peaceful labor relations were the cornerstone on which the heavy investment in modern mechanization rested. Probably some operators had their doubts about a labor millennium, but the industry as a whole took a chance and poured millions of dollars into new machines in the first 5 years after the peace pipe was smoked, a few companies as much as doubling their investment. Productivity zoomed from 6½ tons a man-day to more than 10 tons, a larger increase than in the preceding half century, and is still rising. Some mines average 25 tons a day per man, and the record is nearer 100. The European average, incidentally, is less than two.

And so, if the investment was a gamble, it paid off. The operators took their losses in the railroad market, at least temporarily, and the home-heating field, much of it permanently—together about 140 million tons a year. But the gains mechanization made possible in the electric-utility, steel and export markets have largely recouped that deficit, and offer even greater opportunities for the future. How far in the future? Can Lewis and his miners survive the advent of atomic power?

The whole coal industry has given a lot of thought to the threat of atomic power.

But most of it has been devoted to maintaining the lead coal has in relative costs. The first commercial-scale atomic reactor, at Shippingport, Pa., is generating electricity for about 64 mills per kilowatt-hour, admittedly high because of its experimental nature. The most optimistic estimates are, however, that this can be reduced to from 7 to 11 mills a kilowatt-hour in the next 10 or 15 years. According to the Federal Power Commission, coal is now producing electricity in the midcontinent area for an average of eight mills and in some of the newest utility plants for as little as three mills. By still further cutting down transportation costs—that coal pipeline is the newest wrinkle—that often account for as much as 40 percent of the price of coal, the industry is providing a constantly lowering target for atomic power to shoot at. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, the industry trade organization, puts it this way:

"We recognize the need to continue development of nuclear power in view of the Nation's rising demand for energy. But the United States Bureau of Mines estimates that the country will still need a minimum of 784 million tons of coal by 1975, and may need as much as 1 billion tons—more than double the amount mined last year. Some experts forecast that atomic power will be furnishing perhaps 25 percent of our total electric energy by that date. In many parts of the world where transportation is a major factor, atomic energy may someday be the cheapest energy fuel. But in the United States we believe atomic power will supplement, not eliminate, other fuels. Barring excessive Government subsidies, the coal industry should be able to maintain a competitive price for many years to come."

A report by the Investment Bankers Association of America would seem to agree. "Atomic power," it states, "offers an early competitive threat only to the extent that it may be subsidized by the Government to accelerate its acceptance," and concludes that "the near- and long-term future of the bituminous-coal industry is a bright one."

Mechanization has not been an unmixed blessing to the union. It has raised wages, but the 200,000 miners working last year produced as much coal as roughly twice that number did 10 years. What happened to the 200,000 miners who have been displaced by technological progress? About 75,000 of the older ones have reached 60 and been placed on the pension rolls. Some have turned to other jobs, but the U.M.W.A. now numbers its unemployed at more than 100,000. It's a problem unions besides the miners' are facing today, and the solution isn't an easy one. Nevertheless, the union is maintaining the stand expressed by Lewis several years ago, that "it is better to have a half million men working at good wages and high standards of living than it is to have a million working in poverty and degradation."

The long-range prospect for absorbing these unemployed miners is better than it might seem at first glance. In the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, electric power has attracted new enterprises that have indirectly increased employment. The rapid expansion of electric power now going on in the Appalachian coal region is expected to produce a similar result. For example, a new mine that opened last June at Cresap Bottom, W. Va., will employ 600 men. But the new generating plant being built beside it burning coal practically at the mine mouth will employ up to 100 men, and a new aluminum plant built across the Ohio River at Clarington, Ohio, to use only half the electricity will employ more than 1,200. New factories to turn the aluminum into consumer goods will employ more men, and service industries attracted by these payrolls will contribute to the upward trend. Union officials I talked to believe that if

temporary relief can be afforded the distressed areas where unemployment is greatest, the downward trend will be completely reversed over a period of a few years.

Can the idyllic labor peace last that long or are pressures building up beneath the surface that will eventually blow the "new spirit of tolerance," as Lewis calls it, sky high? In a survey covering the twenties and thirties, rating 17 industries on the general pattern of their strike propensities, Chancellor Clark Kerr and Abraham Siegel, of the University of California, placed miners at the top of the list, followed closely by sailors and dockworkers. Those workers, the study covering 11 countries pointed out, lived in isolated groups; with their own codes, myths, heroes, and social standards, and experienced the same hazards, bad living conditions and intermittent employment. The hard, unpleasant, seasonal nature of the work, they noted, attracted tough, combative and virile workers, among whom the force of public opinion was weak because they never saw the public. In these circumstances, the authors observed, the totality of common grievances after they have been verbally shared may be greater than the sum of the individual parts. A strike for these isolated groups, they concluded, was a kind of colonial revolt against far-removed authority, an outlet for accumulated tensions.

If these were indeed the underlying causes of the notoriously bad labor relations in the coal industry, the prospect of the new look surviving would seem to be pretty good. The old company store, company houses, and company scrip the coal miner lived by in recent memory are things of the past. Mechanization is making him more of a skilled workman and less a pick-and-shovel man every year, with correspondingly better pay. Thanks to the boom in air conditioning, he works in summer as well as in winter. A health and welfare program is giving him more security for his family and his old age. More and more he is getting around in his community and becoming a part of the public he serves.

That doesn't mean John L. Lewis can now retire with no more worlds to conquer. There were enough scattered wildcat strikes last year to lose almost a million tons of production. That's a far cry from the 107 million tons lost in 1949—the last year before the new look suffused the industry's shining face. But it was enough for Lewis to impose disciplinary action and fines on more than 20 locals to enforce the contract that has made coal miners patricians of American labor groups with average hourly earnings above those in the automobile, steel, construction, and manufacturing industries. Miners' average wages broke the \$100-a-week barrier—by \$5.94, to be specific—3 years ago.

There have been other evidences of the cooperative spirit. When high shipping rates threatened our booming exports a few years ago, the U.M.W.A. joined with a group of coal companies and railroads to form the American Coal Shipping, Inc., subscribing a third of its \$50 million capital from the union treasury. Shipping rates later slumped and most of the 30 Liberty ships A.C.S. had recommissioned from the mothball fleet were returned, but Walter Tuohy, of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, called it an unprecedented cooperative effort.

Last summer Lewis was invited to attend the American Mining Congress convention for the first time in his life; he was introduced by the former Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, now a steel-company official, who described him as his friend for 40 years, "sometimes more friendly than others, but a friend." Lewis responded by pointing out that the Russians will surpass us in coal production this year and that the industry needs an agency composed of management, investment, and man-

power to speak with one voice. His union, he said, would be glad to cooperate.

The signing of the recent contract between the union and the operators is only the latest example of cooperation. Both as U.M.W.A. and the B.C.O.A. issued blistering statements regarding the agreement, each in their separate offices, but simultaneously. Simultaneously, that is, after the contract had already been signed. That, one reporter remarked, is cooperation to the 24th degree.

You might say that John L. Lewis and the coal operators tamed each other. Now, they are bristling cooperatively.

Mr. Kaiser's Closing Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in October 1958 Edgar F. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Industries Corp., presided over one of the panels discussing the subject "Interdependence of Businessmen in the Free World," held at New Delhi, India, in connection with the annual meetings of the Boards of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

His closing remarks to the panel are worthy of study by all those who believe in our individual enterprise system; and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert Mr. Kaiser's closing remarks to the panel, as follows:

MR. KAISER'S CLOSING REMARKS

While I have been listening, I have been impressed with the fact that our panelists were not representatives of one particular philosophy, or point of view but, rather, that they were each individually demonstrating a sincere dedication to the world in which they live.

Each of them, in his own life, has demonstrated a true definition of what is meant by the words "private enterprise."

Private enterprise is not just a way of doing business. I would define it as individual enterprise. It is made up of the qualities of individual strength, integrity, tolerance of others, courage, faith, determination, and dedication.

It is private, in the very true sense of the freedom of the individual to contribute to his world in the fullest of terms. It is not a mass movement. It is not something we have created in opposition to, or in conflict with, the institutions that men build into their societies. In my opinion, it is the freedom to create and build whatever institutions and agencies are required to best accomplish man's objectives.

Private enterprise is weakened only through the most extreme regimentation. When its power is granted only to the favored few, when the right of decisions rests only in purely autocratic or bureaucratic concepts, its vitality is infinitely lessened. It is as much a part of good government as it is of good business. And, certainly, the positions that you men here hold in the structures of your governments, in the agencies of your broad business interests, are as truly private enterprise as those functions you perform in the industrial organizations of which you are a part.

It need not be defended and protected, for it is inherent in every contribution any one individual makes, to the general welfare and advancement of the world's people. The world's progress is measured in how widespread is the belief in private enterprise. The Renaissance in Italy and France, the great flowering of Elizabethan England, were not only periods of intense literary and artistic productivity, but times of explosive free economic growth and development.

In the world of today, we may speak of the flowering of private enterprise in terms of increased national income, standards of living, and economic development. These are the shared goals of good government, an enlightened people, and a business and industrial structure dedicated to principles of private enterprise in its correct sense. Yet, these things are not private enterprise in themselves, but, rather, the result of a broad base of dedication and understanding on the part of individuals in government and industry.

ECONOMIC TOOLS

Profits, capital investment, professional skills, know-how are the tools with which we work, and are not to be confused with the driving force which we mean when we say "private enterprise." Because such tools are familiar to us, because the present shape and structure of our economic systems and our methods of doing business suit our work and progress, we have a tendency to regard them as the only possible means of achieving our objectives. We may forget that these are only tools, and our strength lies in our ability to adapt them, or create new tools if needed.

If obstacles and problems are not solvable in what we now accept, and have used in the past, we must have the courage, faith, and skill to create whatever is required for us to do the new job which always lies ahead of us. We must have the courage to explore. We must not be defenders of the past, but creators of the future. One of our responsibilities is to find the means by which our jobs can be done.

Beyond and behind the structure of what we discuss here lie the millions of the world's people who have a tremendous need, not for refrigerators and television sets, for their lives will not become suddenly richer through these, but, rather, for the rights of free choice, and free growth, which must be a part of any ordered and intelligent world.

The part that we may play in this is somewhat less and somewhat greater than we have defined. It is less, in that what we can accomplish economically may be only contributory to the goals and ambitions which a people may have. More, in that our responsibility is greater than the merchants and the builders that have gone before us. We are charged, not with simple responsibility for our own success and growth, but for contributing through our own efforts, to the understanding and potential of the peoples with whom we are privileged to work. For we, too, have much to learn from them.

WORLD CITIZENS

It seems to me that it is impossible for any of us to keep our own jobs, and ourselves, separated from the broadest and deepest problems of our world. We have accepted the responsibility of being world citizens whatever our national loyalties may be.

As businessmen from all over the world, we face certain practical problems which are tied to the specific things we would accomplish. Yet, our work is not performed in a vacuum. It is interwoven into every area of national and world life and, to succeed, we must participate in the most enlightened aspirations of the countries in which we work.

We are subject not only to economic law, but to an ultimate moral law. For, unless what we do is identified with, and made a

part of the ambitions and goals of the people of the world, unless, in building the structures of our industries we also participate in the freeing of a people's vitality, both spiritually and economically, we shall have failed to demonstrate the validity of private enterprise.

All of you know the satisfaction of building a team, building an organization that shares a common spirit. Certainly in my life in business there has been a constant realization that progress is only possible when belief in an enterprise is translated throughout our entire organization into positive action.

In the field of international business and the development of economic areas throughout the world, there is the same need for shared enthusiasm which must include every force with which we work. The spirit of the people is the essential quality and it must extend itself into the fields of government, private business, and all institutions which share the responsibility for economic development.

Each of the men who have spoken with you has given us a clearer definition of the decisions that we must make. It is not the purpose of such a panel to arrive at decisions.

The effectiveness of this conference will, like every step in the progress of man, be written in our individual decisions and actions. The translation of the broad principles of development into action and accomplishment will take place in the corridors and in the rooms and in the discussions between you, individually. And it is right that it should be this way, for here there is no regimentation. There is, instead, the dedication of each of us, as individuals, to a principle of growth and progress for all men, and the justification of our own personal existence in freedom.

"Why build these cities great
If man unbuilds goes?
In vain we build the world
Unless the builder also grows"
—EDWIN MARKHAM.

Capital Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the analysis of Roy Wenzlick, publisher of the Real Estate Analyst, in his December 18 issue, on "Capital Gains." This thought-provoking article is as follows:

CAPITAL GAINS

I am opposed to a capital-gains tax. A tax of this sort is not necessarily a part of the income-tax structure. For example, there is no such tax in Canada. I believe that our economy in the United States would be stronger and would progress more rapidly without it.

My greatest objection to the capital-gains tax is that in a large percentage of cases it is levied where there is really no capital gain. If a person invested \$10,000 in 1948, today, in order to secure the same purchasing power, he would have to receive \$12,000 for his investment. The \$2,000 which the Internal Revenue Service claims as capital gain is merely a greater number of smaller dollars representing the original amount invested. If we use this hypothetical invest-

ment as a sample, the probability is that the \$2,000 of so-called capital gain would be taxed at a 25-percent rate, or a capital-gains tax of \$500. If the capital-gains tax of \$500 is subtracted from the \$12,000, the \$11,500 left is about 4 percent less in purchasing power than the amount invested 10 years ago. Our hypothetical investor has paid a \$500 capital-gains tax to come up with a loss of principal of 4 percent.

Any investment in the period ahead which does not increase at a rate faster than the loss in purchasing power will share this same experience.

My second objection to the capital gains tax is that it reduces the mobility of capital and freezes many investments. An investor in the stock market who, let us say, has a paper profit at the present time of 25 percent above his original investment, may hesitate to sell because 25 percent of his so-called profit will immediately be subtracted, and he may doubt whether he can find some alternate use for his money, paying a high enough return to compensate for the reduction in his principal.

I have always been a great believer in the freedom of the market as the most powerful factor in controlling our economy. If investors are allowed to buy and sell freely, taking their risks of loss or gain, this factor, of itself, will reduce the price swings in the market. Whenever an investor believes that an item is underpriced he will buy. Whenever he believes it is overpriced he will sell, and a large group of persons constantly trying to make a profit will keep the market from getting very far out of line on either side of normal value at the time. In 1929, the excesses of the market were not due to investors but were due primarily to the tremendous number of shares bought on very slim margins, expanding demand among ill-informed speculators to the point where the market went through the ceiling and later through the floor when these loans were called.

My third reason for being opposed to a capital gains tax is that the great need in any expanding economy is for risk capital. This last Congress was so convinced of the need for risk capital that it passed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 setting up finance companies to finance what amounts to equity investments in small businesses, partly at the taxpayers' expense. A small business is defined in this legislation in such a way that it includes the great majority of all firms.

Equity financing should not be done at the taxpayers' expense. The small business loan provision realizes that great risk does exist in this type of financing, and tries to compensate for the risk by various tax advantages. Many of the banks of the United States are being forced against their better judgment to participate in this plan, and I have yet to find a banker who believes that the plan is fundamentally sound.

It would be far better to allow complete flexibility in the investment and reinvestment of funds by the individual, allowing him to select those companies which, in his opinion, merit his confidence. If his judgment is in error, he will lose a part of his principal, but the taxpayer will bear no part of his loss. If his judgment is good, he will make a profit, and his profit can be realized without penalty at any time he thinks it has reached its maximum.

I have said many times in these reports that if we play a heads I win, tails you lose game with the Government—where if there is a profit we keep the profit and if a loss the taxpayer pays the loss—all kinds of ill-advised plans will be foisted on the taxpayer. There is then no chance of limiting the increase in Government expenditures and in Government debt, with its resulting effect on the value of the dollar.

In my opinion, the losses which will be experienced under the new plan for financing

small-business enterprises will be great if the plan is used. I am sure it will be used by many ill-advised groups who would like to expand their activities.

If sound business judgment is used as the basis for lending money to the small concerns, the money is now available without setting up new methods and new sources. This whole idea smacks of the same political philosophy which believes that if informed investors will not buy low-interest mortgages at par the solution is for Fannie Mae to buy them at par at Government expense. Any Government expenditure seems to be justified if it increases the business volume of some particular group, in spite of the fact that the taxpayers are not willing to pay the cost. The unbalanced budget which has resulted in 24 of the last 29 years levies a tax no less real than the tax collected directly by the Internal Revenue Service. Every time that currency and credit is inflated to take care of unbalanced budgets a part of the value of all bonds, savings accounts, mortgages, social-security payments, pension funds, life-insurance payments, and other dollar obligations is confiscated by the Government.

The fourth reason I am opposed to a capital gains tax is that in the past the capital gains tax has yielded highly variable amounts as a source of Federal revenue. During periods of rising capital values the tax may produce tremendous dollar revenue resulting from the fictitious capital gains brought about by inflation. On the other hand, after a persistent decline of capital values at the end of a boom period, realized capital losses may far outweigh capital gains and the gains tax may produce a negative amount.

For instance, in 1928 the Federal capital gains tax on individuals produced slightly more than half a billion dollars. This was almost as much as the tax on current income at that time, as Federal income tax rates then were still low. On the other hand, in 1931 the deductions for capital losses under the capital gains provision resulted in a net reduction in Federal revenue of \$89 million from the \$335 million which would otherwise have been paid on current income if these losses had not been deductible. Inconsistent and erratic movements in revenue yields make attempts at budget balancing difficult and help to further endanger the Government's credit position.

A great part of our difficulty in our economic thinking is ignoring the consumer. In the costly and unwise agricultural program which we have been following since New Deal days we have maintained the prices of farm products above world prices in order to benefit the farmer. As a result we have lost many of our foreign markets, and the consumer in the United States has had to pay higher prices for farm products than he would otherwise have paid. In addition he has been taxed to pay the billions of dollars of subsidy which this program has paid to the farmer. By reducing the income available for the purchase of food and by increasing its price the consumer pays double indemnity.

The capital gains tax also hurts the consumer. Anything limiting the accumulation and free flow of capital into the industries which need it most hampers the production of consumer goods and increases the price of the goods that are produced. Anything that wastes capital, like unwise investments under the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act, retards the progress which otherwise would be made if investments were made solely on the basis of sound business judgment.

In a country where the population is increasing as rapidly as it is in the United States it is essential that new employment possibilities be created rapidly enough to absorb the increase in the number of persons seeking employment. In many lines of busi-

ness it requires an average capital investment of \$5,000 to \$10,000 per employee, and anything limiting the free flow of capital to those industries that need it most will prevent greater employment.

We never seem to learn that relatively few panaceas cure the disease for which they are prescribed. They generally treat the symptom rather than the cause. It is difficult for some Congressmen and politicians to realize that the profit motive is the greatest incentive to our enterprise system, allowing the man who can build a better mousetrap a profit on his endeavor. If the profit is great, the supply of mousetraps will increase faster than the supply of mice, and the price of mousetraps will drop. However, the man who endeavors to develop a useful business finds that the incentives for success have been weakened by his less competent Government-subsidized competitor. He therefore suffers twice, once from unfair competition and again from increased taxes used to subsidize his less efficient competitors. He becomes discouraged and no longer puts forth the effort necessary for the success of his project.

Smokescreen of Cowardice and Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a memorandum and white paper on the "Operations of the British-American Tobacco Co.," prepared and distributed by the foreign affairs committee of the Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A., together with a revised edition of "A Report on the Arab Boycott Against Americans," released by the presidents of major American-Jewish organizations. The text of these releases follows:

MEMORANDUM

To: Department, council and post coordinators, Arab boycott post, county and department commanders, members of the national executive committee, members of the foreign affairs committee.

From: PNC Abraham Kraditor, chairman, foreign affairs committee.

Subject: Progress report on British-American and Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corps' reaction to white paper.

Since the national convention in Los Angeles in August, approximately 50,000 copies of JWV's white paper have been distributed by the national office to the lower echelons for dissemination in the communities. As a result of this effort, the pressures have been felt at Brown & Williamson's headquarters in Louisville, Ky. Brown & Williamson have issued statements which their sales representatives have been displaying, affirming the willingness of Brown & Williamson to sell its cigarette products to Israel. These documents purport to present evidence that Israel is to blame for the discontinuance of cigarette shipments by Brown & Williamson to Israel.

Our members should not be deceived or deterred by this propaganda. This smokescreen is identified as a half truth in the white paper (see pp. 8-10). Israel acknowledges that Brown & Williamson wants to sell its cigarettes to Israel but British-American in London, the parent organization, still refuses to sell its brands of cigarettes (the pre-

ferred brands in Israel). Israel maintains quite properly that it could not trade with Brown & Williamson while being boycotted by British-American, for in so doing, it would be condoning the action of British-American. The allegation that Israel does not have the dollars to pay for Brown & Williamson shipments is a phony issue. Actually, these cigarettes are sold mainly to tourists who bring dollars to Israel. It is to Israel's advantage to buy these cigarettes for the dollars which it earns thereby. Israel has always paid Brown & Williamson in dollars. Obviously, Israel would gain more if it could buy the British-American cigarettes in sterling exchange and sell these cigarettes for dollar exchange.

The white paper asserts that British-American refuses to ship Israel because of Arab treaties. This is once more documented by the letter of September 4, 1958, from Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel of Brown & Williamson in a letter to Mr. Lester Duberstein, executive director of the Department of New York, JWV, as follows: " * * * the refusal of British-American to ship its brands to Israel being the direct result of a most grievous threat made against that company by the so-called Arab nations."

To sum up, the two major arguments being advanced by Brown & Williamson are: First, Brown & Williamson is attempting to divorce itself from the actions of its parent body, the British-American Tobacco Co. This is sheer deception. Brown & Williamson is a wholly owned subsidiary and subject to complete control from the London office. Second, Brown & Williamson pleads leniency for British-American because the Arab nations threaten economic reprisal. It is this very cowardice which the white paper is attempting to expose. Let the British-American directors stand up to the Arab nations as other international companies have done and successfully too.

While Brown & Williamson is putting up this counterattack to the white paper, the Foreign Affairs Committee has reliable information that the top officials of Brown & Williamson have visited London to plead with British-American directors to reverse their policy regarding shipments to Israel. Until they do so, our energies must be directed at maintaining unrelenting pressure. Your task is to give the white paper the widest circulation and to encourage the American people to express their indignation. Use the pamphlet and this release as your source material for answering the allegations by the Brown & Williamson representatives.

Coordinators and commanders are reminded that booklets may be ordered for distribution by writing to national headquarters. The price is \$33 per thousand. Refer to previous releases on how the pamphlet is to be distributed. All inquiries or questions concerning this campaign should be directed to me at 38 Park Row, New York 38, N.Y.

SMOKESCREEN OF COWARDICE AND DECEIT— A WHITE PAPER ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE BRITISH AMERICAN TOBACCO CO.

(Prepared by Foreign Affairs Committee,
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.)

I. INTRODUCTION

This white paper has been prepared by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. to inform its members and their friends of one phase of the committee's efforts to meet the challenge of the Arab boycott against Israel and Jews throughout the world.

This is not a success story. Rather, it tells of failure thus far by this committee to convince the British American Tobacco Co. to discontinue its cooperation with Arab nations in boycotting Israel, a freedom-loving nation of the Middle East and this

country's most reliable ally in that troubled area.

The white paper should not be construed by its readers to be a final report. It is an interim statement on the committee's negotiations with the British American Tobacco Co. It should arm our members and their friends in the American community with the facts, enabling all of us to work in common cause to convince the British American Tobacco Co. that their present ethics in international transactions can only arouse a sense of deep moral indignation among all freedom-loving people.

The British American Tobacco Co. remains today in international trade one of the few major corporations which has admittedly changed its trade policies as a result of Arab pressures to boycott Israel.¹ But before such open admission of cooperation with the Arab boycott program, the British American Tobacco Co. attempted to create a smokescreen to conceal its motives in cutting off trade with Israel. Such cowardice and deceit in international trade should be exposed and every effort should be made to prevent other companies from appeasing those Arab nations which seek to permeate their medieval trade practices throughout the world.

The attempt by Arab nations to spread their hateful boycott against Israel and to Jews throughout the world poses a serious challenge to American security and our country's efforts to unify and strengthen the countries of the free world. For the past 25 years, our Government, with the full support of the Jewish War Veterans, has been advocating and implementing a sound foreign policy of seeking to eliminate artificial trade barriers and to promote free and unfettered trade among the nations of the free world. The major exception to this liberal trade policy has been our Government's restrictions against trade with Communist countries in strategic war materials. Through this trade program and augmented by American funds for economic and military assistance to our worldwide allies, this country has helped to forge a strong alliance of free nations of the world to resist Communist aggression. Any trade practice which establishes new artificial trade barriers among our allies or seeks to divide nation against nation, people against people, weakens our alliance, permits Communist exploitation of these differences and saps our strength against our most formidable enemy, the Kremlin rulers.

A quarter of a century ago, the Jewish War Veterans alerted the American people to the scourge of nazism by launching a boycott against German imports. History proved our judgment correct in identifying Hitler and his gangsters as the real threats to world peace. The Jewish War Veterans hold with equal firmness today that the Arab boycott is an international disease which in epidemic proportions can undermine our national security. In international affairs as in medicine, quick quarantine can spare needless deaths.

II. THE BRITISH AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND THE ARAB BOYCOTT

A. History of the Arab Boycott: The Arab boycott, launched 10 years ago, sought originally to prevent Arab nations and their citizens from trading with Israel or her nationals. The Arab League which directs this boycott then widened the scope of its activities to blacklist or bring "economic pressure against any company that maintains branch plants, assembly operations or agency offices

¹ On previous occasions, this committee reported to the Jewish War Veterans membership on its negotiations with the Shell Oil Co. and the American Express Co. Both companies have altered their trade policies and now resist Arab pressures regarding their trade with Israel.

in Israel, permits licensing arrangements by or has financial interests in Israel firms or provides consultant and other services to Israel. The products and services of such firms are denied admission to Arab lands."

While many firms and governments throughout the world have resisted Arab approaches to boycott Israel and knuckle under to the Arab intimidations and threats, some companies, among them, the British American Tobacco Co., have capitulated to such pressures. Before discussing how British American capitulated to the Arabs, it is pertinent to report on the history of this international tobacco giant.

B. History and operations of British American Tobacco Co.: This company, operating out of London, England, was organized in 1902 to serve as an international distributor of tobacco products. It controls through stock ownership, numerous operating and holding companies throughout the world but principally in the sterling area. (The company, as a matter of policy, does not disclose the number or location of all its subsidiaries.)

In the United States, British-American conducts both a domestic and international sales operation, through its wholly owned subsidiary, the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., which was incorporated in 1927. Brown & Williamson markets the following tobacco products in the United States:

Pipe tobacco: Sir Walter Raleigh, Granulated Tobacco, Old North State, Golden Grain.

Cigarettes: Viceroy, Raleigh, Avalon, Kool, Wings, Life, Du Maurier.

Cigarette tobacco: Bugler, Target, Kite.

Plug tobacco: Blood Hound, Sun Cured.

Snuff: Tube Rose.

C. British-American yields to Arab pressures: On March 26, 1956, Brown & Williamson wrote to Hamashbir Hamerkazi, an Israeli importer, that "We are unable to accept this order nor will we be able to accept any other orders from you until further notice." Similar letters were received by other importers seeking those tobacco products which British-American Tobacco Co. sells under license throughout the world. In explanation for this cessation of trade, a British purchasing agent² wrote to his Israeli correspondent, "We think you know what this means. Apparently, pressure has been brought to bear upon British-American Tobacco Co. by the Arab countries to such an extent that they have made this decision."

When officials of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. were queried by an American correspondent in October 1956 about its failure to ship those brands where it acts as exporter for British-American Tobacco Co., Brown & Williamson officials attempted a buckpassing deceptive maneuver and were quoted as saying, "with respect to British-American Tobacco Co., Brown & Williamson was agent for export only."³

Israeli Government officials noted at the time that through its refusal to maintain normal business affairs with Israeli importers, British-American Tobacco Co. and its American subsidiary, Brown & Williamson, took unprecedented action in international trade by relinquishing its neutrality and supporting the Arab position to the detriment of Israel. This behavior was sheer cowardice.

² "Bigotry and Blackmail"—A Report on the Arab Boycott Against Americans. February 1958, p. 14.

³ His name is held confidential at his request.

⁴ Jewish Telegraphic Agency dispatch—Oct. 25, 1956.

III. NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH-AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS—1956

The foreign affairs committee, department of New York, in April 1956, initiated an investigation of the facts surrounding the report on the boycott of Israel by British-American and Brown & Williamson. It determined and reported to its department convention (June 1956) that Brown & Williamson had refused to ship its products to Israel. The convention passed a resolution asking for appropriate action on those facts by the national organization. At the national convention in August 1956, the national foreign affairs committee was requested to meet with officials of British-American and recommend further action by the national organization.

On September 5, 1956, Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel for the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Co., met with officials of the Jewish War Veterans. He stated that Brown & Williamson had not refused to sell and ship to Israel any of its brands—Viceroy, Kool, Raleigh, etc.—but that it could not ship to Israel brands owned by British-American. In a letter following this meeting, Mr. Yeaman wrote on September 14, 1956, "You will recall that I offered to appear before your committee at its meeting on Tuesday, September 18, should you so wish and that it was your view that such an appearance was not desirable. With that in mind, I should like to repeat that I stand ready to appear before your committee at any time you wish should your decision in that matter be altered."

On September 25, 1956, Mr. Abraham Kraditor, chairman of the foreign affairs committee, sent the following letter to Mr. Yeaman in reply:

"SEPTEMBER 25, 1956.

"ADDISON YEAMAN, Esq.,

"Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.,
Louisville, Ky.

"DEAR MR. YEAMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 14, 1956.

"You were kind enough to write as you did and Mr. Chasin and I appreciate the frank and forthright spirit in which you discussed the problem that concerns us both.

"The foreign affairs committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States met in New York on Tuesday evening, September 18, 1956. Your letter was read to the group and the consensus of opinion was that no action should be taken at a time when the British economy as a whole finds itself under stress because of the events in the Suez area. This, of course, does not in any way alter our conviction that the British American Tobacco Co.'s decision to terminate shipments of tobacco products to Israel was unworthy of a responsible business organization in a free community. We take no comfort from the unhappy fact that those states whose insistence presumably led British American to adopt its current policy are now applying to Great Britain the same epithets and overt hostility they have hitherto reserved for the State of Israel.

"Current traffic problems in Middle East waterways suggest that British American may be preoccupied just now with problems somewhat more troubling than how to get cargo through to Israel. Nevertheless, our organization continues to feel that the company's present policy richly merits revision and we hope you will find it appropriate to convey these sentiments accordingly. We find ourselves, after all, in a time when a gesture of fundamental good will from one decent, civilized country to

⁵ He acknowledged that he also acted as counsel for British American Tobacco Co. in this country.

another can strengthen bonds that will serve us all well in a time of common adversity.

"Sincerely yours,

"ABRAHAM KRADITOR."

IV. NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN BRITISH-AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS—1958

The Suez crisis of 1956 was followed immediately thereafter by the Sinal campaign, the ill-fated French and British involvement, and ensuing events which occupied the interest and attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee. In 1957 and 1958, the Committee engaged in negotiations with both the Shell Oil Co. and American Express Co. to have them reverse their policies of cooperation with the Arab boycott. Subsequently, those companies altered their practices to our satisfaction.

In the opinion of the Foreign Affairs Committee, its position with regard to British American Tobacco Co. should be reexamined.

The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. was included among the American concerns in the pamphlet, "Bigotry and Blackmail" which had capitulated to Arab pressures to discontinue trade with Israel. Jewish War Veterans distributed over 15,000 of these booklets. Mr. Abe Shefferman, a member of the Jewish War Veterans JWV Post No. 58, Washington, D.C., who read this pamphlet, wrote an indignant letter to the "National Jewish Post and Opinion" which was printed on April 11, 1958, criticizing the Post for accepting advertisements from Brown & Williamson for Viceroy, noting that "the makers of Viceroy have become an accessory to the fact (of a boycott of Israel) with its Arab boycotters."

This letter brought a reply from Mr. Addison Yeaman, general counsel of Brown & Williamson. Excerpts of his letter of May 15, 1958, to Mr. Shefferman are reproduced below:

"Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. acts as manufacturing and shipping agent for British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., in respect to those brands, of American-type blended cigarettes, which the British-American Co. owns (by way of owning the trademark) in various countries of the world including Israel. Among these brands are Lucky Strike and Pall Mall. As of course you know, both of those brands are owned in the United States by American Tobacco Co. There is no connection of any kind between the British American Co. and the American Tobacco Co., and the American Tobacco Co. has absolutely nothing to do with the brands, Lucky Strike and Pall Mall, in those countries where the trademarks are owned by British American.

"As I have said, Brown & Williamson manufactures these brands as agent for British-American, and Brown & Williamson ships these brands as agent for British-American and as its agent merely. Some time ago Brown & Williamson was instructed by British-American that until further notice Brown & Williamson should not ship Lucky Strike or Pall Mall cigarettes to Israel. As agent, Brown & Williamson had no part in that decision and as agent it could do nothing but comply with instruction of its principal.

"It subsequently developed that the British-American had given such instructions as a consequence of very grave and serious threats made by certain of the Arab countries. The decision was a very hard and difficult one to make. No element of prejudice, racial, religious or otherwise, entered into the decision.

"Brown & Williamson has never declined or refused to sell its own products—Viceroy, Kool, and Raleigh—to customers in Israel. We regret that the volume in these brands in Israel had always been very low and it virtually disappeared when the Israel Treasury declined to issue permits for the use of

dollar exchange for the purchase of tobacco products, as we are advised. Apparently that restriction has been somewhat eased as we have in recent months had one or two small orders from customers in Israel for Brown & Williamson's products. These orders were very promptly filled and I assure you that when we receive any more orders for our products for which payment in dollars can be made, we will just as promptly accept and fill them."

In analyzing this letter to Mr. Shefferman, the foreign affairs committee came to the following conclusions:

1. The open admission that British-American was yielding to Arab pressures should be made public knowledge. The American people should be afforded the opportunity to react to this cowardice on the part of British-American.

2. Efforts by Brown & Williamson to relieve itself of responsibility for its refusal to ship cigarettes to Israel should be denounced as a fraud and an attempt to deceive the American people. Brown & Williamson as a wholly owned subsidiary of British-American should not be permitted to weasel out of its responsibility for cooperating with the

3. The Brown & Williamson claim that immoral Arab boycott.

The "Israel Treasury declined to issue permits for the use of dollar exchange for the purchase of tobacco products" demonstrates clever use of half-truths. The facts are that the Israeli Government formulated its policy on the basis of principle. It has always permitted its importers to pay Brown & Williamson in dollar exchange for tobacco sales in Israel. The Israelis, however, refused to permit the imports of Brown & Williamson products unless all British-American controlled brands were made available. Obviously, if Israel permitted Brown & Williamson to withhold some brands, it would indicate that the Israelis condoned British-American's yielding to Arab pressures.

On June 27, 1958, the Foreign Affairs Committee extended an invitation to Mr. Addison Yeaman to appear before the committee to interpret his client's position in light of the above analysis. This invitation was extended based on Mr. Yeaman's written statement: "I should like to repeat that I stand ready to appear before your committee (Foreign Affairs Committee) at any time you wish should your decision in that matter be altered." (September 14, 1956.)

That invitation was respectfully declined by Mr. Yeaman on June 30, 1958. He wrote, "... it does not seem to me that there is anything I could usefully add before your committee and for that reason alone I believe no purpose would be served by my appearance."

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The record reveals indisputable evidence that the British-American Tobacco Co. and its wholly owned American subsidiary, the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., have knowingly and wittingly cooperated with the Arab League nations in boycotting Israel. This act of economic cowardice in yielding to Arab pressures has been accompanied by a Brown & Williamson public relations campaign to place the burden for the severance of this trade in tobacco products on Israel rather than British-American policy.

Jewish War Veterans, through its foreign affairs committee, has not been deceived by the Brown & Williamson smokescreen. After 2 years of independent study and investigation followed by negotiations with representatives of Brown & Williamson, the foreign affairs committee believes firmly that British-American and Brown & Williamson stand guilty before the American people for their cooperation with the illegal and immoral Arab boycott. Such cooperation has only served to spread the venom of this economic weapon from Israel to the shores of our country and other freedom-loving nations.

History teaches that dictators feed on appeasement. Our country and our people, after the ill-fated Hitler appeasement before World War II, have learned that sacrifices are necessary to meet the aggression of dictators. This explains the firm and bold actions taken by our political leaders since World War II to face up to the Russian rulers in the Kremlin.

The Arab boycott and the other machinations of Nasser and his followers in the Middle East (the illegal seizure of the Suez Canal, the infiltration tactics among pro-Western countries) should serve as ample warning that the actions of these people undermine the security and welfare of our Nation and our freedom-loving allies throughout the world.

The Jewish War Veterans stands committed to combat the antidemocratic forces. Through this pamphlet, this organization appeals to its membership and the American people to bring the full force of its moral weight to convince British-American Tobacco Co. to reverse its present policy of yielding to the Arab boycott.

A REPORT ON THE ARAB BOYCOTT AGAINST AMERICANS

A STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENTS OF MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

The Arab blockade and boycott of Israel has now been extended by the Arab League to a systematic boycott and blacklisting of any American enterprise that maintains permanent business connections with Israel or with Israeli firms and indeed to a worldwide effort to boycott any business owned by Jews.

The Arab League maintains a public blacklist of American and other companies that invest in Israel, maintain branches, assembly operations or distribution outlets there, or that license patents for Israel use.

American vessels that stop at Israel ports are denied permission to make calls at Arab ports.

American planes that land in Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territories.

No American is permitted to enter an Arab land from Israel except on official business.

Americans who are Jews are a special target of the Arab boycott. Saudi Arabia, particularly, refuses to allow the Arabian-American Oil Co. or other concessionaires to employ Jews for work in Saudi Arabia. Most Arab League States refuse visas to Jewish travellers and some refuse to allow Jews to land even in transit. Saudi Arabia has prevailed upon our Government to screen American military, diplomatic, and civilian personnel so that no Jew is assigned to the United States airfield at Dhahran.

In July 1956, the U.S. Senate, in a resolution adopted unanimously, condemned religious discrimination against Americans by foreign countries. Our Government, however, not only has failed to voice vigorous objection to this discrimination but in fact thereafter renewed the discriminatory Dhahran Agreement. As a result, American Jews are no longer equally protected in their rights of citizenship.

The Arab League has been circulating questionnaires to chambers of commerce and individual companies throughout the world inquiring whether specified companies were controlled by Jews or employed Jews.

Holland, France, and Switzerland have denounced the Arab boycott and have instructed their nationals not to answer such questionnaires. West Germany has refused to yield to Arab threats to cease business with Israel. Our own Government, however, thus far has taken no public stand against the boycott.

The Arab boycott has been described recently by the Secretary General of the United Nations as a "deadweight" upon the efforts of the U. N. to achieve peace in the Middle East. The boycott is a chronic source of

conflict which undermines American efforts to allay tensions in that area.

The Arab boycott of Americans is international intimidation; it thrives on appeasement and capitulation. We are confident that Americans deplore the Arab boycott and will want to resist this impairment of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. We are confident, too, that if the U.S. Government would strongly oppose this international blackmail and medieval bigotry, the Arab boycott against Americans inevitably would end.

In the light of the foregoing, we, the undersigned, declare our repugnance of the Arab boycott and urge all commercial firms to resist it with every legal means at their command. At the same time, we express our firm hope that our own Government will prohibit racial or religious discrimination against American citizens in the administration of any treaties or executive agreements to which it affixes its signature:

Dr. Philip S. Bernstein, chairman, American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs.

Mrs. Moise S. Cahn, president, National Council of Jewish Women.

Benjamin H. Chasin, national commander, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.

Pinchas Cruso, Labor Zionists.

Dr. Maurice N. Elsendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Moe Falkman, chairman, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel.

Moses I. Feuerstein, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Dr. Miriam Freund, president, Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America.

Mrs. Rose L. Halprin, acting chairman, Jewish Agency for Israel.

Adolph Held, chairman, Jewish Labor Committee.

Bernath L. Jacobs, president, United Synagogue of America.

Phillip M. Klutznick, president, B'nai B'rith.

Rabbi Irving Miller, chairman, American Zionist Council.

Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president, Zionist Organization of America.

Dr. Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress.

Rabbi Isaac Stollman, president, Religious Zionists of America, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.

David L. Ullman, chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Arab League boycott of Israel has now been extended to a systematic boycott of American companies maintaining business connections with Israel or Israeli firms and, increasingly, of American Jews. This attack upon Americans takes various forms: The boycotting and blacklisting of American firms and vessels, the denial of entry and transit visas to American Jews, the barring of U.S. military and civilian personnel who are Jews from our airfield at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, the obstruction of international travel by air, and similar interference with the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States.

In order to coordinate and intensify the boycott activities of its constituents, the Arab League has established a general boycott office in Damascus, Syria. Arab League boycott regulations are administered by the various branch boycott offices, whose activities usually fall within the responsibilities of each country's ministry of commerce. Blacklists are maintained in each branch office and Arab commercial and consular representatives abroad endeavor to expand the boycott. Arab diplomats accredited to the United States engage on our soil in efforts to direct the boycott against American Jews and against products manufactured or sold by them. Iraq's administration of the boycott illustrates the operating procedure. Imports

and exports to and from Iraq require special licenses, certificates of origin and destination, and endorsement by Iraqi or other Arab diplomatic personnel in the foreign countries involved. Iraq also sends to the general boycott office in Damascus lists of her exports to foreign countries, including America, so that Arab missions in these countries may check to see that none of the Iraqi goods are transshipped in violation of boycott regulations (Business International, May 31, 1957).

II. THE BOYCOTT OF JEWS AS JEWS

The Arab boycott applies to Jews as such regardless of their nationality.

The following letter, sent on November 13, 1955, to the chairman of the board of directors of Verkoopkantoor Van der Heem N. V. The Hague, Holland, is typical of similar letters sent throughout the world:

"Dear Sir: As you are aware the Arab countries are in a state of war with Israel and for this reason we are making an economical [sic] siege around Israel. This siege is administered by a special control and investigation office with members of all the Arab States.

"An officer in said office visited us today and requested that following information be supplied about your company:

"1. Do you have any business relations with Israel, whether you sell your products there and name of your agent and address?

"2. Do you import any materials whatsoever, raw materials or parts from which your products are made, from Israel?

"3. Do you have a branch factory or utilizing any of your capital in any factory in Israel?

"4. Is any part of your capital paid by Israelites? If yes, what is the amount of said part?

"5. Do you have any Jewish employees in your company? If yes, how many and what are the positions held by them?

"6. Are there any Jews on your board of directors as members?

"7. Are any of your managers or branch manager Jews? If yes, please give name of the department headed by such a man?

"8. Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew?

"9. What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices?

"We have been requested to give full detailed answers to each of the above questions but as we do not know each information, we are now writing this letter to you for being kind enough to give the required information so that we pass your letter to the Economical Siege of Israel Office, on your behalf.

"Your reply is to be please in two copies and signed by the chairman of the board of directors.

"We advise you to give accurate and frank information because of any difference between your answers and the information the government office may obtain by investigation will create legal complications."

Saudi Arabia has taken the lead in discriminating against Jews and any firm employing them in any capacity. The March 5, 1956 issue of the U.S. Commerce Department's Foreign Commerce Weekly reported:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally would be accomplished by Saudi Arabian Consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Earlier, the New York Daily Mirror on December 29, 1955 reported that "at the Saudi

Arabian Consulate in the Chrysler Building, a trade attaché admitted that American firms either owned or headed by Americans of the Jewish faith cannot do business with the Arab countries."

Letters sent by Arab importers to American exporters notify them of the restrictions. One of these letters, dated January 7, 1956, states:

"With reference to your letter No. IW:ek of the November 21, 1955, we have to inform you that you will have to get the original certificate attested and certified by the Saudi Arabian Consulate in your country to the effect that firm which exports the machine is not a Jewish firm, without which we cannot have dealings with your firm."

An editorial in Fortune magazine of August 1957, reports: "Businessmen throughout the world were in receipt some months ago of a strange questionnaire. Dated Cairo, Egypt, the questionnaire pressed them for information on whether their firms were guilty of having Jewish ownership or participation." A recent study by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D.C., reports that "the boycott was applied to foreign firms having Jewish directors" ("Regional Development for Regional Peace," p. 276). The London Chamber of Commerce was requested some time ago to certify that British firms wishing to deal with the Arab countries were not Jewish (New York Times, October 15, 1957).

In a debate before the Second Committee of the U.N. General Assembly, held on October 14-15, 1957, representatives of Iraq and Egypt denied the charge that the boycott applied to Jewish concerns having no connection with Israel but offered no evidence in support of their denial (A/C.2/SR. 461, 464).

Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq, and Syria refuse entry or transit visas to Jews, as Jews regardless of their nationality. (Americans and other visiting Israel are not allowed to enter Arab countries directly from Israel, except on official business. They are not granted visas to Arab lands if there is evidence that they intend also to visit Israel.) The Department of State informs all passport applicants that Jews will be denied the right to visit many of the Arab lands. Passengers on cruise ships of American Export Lines touching at Arab ports are told beforehand that those of Jewish faith or with "Jewish" names will be denied certain travel privileges in Arab countries freely available to other passengers. American airlines flying regularly to the Middle East indicate in their schedules that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to leave the plane at Arab stopping points. Pan American World Airways, which flies to the Orient, informs passengers that Jews are allowed on flights to Beirut, Lebanon, but they cannot disembark or change at Iraq.

Until last year American teachers of the Jewish faith were barred from tours to a number of Arab countries sponsored by the National Education Association. As a result of protests, Jordan was dropped from the 1957 list of countries eligible for NEA-sponsored trips. Lebanon and Syria continued to receive NEA sponsorship because of "oral assurances" by their diplomatic representatives here that Jewish members of the National Education Association would receive visas if they were not Zionists.

Syria boycotts phonograph records of musicians like Yascha Heifetz and Yehudi Menuhin, solely because they are Jews. For similar reasons, Danny Kaye was barred from entering Arab lands, although on a mission for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

III. DISCRIMINATION AT DHAHRAN

Although the United States has had installations at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, since 1945, American Christians are restricted in the practice of their religion at the airfield

and American Jews are totally excluded both from the field and the country. Ever since the United States first used the field there has been an atmosphere of religious bias and discrimination surrounding it. Among the clauses of the basic agreement (signed in 1951 and renewed in 1957) governing American rights and obligations at Dhahran are provisions requiring the United States Mission to submit "a detailed list of the names and identity" of its members and employees so that there will not be included individuals "objectionable to the Saudi Arabian Government." If the mission is requested by the Saudis to remove or replace any of its personnel, it must do so promptly. Furthermore all civilian contracting firms and their workers must likewise "not be unacceptable to the Saudi Arabian Government." (U.S., "Treaties and Other International Acts Series," No. 2290.)

The practical effect of these provisions is that American Jewish military personnel are never posted to the American military airfield at Dhahran. American Jews are not permitted to be employed by the Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) or any other private American firm. Aramco is owned jointly by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (30 percent), Standard Oil Company of California (30 percent), the Socony Mobil Oil Company, Inc. (10 percent) and Texas Oil Company (30 percent). American Christians may not publicly practice their religion or display the symbols and insignia of their faith. The United States forces at Dhahran are forbidden to maintain chapels.

IV. THE BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN ENTERPRISES

In the earliest stage of the boycott, the Arab League required only that all Arab nations and citizens refrain from any connection with Israel or her nationals, goods and services. But not content with preventing Israelis from dealing with Arabs and Arabs from dealing with Israel, the Arab League has extended the boycott and blockade to foreign ships.

The League now blacklists and engages in other forms of economic pressure against any company that maintains branch plants, assembly operations, or agency offices in Israel, permits licensing arrangements by, or has financial interests in Israel firms or provides consultant and other services to Israel. The products and services of such firms are denied admission to Arab lands. American and other foreign vessels may not stop at Israel ports on the same run on which they put in at Arab ports. American Export Lines, for example, must, at a considerable expenditure of time and money, operate a separate Middle East service to the Israel ports of Haifa and Tel Aviv.

An illustrative boycott decree is Regulation No. 11299 of the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Commerce which warns "all the importing merchants to notify their agents abroad not to ship their goods on Israeli ships or through Israeli navigation companies or on foreign ships which may anchor during trips to Arab countries in Israeli ports. In case of contravention of these instructions, the shipped goods will be confiscated." Some 100 vessels of foreign registry have already been blacklisted by the Arab countries for sailing to Israel (Fortune, August 1957), including the following American ships: *Anniston City*, *Indian Bear*, *Kern Hills*, *Memory*, *Mobilube*, *Sacconet*, *Steel Designer*, and *Trinity*. Many other American-owned vessels under foreign registry also have been blacklisted. American vessels carrying Israel exports and imports have been subjected by Egyptian authorities to discriminatory and illegal delays and obstructions in traversing the Suez Canal, in violation of the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, which condemned such "unjustified interference with

the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another."

Instead of protesting the boycott restrictions on American enterprise, our Government has notified American shippers of the regulations of the boycott office (Foreign Commerce Weekly, January 4, 1956, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce). Moreover, the United States Navy's Military Sea Transport Service has advised American tanker owners who offer their ships to MSTs that if the tankers are on the Arab blacklist and can therefore not load at Arab ports, any travel deviation caused by this fact will be at the expense of the owners.

There are similar restrictions against American and other airlines. Planes using the airports of Israel are forbidden to fly over Arab territory or to receive flight information or rescue services from Arab sources (New York Times, October 15, 1957). Saudi Arabia has even gone so far as to threaten to shoot down any aircraft flying over her territory on the way to or from Israel. All of these restrictions violate the Convention on International Civil Aviation as well as the International Air Service Transit Agreement.

American newspapers report similar experiences by American businesses throughout the world (e. g., New York Herald-Tribune, February 12, 1956; the New York Times, October 15, 1957). In a statement quoted in the New York Post of February 3, 1956, the Iraqi Consul in New York, Gen. A. K. Gallani, said:

"Our policy is that all firms, be they Christian, Jew, or Moslem, are not allowed to do business with the Arab countries if they have a subsidiary or branch in Israel. This was a decision of the Arab League not of Iraq alone, and the reason is that Israel is at war with the Arab countries."

V. RESISTANCE TO THE BOYCOTT

In the past year, the Arab League has blacklisted some 25 companies in 19 countries and coerced 50 others into discontinuing or not undertaking commercial relations with Israel (Chemical Week, Apr. 6, 1957). However, a number of firms throughout the world have steadfastly refused to yield to the boycott and have therefore been placed on the blacklist. These companies refused to be intimidated, even in the face of possible financial loss. The following American companies have been boycotted by one or more of the Arab States, according to Business International of May 17, 1957:

Air Electric Corp., American Bilrite Rubber Co., Chemical Construction Corp., Continental Import & Export Corp., Elliot Import Corp., Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co., Empire Brushes, Inc., General Shoe Corp., General Tire & Rubber Co., Herman Hollander, Inc., Hudson Pulp & Paper Co., International Latex Co., Jacques Torczyner & Co., The Lock Joint Pipe Co., Moller Dee Textile Corp., National Plastics Co., P.E.C. Diamond Corp., Pilot Radio Corp., The Plough Sale Corp., Sinclair & Valentine, Inc., United States Near East Laboratories, Willys-Overland Corp.

One of the above companies, in a letter that it insisted be confidential, recently wrote: "Ever since the advent of our support toward the Israeli economy, our products have been boycotted in every Arab country wherefore our export sales amounted to substantially better than seven figures annually and undoubtedly would be double these figures today if it were not for the boycott. . . . Despite these severe economic losses, the company, well known in America, still maintains its business in Israel as a matter of principle.

The American Express Co.: In February, 1956, this company closed its offices in Israel and kept them closed until the spring of 1958. On June 19, 1958, the company, after completing negotiations with the Israel Government Tourist Corporation, issued the following statement:

"The Israel Government Tourist Corporation and American Express Co. representatives have had discussions in Jerusalem resulting in a program for joint promotion of travel to Israel. American Express undertook to reorganize and improve its representation in Israel. Its agencies will be enlarged and modernized in order to provide full range of services to an increased number of both local and foreign customers.

"The Israel Government Tourist Corporation stated: 'We are pleased with the constructive outcome of these recent discussions. American Express is promoting travel to Israel, and we are confident that as a result of this new promotion effort and the improved representation of American Express in Israel, results greater than heretofore will be accomplished.'

"The joint promotion campaign will include advertising, window displays in American Express offices in the United States and around the world, posters, publicity, and a variety of other promotion activities jointly financed by the Tourist Corporation and American Express. This campaign will stress both the traditional values of Israel as the Land of the Bible and the new sun and sea vacation attractions which are being developed in Israel. The 10th anniversary celebrations have proved to be a strong stimulus to Israel tourism."

After considering the American Express-Israel Government statement, the presidents of major American Jewish organizations commented:

"We are confident that the new joint plans of the Israel Government Tourist Corporation and the American Express Co. will be as beneficial to American Express as it will to the development of Israel tourism. The action of American Express exemplifies the best traditions of the American business community. It strengthens the unhampered flow of international trade and commerce free of any extraneous considerations."

VI. YIELDING TO THE BOYCOTT

Some companies have facilitated the operations of the boycott.

The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.: In March 1956 this wholly owned subsidiary of British-American Tobacco Co., Ltd., of London (not to be confused with the American Tobacco Co.) began refusing orders for the most important brands of cigarettes distributed by it. This is the only instance of a foreign corporation refusing orders from Israel importers. That this capitulation was due to Arab pressure is admitted by Brown & Williamson in a letter dated May 15, 1958, which says that its parent organization, the British-American Tobacco Co., was motivated by very grave and serious threats made by certain of the Arab countries. The Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. produces Viceroy, Kools, Raleigh, Du Maurier, Wings, Avalon, and Life.

Aramco: The Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco), in addition to denying oil to Israel, has threatened to cancel its contracts with European firms producing such innocent apparatus as floating roofs for water tanks if those firms do business with Israel (Fortune, August 1957). In addition, Aramco and its subcontractors, with the acquiescence of the State Department, have refused in New York State to hire persons of Jewish faith for work abroad or to allow their non-Jewish employees to bring into Saudi Arabia products manufactured by firms on the Arab blacklist. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination questioned the State Department about this Aramco policy. It was told of the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co., explaining that this relationship was the basis for the harmony between this Government and the Arabian Government

and should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected. (New York State Commission Against Discrimination, 1950 Progress Report, p. 48.)

VII. THE OIL COMPANIES AND THE BOYCOTT

For the last 10 years, the major American and British oil companies have yielded to the Arab boycott. These companies are the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, the Standard Oil Company of California, the Texas Co., the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., the Shell Oil Co. and the British Petroleum Co. Their yielding to the boycott has taken various forms:

1. The flow of oil from Iraq to the petroleum refinery at Haifa was interrupted in 1948 and has never been resumed.

2. The Haifa oil refinery, owned and operated jointly by the Royal-Dutch Shell Group and the British Petroleum Co., has not been used to its full capacity. Shell and British Petroleum refused fully to utilize the capacity of the refinery even during the Korean War when the free world underwent a shortage of refined petroleum products.

3. Tapline, the pipeline carrying oil from Saudi Arabia to the Mediterranean, is owned and operated by the Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco). Completed in 1950, the pipeline terminates in Syria and Lebanon. Although a contract was signed with the Palestine Government scheduling the terminus of the pipeline in Acre in what is today Israel, the original terminus was deliberately by-passed because of Arab pressure.

4. Since the institution of the Arab boycott, the major oil companies have refused to send tankers with oil destined for Israel through the Suez Canal so that Israel has been compelled to pay a considerable premium for her oil shipped in other ways.

5. All the major oil companies that had been operating in Israel have withdrawn from oil marketing there in conformity with Arab boycott demands.

6. All the major oil companies declined to engage in oil exploration in Israel.

7. The oil companies have discouraged other firms connected with or dependent upon them from doing business with Israel.

VIII. THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Even the operation of the International Wheat Agreement has been affected by the boycott. The objective of this agreement is to insure, at equitable and stable prices, supplies of wheat to importing countries and markets for wheat to exporting countries. The United States is a member of the agreement as an exporting country, and Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia participate as importing nations.

While the International Wheat Agreement does not control the production of wheat in any member country nor the method by which wheat can be sold pursuant to the agreement, all sales under the IWA must be within the minimum and maximum prices set by the agreement. For example, under the 1956 arrangement the price range was from \$1.50 to \$2 per bushel (New York Times, Apr. 22, 1956).

Because the market price for wheat in the United States is higher than the maximum allowable export price under the International Wheat Agreement, our Government has since 1943 been subsidizing American wheat exporters so that we would be able to meet our quota of guaranteed annual sales. Most of this wheat is exported from their own stocks by private U.S. businessmen who are paid a direct subsidy by our Government. The terms of each sale are worked out privately by the U.S. exporter and the foreign buyer, after which the former files a notice of sale with the Government, applying for an export payment. In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture reported that the average

wheat subsidy payment amounted to \$0.47 per bushel (report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1954). The amount of wheat and flour exported by the United States under the IWA between 1949 and 1955 to the Arab countries totaled approximately 36 million bushels (Annual Reports for the Crop Year, 1949-55). Calculating on the basis of \$0.47 per bushel, this means that the United States has subsidized the export of wheat to these countries to the extent of some \$17 million out of tax funds supplied by all our citizens.

The Arab League states refuse to ship their American wheat on blacklisted vessels or to buy wheat from American exporters who are Jews or who have dealings with Israel. As a result shipping costs increase. Our Government has declined to take the necessary administrative, legislative, or diplomatic action to end this discrimination. In effect, therefore, the United States submits to the operation of the Arab boycott and Americans are taxed for a wheat subsidy plan from which they are barred.

IX. THE UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN ARAB DISCRIMINATION

Unlike other countries, the United States has become enmeshed in this boycott against some of her own nationals and has permitted the rights of American Jews to be placed in an inferior category. Our Government did not effectively resist the demand of Saudi Arabia that American Jews be barred from American installations at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, nor did it resist the refusal of certain of the Arab States to grant visas to American Jews. Our Government has not encouraged American businessmen and shipowners to ignore the Arab boycott and blockade and to refuse to furnish to the Arab boycott office information as to the religious composition of American companies.

Spokesmen for our Government have sought to justify American inaction in a variety of ways. For example, as regards Jordanian and Saudi Arabian visa restrictions against American Jews, the Secretary of the Air Force on June 20, 1955, wrote to then Senator Herbert H. Lehman: "These restrictions are promulgated and enforced by the Arab countries and are not within the prerogative of the State Department or the military to change." On May 22, 1956, the State Department's Public Services Division issued a statement which said in part:

"International law and practice recognize the fundamental right of a sovereign state to determine whether and under what conditions aliens may enter its territory. We believe that American citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges in a foreign country which we allow the nationals of that country in the United States. However, we are obliged to recognize that any attempt by this country to force our views on a foreign nation would be considered intervention in the domestic affairs of that nation and therefore greatly resented."

At one time the State Department attempted to explain away the boycott of Jews as merely the work of a number of private individuals in the Arab countries rather than the result of official policy in the Arab League. Thus in a letter to Senator Lehman, dated December 15, 1953, the then Assistant Secretary of State, Thurston B. Morton, declared:

"The Department hopes that these instances are in the nature of sporadic, out-of-bounds actions based on excessive zeal or misunderstanding on the part of certain individuals rather than an indication of fundamental intensification of boycott practice by the Saudi Arabian Government."

As a result of widespread protest, on July 26, 1956, the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution (S. Res. 323) which stressed the primary principle of our Nation that

there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations * * * [and that] any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions * * * generally is inconsistent with our principles. At their presidential nominating conventions in 1956, the Republican and the Democratic Parties adopted platform planks opposing foreign discrimination against Americans such as now exists in Saudi Arabia. A year ago, both the President's Committee on Government Contracts and the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy asked the Departments of State and Defense to eliminate the discriminatory practices involving Americans in Saudi Arabia.

Despite the Senate resolution and other protests, the State Department renegotiated the Dhahran agreement in April 1957 without obtaining any change in the Arabian discriminatory practices. This policy of allowing foreign governments to discriminate against American citizens on religious grounds represents a sharp reversal of earlier official attitudes by our Government. When the Czarist regime in Russia sought to deny visas to naturalized American Jews and to question visa applicants in the United States about their religion, William F. Wharton, Acting Secretary of State, informed Russia on February 28, 1893:

"It is not constitutionally within the power of this Government or any of its authorities to apply a religious test in qualification of equal rights of all citizens of the United States; and it is therefore impossible to acquiesce in the application of such a test, within the jurisdiction of the United States, by agents of a foreign power, to the impairment of the rights of any American citizen or in derogation of the certificate of this Government to the fact of such citizenship."

"His Majesty's Government, however, surely cannot expect the United States to acquiesce in the assumption of a religious inquisitorial function within our own borders by a foreign agency, in a manner so repugnant to the national sense." (U.S. Department of State, "Papers Relating to Foreign Relations," 1893 (Washington, 1894), pp. 536-537).

Despite this protest, however, the issue was not resolved and Russia continued her discrimination against American Jews. This discrimination became an issue in the presidential campaigns of the day and culminated in a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 300 to 1 on December 13, 1911 (J. Res. 166). In response to this overwhelming sentiment of the American people, 2 days later the State Department notified Russia, a world power, that the United States had decided to cancel the commercial treaty of 1832.

X. NONCAPITULATION BY OTHER GOVERNMENTS

The greater the capitulation to the Arab boycott, the greater are the demands made upon those who capitulate to it. First a company is simply asked not to maintain a branch or office in Israel. Then it is asked not to trade with Israel. Finally, it is warned not to hire Jews in executive capacities on pain of losing Arab favor.

Conversely, there is ample evidence that when faced with firm resistance the Arabs back down. Despite threats of economic reprisals, West Germany continues reparations payments to Israel and continues to trade with her. Yet between 1953 and 1955 the combined dollar value of German exports to Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and Syria rose from \$94,929,000 to \$123,862,000. (Figures supplied by the German Consulate General in New York, June 5, 1957).

In 1956, the Central Organization for Foreign Economic Relations at The Hague advised the members of the Dutch branch of the International Chamber of Commerce not to supply Arab importers with information

about the number of Jews working in Dutch export houses. On September 23, 1957, Dr. Willem Drees, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, reiterated that his Government would resist all Arab boycott measures infringing upon Dutch interests. He declared that as a United Nations member Holland shares responsibility for Israel's existence and that the boycott is "illegal and conflicts with the armistice agreements" (Netherlands News Bulletin, Sept. 21, 1957). As for resistance on the part of individual firms, the following statement by a British concern could well serve as a model for all governments and private companies beset by the Arabs:

"We vigorously contest the right of any overseas body or government, to dictate to us where we shall or shall not market our goods. Our business is that of selling our products anywhere in the world, and in this we are actuated by commercial considerations alone, politics playing no part whatever in our sales policy. We do, in fact, maintain strict neutrality in all our dealings with various countries, and that, in our opinion, is eminently more desirable than taking sides on issues completely unconnected with the affairs of England. The only edicts we obey are those of our own Government and provided they do not impose restrictions on the export of our goods to any particular destination, we regard ourselves as free to sell wherever there is a demand."

XI. CONCLUSIONS

The Arab boycott activities encroach upon the elementary American freedoms to trade, to invest, and to travel. There is a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation between the United States and the State of Israel. But because of the Arab boycott, American business firms are compelled to assume a posture toward Israel which is not in conformity with the spirit of that treaty. American citizens in this country are questioned about their religion by consular and diplomatic officials of the Arab States. American Jews are denied, because of their religion, privileges granted to non-Jews.

Arab economic warfare places a wholly unwarranted burden upon the American taxpayer. By imposing unnecessary expenditures and losses upon all of the countries of the Middle East, the boycott subverts the purposes of United States economic assistance, making the area increasingly more dependent upon such assistance.

While the boycott lasts, progress toward peace in the Middle East is impossible. This has been recognized by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld who at a press conference on August 8, 1957, referred to the boycott as a deadweight upon our efforts.

In the broadest sense, the Arab boycott therefore constitutes political and economic aggression. By creating and maintaining tension, the boycott helps keep the Middle East in a state of near-war, continually threatening world peace and stability.

While the boycott lasts, interests vital to America are jeopardized. On political, economic, and moral grounds, it must therefore be resisted by the U.S. Government, by American business and by American public opinion.

A Latin American's Ideas on Hemispheric Unity—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD additional excerpts from the book by Jose A. Benitez, "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America," which was published recently:

A HEMISPHERICAL REALITY

Can the difficult struggle of the people of Puerto Rico during recent years serve as a useful case history for our brothers of Latin America, so as to assist them in their approach to intercontinental relationships?

The case of Puerto Rico is one that typifies the determination of a courageous people to overcome effectively the adversities of a difficult transition, without sufficient natural resources, living in dire privation, sickness, misery, and want, depending almost exclusively on a one-crop type of agriculture, devoted to the raising of sugarcane, supplemented by a little tobacco, a little coffee, and some other minor crops. In short, a declining type of agriculture, and, what was worse, one depending on a precarious reciprocal relation with the people of the United States. This is a fight the people are determined to win and are winning.

As the politicians dedicated themselves to academic struggles, they contributed to the promotion of divisionism, which stagnated the progress of the people and increased the economic and social maladjustment suffered by our island. It is evident that the people, exploited as they were by the greedy practices of the large landowners and of absenteeism, dominated as they were by colonialism, were almost at the point of despair in their discouragement.

The hard fight that initiated the awakening of the Puerto Rican conscience began—as I said before—in the year 1938. In 1940 at the polls the Puerto Ricans gave control of power to the right type of leadership. That was the overwhelming civic action which gave origin to the emancipating revolution of Puerto Rico.

Today, after 18 years of hard struggle which the people of Puerto Rico carried out with strong determination, the island—that fraternally contributes from the treasure of its experiences to the friendly people of the free world through the various programs of technical assistance of the United States—is nothing less than a gigantic and diversified workshop, in a constant, dynamic program of activities, well planned and equitably distributed among the 76 municipalities of the country.

The instruments and agencies necessary to fight the miseries of the population were established with diligence and generosity. Public services were increased to press on the fight against privation and sickness. The welfare and hospitalization programs were enlarged. The units of the public health service were increased, as were school dining rooms, milk stations, direct relief, and social security. An unemployment insurance program was tentatively created. The urban and rural sectors were provided with abundant, pure, fresh water. The electrification program was also increased to include the rural areas. New schools, roads, and lanes were built. The enormous slums which have housed thousands of humble laborers, workers providing the sinews of our productive energy, will very soon be totally supplanted by clean living quarters in excellent housing programs, modern and comfortable. Labor legislation has provided for the care and social elevation of the laborers and has improved notably their standards of living.

The economic problems have been faced with energy. Agriculture is being diversified and strengthened by new techniques. The industrialization program to increase the wealth, wipe out unemployment, and raise wages to a point which will improve the general welfare of the people promises to bring, within a few more years, the self-sufficiency which is still lacking in Puerto Rico. Agricultural experiment stations, a

scientific system of cooperatives, training centers, and the work of social education of the community stimulate and facilitate the coordinated effort toward greater production.

The program fostered by the leaders of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is controlled and directed by a planning board whose technicians pass on—approving or rejecting—the promotions suggested as features of the organized development.

The University of Puerto Rico—recently admitted to membership in the American Association of Universities—provides the lawyers, doctors, pharmacists, engineers, architects, agronomists, public administrators, accountants, teachers, and others who are constantly joining the legion of executives and various public servants who work together in the fight against poverty and for the creation of a highly civilized level of life. The university is in charge of developing continually the vocational school—the largest of its kind in the world—where men are trained in all manual and industrial occupations, and which thus serves as a generator providing power for the great shop which is the island of Puerto Rico.

In a project of similar significance, the department of public education—which expends in its work the greatest share of the budget—in addition to pursuing its plan of general education—is giving emphasis to the complete elimination of illiteracy on the island. To that end, adult education is carried on at night schools throughout the land.

Those students who, having obtained scholarships from the United Nations and the technical assistance program, come to Puerto Rico to gain the benefit of experience there, as well as various other visitors, such as intellectuals, politicians, newspapermen, and statesmen, know of the cordial anxiety of the people of Puerto Rico to share the fruit of their struggle for improvement and security with their brothers of Latin America and the people of the rest of the world.

Hundreds of students and professional men from Europe, Africa, Asia and various islands of the Pacific, and especially from many of the republics of Latin America, come to the island to study procedures, programs and techniques used in Puerto Rico by various institutions, so as to carry the wealth of the knowledge thus acquired back to their countries where it will be put to use in their respective communities and special fields of endeavor. These friendly people are the best ambassadors for the good will and the cooperative spirit of the people of Puerto Rico.

The resulting achievements, which are the fruit of the initiative and struggle of the Puerto Rican leadership, would never have been attained without the favorable disposition, the generosity, and spirit of helpfulness of the United States. It was a matter of finding avenues of understanding in the official circles at Washington, of talking to the leaders of the Nation and interesting them in the responsibility of their historical commitments. Soon the democratic, liberal, and human traditions of the great Republic of the North came to bloom. Past indifference changed to mutual cordiality in the cooperative efforts which have brought about in a short time the social, economic, and political development of our people.

Puerto Rico is a community genuinely Latin America. Its historical, ethnical, and idiomatic origin is the same found in all the nations of Latin America. Our personality preserves intact its fundamental attributes. Upon entering the political orbit of the United States, we faced the same problems of misunderstanding and indifference that still estrange South American nations from the dynamic and busy colossus of the North. We ourselves lost much valuable time in not correcting our early attitude of negligence, incomprehension, and aloofness.

But new men without xenophobic complexes and conscious of the necessity to bring an end to barren apathy, soon produced proof of the capacity of generous and intelligent nations—regardless of their differences in race, traditions, history, and culture—to bring forth the mutual blessings of an understanding and fertile fellowship.

Puerto Rico broke down the barriers of misunderstanding with the United States, and has thus developed, under the cordial influence of the resulting rapprochement, its multiple and vigorous potentialities. This privileged position enables the Puerto Rican people, intellectually, politically and psychologically, to serve as a responsible spokesman to the United States concerning the values which the Latin American people could contribute on behalf of the general good of this great hemisphere of ours. In the intercontinental evolution, neither the North nor the South can evade the common duties of their destiny. Why not begin the task which is obvious before us, the logical and full completion of reciprocal arrangements, which cannot long be delayed?

The world more and more is tending to lose its nationalistic barriers. It will be ripe, in the course of time, to accept the idea of a single governmental organization administered on the concept that there is only one humanity. The leaders of the great geographic communities—as the Europeans, the Asians, and the Arabians have begun to do—are under the obligation of grouping and strengthening their energies, to spread the greatness that dissolves selfishness, shares potentialities, ennobles life, and perfects civilization.

Puerto Rico wishes to sow its humble portion of seed in a furrow of the planting of brotherhood that will bring forth the mighty unified America that is on its way.

Such, in short, is the hemispherical reality which may be inspired by our people, who, filled with enthusiasm for perfecting the Puerto Rican civilization and sharing it fraternally with our brothers of the globe, may hope to spread their influence even further—to building a better world.

OUR PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL POLITICS

Puerto Ricans, because of our condition as U.S. citizens, are free to go in and out of the country, and to settle down in the U.S. territory just as the same as those who are U.S. citizens by the circumstance of birth within the States. Constitutionally—due to the fact that Puerto Rico does not pay taxes to the Federal Treasury—the Puerto Ricans who live on the island take no part in the election of the President nor in the elections of the other national officials who are named by ballot; but the Puerto Ricans who reside within the national boundaries take part in the political campaigns of the parties and cast their votes in favor of their candidates.

Higher standards of living due to better salaries have been incentives to the Puerto Ricans who have flocked to the United States, enlarging the Puerto Rican colonies there. They are established permanently today in large towns and in such cities as New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and in many communities throughout Florida, California, and New Jersey, taking part in all types of professional and manual activities as a leading North American productive force.

With the cooperation of the government of Puerto Rico, of the States and the Federal Government of the Republic, and of religious, civic and political organizations, the Puerto Ricans who emigrate to the national territory adapt themselves well and are soon integrated in the North American way of life. The process of adaptation has revealed to the people of the communities where Puerto Rican have settled the social, political, and economic contribution that

Puerto Ricans can give, especially because of the openhearted spirit in which they approach everything that surrounds them.

The Puerto Rican showed his importance in the democratic structure of the United States when he inscribed his name on the rolls of voters and participated in local elections and in general followed the course of other important immigrant groups who became United States citizens, became integrated in the national life and obtained advantageous positions. There is no doubt that the Puerto Rican will perform a prominent role in the politics of the nation. In support of this belief, we see that the number of Puerto Rican residents is continuously increasing and their interest in public life is constantly becoming more effective.

Probably most of the world knows that the two great political organizations of the United States are the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. Both of these organizations—who constantly contend for the ascendancy in political power, finding fortune favoring sometimes one side and sometimes the other—joined to abolish colonialism in Puerto Rico, and which ever party has the leadership of the national administration sets aside partisan considerations in maintaining a friendly understanding between government and government with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The National Republican Party, with which the Statehood Republican Party of Puerto Rico is affiliated, not long ago had a promise in its platform of statehood for the island. It is very significant that this promise was changed in the last convention to a compromise proposal favoring social, economic, and political development under the present form of the Puerto Rican regime. Which ever party governs in Washington, the relations with Puerto Rico will be from government to government.

There exists the political reality that the Puerto Ricans are United States citizens, and, since there are Puerto Rican voters in national elections, both major United States parties have officially recognized two committees, one Republican and the other Democratic, which were organized and actually function in Puerto Rico. These committees, acting within their respective national groups in the United States, have the same essential importance and enjoy the same privileges as do the committees of the various States of the Union. The Puerto Rican committees offer constant help to the committees of their respective parties in those States where there are Puerto Rican residents.

Both political committees of the island have the same relationship to their national committees as do the State committees within the United States. Each names two national committee members, a committee-woman and a committeeman, to take part in national party activities. The committees of the island have equal rights with the committees of the States of the Union.

For those unfamiliar with the U.S. national politics, it is interesting to note how the country's principal executives are selected and how Puerto Rico and other non-States of the United States hegemony exert their influence in these matters.

Every 4 years the political parties of the United States hold conventions to nominate their candidates for the presidency and the vice presidency of the Nation. Of the 178 million citizens who live in the United States, a total of, say, 1,372 delegates of each party will vote in such conventions. The nomination is attained with only 687 votes (based on the above total), one vote over one-half the number of votes. It is also worth noting that the representation to these conventions is divided chiefly according to the number of inhabitants of each State.

The National Democratic Party—of whose Puerto Rican Committee I am the presi-

dent—divides the votes of its convention as follows:

Alabama.....	21
Arizona.....	14
Arkansas.....	16
California.....	70
Colorado.....	18
Connecticut.....	22
Delaware.....	12
Florida.....	26
Georgia.....	23
Idaho.....	14
Illinois.....	60
Indiana.....	32
Iowa.....	26
Kansas.....	22
Kentucky.....	26
Louisiana.....	20
Maine.....	16
Maryland.....	24
Massachusetts.....	38
Michigan.....	46
Minnesota.....	28
Mississippi.....	15
Missouri.....	32
Montana.....	14
Nebraska.....	18
Nevada.....	12
New Hampshire.....	14
New Jersey.....	36
New Mexico.....	16
New York.....	98
North Carolina.....	36
North Dakota.....	8
Ohio.....	58
Oklahoma.....	28
Oregon.....	16
Pennsylvania.....	74
Rhode Island.....	16
South Carolina.....	20
South Dakota.....	8
Tennessee.....	32
Texas.....	56
Utah.....	12
Vermont.....	6
Virginia.....	32
Washington.....	26
West Virginia.....	24
Wisconsin.....	28
Wyoming.....	14
Alaska.....	6
District of Columbia.....	6
Hawaii.....	6
Puerto Rico.....	6
Virgin Islands.....	3
Canal Zone.....	3

The listing of vote distributions reflects the importance that the political parties of the United States give to the Commonwealth. We have, within the party, the same number of votes as the State of Vermont, the District of Columbia, Alaska, or Hawaii. We have two votes less than the States of North and South Dakota, respectively. And although Puerto Rico does not vote for a President or a Vice President, it does vote in the conventions of the political parties of the Nation, and with these votes has influence in the selection of party candidates for these great offices, and it participates jointly with the delegations of the Federal States in the resolutions, agreements, and other political actions they take in their efforts for leadership of the Republic.

No great imaginative effort is needed to envision the diversity of relations and associations through which the Puerto Ricans affect life in the United States, aside from the part they play, as indicated above, in the strife and fate of the national political parties. The successes springing from this political brotherhood enjoyed by the Puerto Ricans in North America have already borne fruit abundantly in such populous cities as New York, where the Puerto Rican votes, if not decisive in themselves, at least affect the balance in the results of the local elections.

As a result of the organization of the Puerto Ricans in New York City, the city district in which he lives has selected as its

representative in the State assembly, or legislature, the Puerto Rican attorney, Felipe N. Torres. Among the New York City judges, we have the Puerto Rican, Manuel A. Gómez, and another of Spanish descent, Emilio Nuñez. There is a district leader, Antonio Méndez, who leads the Democratic Party in district No. 14 of the city. Attorney José Ramos López has served on the State workmen's compensation board. The Republican Party recently has nominated a Puerto Rican as a candidate for the U.S. Congress. The horizons promise to continue enlarging for civic duty, calling upon the capacity and strength for the Puerto Ricans in the United States in the same way in which we had the good fortune to see such opportunities arise in the more limited sphere of our land, Puerto Rico.

On the other hand, we have had powerful and enthusiastic collaborators in the national leaders, both Republican as well as Democratic. Now and then these come to Puerto Rico to learn our points of view and perhaps to study the Spanish character as it is revealed in the Puerto Rican, so as to know better their reactions, habits, and customs, and thus to learn what conduct to follow not only with the Puerto Ricans but also with the other Spanish inhabitants who live in the United States.

Through the influence of their votes in the elections of Governors, Congressmen, mayors and other public officials—an influence which is well recognized—Puerto Ricans in the United States have had the strong satisfaction of seeing direct results in benefits to their fellow Latin American immigrants.

Our condition as citizens of the United States, with the knowledge we have gained of the Nation's political life from our participation in the activities of national political parties, added to our condition as Latin American people, assuredly puts us in an exceptionally suitable position to serve between the United States and Latin America to help provide the warm and comprehending approach needed to erase old differences and misunderstandings and bring about a fellowship of all the people of the American continents.

Puerto Rico feels itself up to the task.

THE MISSION OF THE AMERICAS

I made a brief allusion in a previous chapter to the interest of such illustrious statesmen as Winston Churchill concerning the feasibility of creating a federation of Europe. I referred, also, to the consolidation of nations being carried forward by Asiatic and Arabian leaders.

In view of the forbidding political situation overshadowing the shrinking world in which we live, it is to be hoped that the great international leaders of the free world will come to recognize the necessity of strengthening and securing the life of their people, uniting them in commonwealths of maximum potentialities. The differences between nations having great territory and large population together with powerful economic resources, and the nations possessed of small territory, small population and scanty resources can be adjusted only by the unification of peoples with the same ideals, interests and common ambitions, unification directed toward the end of becoming greater through such federation.

In a world such as ours, full of driving and competitive tendencies, with some nations engaged in the barbaric domination that enslaves weaker ones, our chief problem is no other than that of assuring our survival by making ourselves the fittest, through mutual defense and cooperation with the other nations in our orbit.

From the early days of tribal life up to the present, humanity has moved always toward greater community concentrations. This beneficial tendency has proceeded, however, at a dishearteningly slow pace, a gait that

has dragged heavily on the potential advancement of civilization.

It is a shameful fact, and the fault of the peoples' leaders, that scientific progress has had its greatest and most rapid advancement in the forced culture of wartime. But such is the case. Nations that could develop with more splendor and nobility in time of peace have been very busy consuming the acid fruits of their selfishness, giving little consideration to the magnificent possibilities for their own enlargement through the fraternal growth of humanity.

The evolution toward a unique government of the human race—which is inevitable in the centuries to come—would have no civilized virtue if it were to come into being through the domination of man by man. Paradoxically, however, the present leader in the movement toward the gathering of peoples is a piratical colossus. He is indeed swiftly forming mighty conglomerates, both in population and in geographical expanse. And that being the case, prudence dictates that we face the inevitable conclusions and not delay a moment the labor that must be done for our progress toward the conquest and the fulfillment of the future.

Our hemisphere cannot ignore the realities of life at the crossroads where its nations stand today. The countries of the two Americas should earnestly and deeply meditate the historical implications of the moment in which they are immersed; the destiny that they may or may not fulfill; their weakness in their present isolation in the stormy international currents; the greatness which they could achieve in a hemispheric bloc, and the energy which could be generated in social, economic, scientific and cultural interchanges among the American nations. In a word, it is necessary to rationalize and to see the mission which a united America, pioneering and unselfish, could accomplish for the peaceful and fruitful organization of the genuinely civilized world of the future.

The incalculable natural wealth that the enormous territory of the American continents holds—still largely neglected, or unsuspected, in the soil—once developed to capacity could supply all the needs of the world.

The American nations occupy a comparatively virgin land. They are not subject to the grievous pressures for existence that bear upon communities of the Old World, where feelings of discouragement, despair, and desperation have driven the people often to take the road to war as a means of escape.

There lies before America a future free of the contamination of national psychological complexes. The hemisphere has no tares of ancestral bitterness. Its spirit is intact for the unselfish service it can give in the great intercontinental affairs of the globe. Perhaps its continued separation from the rest of the world helped it to preserve its purity. These considerations should encourage its people to accept the role of leadership that is indicated for them. The American people cannot continue divided but must join together to make the most of the wealth within their vaults, not only for themselves but for all the human race.

Our hemisphere must turn its eyes to its fitting and unexplored greatness, developing and directing it, and offering its fruits generously to the nations that now fight for a place under the sun. The contribution of America thus offered loyally for human fellowship could and should reestablish the equilibrium of those tormented nations whose construction has induced them to make war and thus to retard the advancement of civilization.

America could and should provide the rest of humanity the additional resources needed for its happiness, abandoning all reserve and hostility. Because of its youth, our hemisphere has all the conditions, qualities, riches and strength needed for the task

of fraternally reconstructing the world to a degree which up to now has been spoken of only in a theoretical way. Its healthy youth, its unselfish and graceful spirit, place America in the privileged historic position to be the human bloc that will find ways of removing disputes and problems of the world through brotherly devices, doing away with the dark barbarity of violence.

The American nations could very well come to the year 2000 as leaders of the earth, exerting a leadership not to enslave or to destroy but to be useful in the building of the patterns of fraternal companionship that the world needs in its advance to greatness, spirituality and perfection. But this would require setting aside national and ethnic jealousies and recognizing the difficulties, and being conscious that only the more populous regions, regions having also territories of unlimited potentialities, could be the directors of the extraordinary and ambitious mission.

The United States very evidently is the most highly developed and efficient power in the American sphere. Its strength not only could establish its leadership from Alaska to Patagonia but also could extend it to the most distant corners of the world. As the chief defense against the antagonistic attitude shown by Russia to the nations of the Occident, dominated as Russia is by an imperialistic greed for expansion and world control, the United States is under an obligation to protect the right of liberty and the useful life, and to continue in this role, maintaining through various alliances the means to safeguard conservative and altruistic ideals. These alliances must be effected even with nations which are in many respects quite different in their character and interests, to the end that there will be a universal human fraternity and the development of a common civilization which will endure forever. But she should give first thought to the protection, security, and survival of the occidental nations that have a mutual area of interests. In this time of continuous threats to world freedom, the United States has no alternative; it must put all its resources at the service of the defense of all friendly nations, whose fortunes are tied to its own security.

Her responsibility for concern regarding affairs more distant certainly does not mean that the United States should not give first attention to the historic mission closest at hand, that of establishing a fraternal union with the Latin American nations of the hemisphere. It is to be hoped that the leaders of the great republic of the north will consider giving urgent precedence to work for an understanding with their nation's neighbors in Latin America, so as to begin the germination of hemispheric unity as a starting point toward the greater, world wide work which destiny seems to have reserved for our hemisphere.

On the other side, I feel sure that the leaders of the Latin American countries will do no less in the vital appointment that they have with history.

All the leaders must stubbornly strive to give creative objectivity to the mission which is theirs to fulfill in their respective communities, to build the new world that is to come, even if the hemisphere does not at first accept their initiative. The United States and Latin America could provide preponderantly the techniques and resources and, above all, the virtues of brotherly unselfishness which would be required for the achievement of the great task.

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to point out that the peoples of all the Americas are equally obligated not to shrink from the massive demands of the glorious gesture that the desperate, cornered state of humanity calls for.

The task is there. It is for its missionaries to carry it through to victory.

SOME LAST CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the historic mission that the America Nation could jointly fulfill to obtain the world fellowship that is advocated here, an immediate benefit to all the nations of the hemisphere would be a rapport established with each other, erasing the frictions and prejudices that grew up in the creation of the intercontinental society. In a great measure, these prejudices and frictions are ghosts of doubts and suspicion begotten by the distrust and lack of communication which has predisposed the various races. In a lesser way—also ghosts, because they belong to errors of the past—the prejudices of Latin America are the result of the intervention of the United States on Latin American soil, prior to the time when President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a policy of hemispheric friendship.

As the two continents were drawn to each other in a cordial and loyal approach, they would remove frontiers that today separate North, Central, and South America, not geographically and politically, but with regard to interests and abstractions that are equally formidable.

Such an approach, based on fraternity and cooperation, would relieve the United States of an outside search for that which she needs to prosper and to enlarge herself and would similarly put within easy reach of Latin America all the productive resources that are lacking within its geographical limits. The two would contribute their respective potentialities—those already developed and the much more copious ones which are yet undeveloped—so that in a few years the resulting social, economic, scientific, and cultural advancement would be enormous.

It is evident that the task is work for a Cyclops, so far as it concerns the need of attaining genuine comprehension and pure magnanimity, whose breath would dissolve all the disagreements which today hold apart American nations. Both—the United States and Latin America—have their peculiar systems of life, with differences in history, customs, traditions, language and even objectives. But does this mean that they cannot get together, understand one another and share the common destiny that lies ahead?

Puerto Rico is by origin Latin American, as I said before. It entered into political relations with the United States in 1898. The island suffered from the same problems of misunderstanding and remoteness that exist today between the United States and other Latin American communities. Puerto Ricans faced incomprehension and indifference. There could be no success for us that was not based on the greatness of both the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico. As soon as we began to draw together, all incomprehensions and prejudices fell apart, and our association, fortified today by the bond of a common citizenship, thrives in the rich interchange on which our development is based.

If our Puerto Rican leaders succeeded in helping accomplish this American union, why could not the leaders who today orient the policies of other Latin American communities broaden and advance such diplomatic gains?

Communist Russia knows that its cunning expansionism cannot undermine, even in a clandestine way, the compact and powerful unity of the North American people. That is why it is maneuvering desperately to infiltrate its germs of anarchism, weakness and demoralization in the vital organs of the Latin American countries, through seemingly advantageous economic offers that doubtless could endanger the stability and free determination of those communities. Can we be so deceived as to yield to an economic infiltration over which hovers the steel expansionism and the grasping domination that have enslaved so many satellites in Russia's barbarous orbit?

Probably there will be a stern rejection of these devices by the Latin American leadership before the germ of the deceitful and subtle diplomacy of communism can undermine the future of Latin America and the destiny of our hemisphere.

Nothing that Latin America and the United States could wish for to improve their respective communities needs to be searched for in the Old World. They have everything needful in their own territory, or if anything is lacking temporarily it can be found by exploration of hemispheric resources. The continents, under the infinite guidance of God, must hope that the leaders of the several nations may have the vision of their enormous destiny.

The task of developing American fellowship is one for men of good will and not for Cyclopes. Both the Latin American and the North American people have equally the key that could put an end to their differences. A few examples will indicate the remedies that should be applied for the removal of causes of discontent.

Before anything else, we should go into the field of communication, not with the hauteur, reserve, and conventionalisms of diplomacy, but with a humane and brotherly attitude that assumes that all are equally dignified and useful and can exchange the most noble contributions.

After that, all practices of trade lacking equitable reciprocity and having an unfairly selfish end should be restricted until they are totally eliminated.

To the United States may be pointed out, as guides to rectifications it needs to make in the economic field, some facts that, beyond doubt, have to do with the justified suspiciousness of the Latin American people.

Development of the economic potentiality of the hemisphere should not be directed toward the north or toward the south, but to both equally.

The United States will benefit by buying more products from its neighbors of the south.

The tariff barriers that have established the existing unilateral utilitarianism should be increasingly reduced until they are abolished.

The U.S. importation quotas for Latin American products must disappear, thus establishing genuine reciprocity.

The inversion of capital should be planned to flow toward the underdeveloped countries so as to create the economic power of a distributive situation in the southern continent having neither overstrong nor overweak sides.

The program of technical assistance should be increased to incorporate the development on the southern continent of more numerous and more skillful professionals, so as to promote the growth of all productive fountains and fight the endemic misfortunes that interrupt the advancement of the countries south of the Rio Grande.

Business should be regulated by just rules and laws.

Such institutions as the Export-Import Bank should correct their lending system. In the indirect way in which the Bank offers its help it seems to favor expressly the North American industrialists, agriculturists, and businessmen in a manner mainly directed at supporting the interests of the U.S. economy, while at the same time it seems to exert an encroaching control over those countries that obtain its loans. The idea of creating an inter-American bank—actually under consideration in Washington now—to rehabilitate the Latin American economy seems to be the remedy of the obvious drawbacks of the Export-Import Bank.

Interventionist laws such as the Internal Revenue Act of 1950, which extend their fiscal collections to the independent nations of Latin America to extract revenues that are rightly the Latin Americans' income and which are needed for their full economic

progress, have no possible justification and create a bitter disaffection among Latin American leaders. Such laws, besides being injurious to the promotion of the economic interests of U.S. citizens in Latin America, give aid to the penetration and competition of Old World interests in Latin America.

In addition, the problem of Washington's relation with the dictatorships of Latin America—of which, fortunately, there are few left—deserves a complete revision, to reduce drastically the military assistance that is offered and, instead, provide cooperation in projects of social significance, such as housing projects, health projects, and programs to raise standards of living and expand public services.

It is possible also to give some hints to the Latin American countries of matters they might rectify in order to encourage the people of the United States to take a more interested attitude toward them.

Although we Latin Americans are conscious of the European blood flowing in our veins, we must think, feel, and act according to American realities. It is not a good attitude to despise the interchanges and reciprocities which we both, the Latin Americans as well as the North Americans, could cultivate, so as to promote trade among ourselves, rather than to go looking for business in distant quarters.

A thoughtless predisposition to distrust should not be directed against persons possessed of the good human endowments of the people of the United States. Latin America should recognize that the root cause of its haughtiness (presumably deriving from the hurt done by the lamentable interventions of the past or by the pressure of the old dollar politics) has been removed, and should see the actual disposition, the proved magnanimity, of the U.S. people.

The xenophobes are abundant in Latin America. Among them we find the politicians who, for personal reasons unnecessary to discuss here, cherish passionate grudges against the United States; the agitators who take a communistic line and spread discord, playing upon various feelings of inferiority to promote sentiment against the United States, or propagating the same grudge among youth of frustrated ambitions. The Latin American peoples must be very careful to guard themselves from these fanatic elements, which are their worst enemy, purveying anarchy dressed as patriotism, or injecting the microbe of communism into the blood stream.

In summary, the North and the South must end their disagreements and each one get rid of the limitations that hinder this settlement. And instead of addressing each other in stilted diplomatic language they should start to speak the vernacular of the family.

The hemisphere may hope that the United States and Latin America will gracefully accomplish the part which is required of each one. The destiny of both is the political destiny of all America.

Perhaps God will order affairs so that the lesson of Puerto Rico will guide the achievement of the task that the American nations can fulfill for the progress of human relations.

World Peace Through Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ord, I wish to include the following address delivered by Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., president of the American Bar Association, before the first session, the assembly, American Bar Association convention, in the Philharmonic Auditorium, Los Angeles, Calif., August 25, 1958. The text of the address follows:

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

The privilege of serving this great association as its president is an honor for which I shall always be most grateful. These past 13 months have been an interesting, rewarding, and gratifying experience. I earnestly hope that those who evaluate the record since London will conclude that this has been a period of progress for the association's programs of service to the public and to the legal profession.

The presidential addresses of my predecessors have considered the contemporary facts of their day and the duties and responsibilities thrust upon lawyers by the great issues and problems of their time. These distinguished presidents of our association have challenged our profession to face up to those issues and to solve the legal problems which arose therefrom. In emulation of precedent I now speak of the No. 1 problem of mankind in the world of today: How to achieve and maintain world peace.

As a foundation for my thesis that peace between nations may be achieved and maintained through use of the rule of law in a new worldwide system of courts, it is helpful to recall the rapid forward rush of events in our era of unprecedented change. History teaches that these dramatic new advances are mere promises and preludes to even greater achievements in the future. One who would postulate any plan to solve any problem of our day must therefore also look beyond the present to the new horizons and the new frontiers envisioned by the world in which we now live.

1. THE WORLD TODAY

We live at a turning point in the history of civilization—in a time when the whole world is being made over socially, economically, scientifically, and even intellectually. Our era has witnessed such dramatic achievements as flight faster than sound, the splitting of the atom, miracle drugs, satellites in space, and many others. Rapid and turbulent changes in the scientific, economic, and social fields, almost too numerous to name, daily defy evaluation on the basis of prior standards and experience. Vistas of endless space have opened as man's horizons have widened to encompass the universe. At a pace beyond dreaming the whole pattern of our existence is being reshaped. As we inventory our strengths and weaknesses we must conclude that concepts of the past are no firm foothold for the dynamic present and the uncertain future.

Amid tremendous developments for good and evil, a revolution in international affairs is taking place. Due to rapid communications and transportation, ours is a physically indivisible world. Age-old barriers such as seas and mountains, weather and climate, even time and distance, are fading into insignificance. The many economic relations and intellectual exchanges between nations are steadily increasing. The birth of new nations, and the newly won independent status of other nations, have created a rising tide of intense nationalism and anti-colonialism.

The whole world is involved in an accelerated industrialism and caught up in a tide of rising expectations. Yet there are vast discrepancies of economic development with widespread poverty, hunger and disease. The world Communist conspiracy is capitalizing on a growing spirit of rebellion against social and racial discriminations and low living standards. But while we can deplore

this Communist exploitation of human misery, we cannot condemn the social and economic aspirations of millions of human beings. We applaud their desire to compress centuries of social and economic development into mere decades and wish to aid them in achieving that goal.

The International Communist conspiracy has extended its colonial empire to include one-third of the people of the world, and it is working constantly to further its plan for complete world domination. The Kremlin has achieved its major conquests not by force of arms but by subverting the minds of men through political, economic and sociological warfare and other subversive tactics. These tactics create an almost constant crisis and tension. Communist words are used for concealment and confusion rather than enlightenment. The peril from false Communist propaganda is putting the very idea of a free society to its greatest test in all history. In a world where strength resides in man's mind not his muscle, the loss of the fight for the minds of men could mean disaster. Yet peoples in other countries, and in our own country, all too often fail to recognize this threat to their freedom in this new guise.

The use of mass-psychology headline barges is a major diplomatic development of our era. But people have grown weary of the constant strife and bickering in international affairs. In this situation wrong concepts may sometimes be unknowingly accepted. A man who gets wrong concepts, whether from reading misleading charges and countercharges, or otherwise, cannot fail to arrive at wrong conclusions. Thus many of our people are often bewildered and benumbed to the point where they react apathetically to even clear statements of the Communist menace.

We have been forced into spending billions on military expansion in an ever-accelerating arms race with Russia. Every such arms race in all history has ended sooner or later in war. We live constantly on the brink of catastrophe as we go from crisis to crisis. The Damoclean sword hanging over all the wonderful scientific achievements of our era is the knowledge that man's achievements could lead to the suicidal extinguishment of the human race. No one doubts that an all-out nuclear war today would be so incredibly destructive as to produce mass extermination.

As we listen to the roar of current history it is absolutely clear that mankind—men, and nations, and races—must learn to live together or else see civilization as we know it perish in the senseless devastation of war. The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the ICBM's, the sputniks, the explorers, and vanguards have attuned the minds of the people of the world to an overwhelming desire for peace which is stronger than such desire at any other time in all history. There is a growing realization that if the holocaust of all-out war explodes, every man, woman, and child will be in the front lines for the first time since the Indian Wars. The cause of peace is thus the cause of human survival.

Today, when man has learned how to destroy the world, his greatest need is for instrumentalities and institutions which can save mankind from the mass extermination of nuclear war. The sands of time have about run out in the hourglass of our civilization. Few will dispute that the No. 1 problem of our day is how to achieve and maintain true peace. This situation presents a unique and unparalleled opportunity to lawyers, for it is the rule of law which contains the key to a peaceful world.

2. MANKIND'S NO. 1 NEED: A WORKABLE PLAN FOR PEACE

It is obvious that to secure for mankind the marvelous benefits provided and promised by present-day civilization, and avoid the evils and dangers which hover over the earth from pole to pole, the greatest need of

the world today is a workable plan to achieve and maintain peace. We must realize the inescapable fact that peace does not prevail in the world today. The existing situation has been described by Sir Winston Churchill as a "truce" maintained by "mutual terror," by President Eisenhower as a status of "balanced terror," and by others as military deterrence based upon "retaliatory terror." But no matter how it is described and by whom, it is not peace.

Peace means something more than the absence of war, something better than the truce in which we now live. The difference between a peace and a truce is that where there is peace there is no fear and no threat.

3. THE MACHINERY NOW USED HAS NOT CREATED PEACE

A look at the policy of the United States today reveals that our Government is maintaining the current truce through (1) military force, (2) diplomatic negotiations, agreements and treaties, (3) trade and aid, (4) the United Nations and alliances with friendly nations, and (5) measures designed to off-set Communist propaganda. But all of this together has not achieved true peace.

Weapons of horror cannot either guarantee the security of our Nation or form a foundation for peace.

The chessboard of diplomacy has not achieved peace.

Artificial barriers to the free flow of trade between nations present seemingly insoluble problems.

Financial aid has not always brought us friends, for friendship, among men or among nations, cannot be bought.

The United Nations has performed magnificently within its limitations, but it is out of date, and cannot even prevent little wars, nor even slow down the ever-accelerating arms race with its threatened consequences.

We are being far outstripped in the propaganda field by adversaries who use the very cry for peace as a propaganda weapon. We have not reshaped the truth into an effective instrument of combat against the "big lie" technique utilized by the Kremlin. And even a winning effort in the propaganda war will not bring peace.

No one can successfully contend that this existing machinery, which has brought only a truce so far, is an effective plan for peace. International tensions, anxieties, fears, and threats are the lead story in nearly every news medium day by day. They are increasing rather than on the wane. And there is no prospect for improvement through the instrumentalities now in use. Man's number one problem remains how to end the buildup of hot and cold weapons in such a way that peace may prevail. The stalemate of the current standpatism of our foreign policy must be broken. And the existing apparatus of our cold-war effort certainly does not provide a formula for such a breakthrough.

To end the ever accelerating arms race before mutual doom replaces the truce of mutual terror, we must go beyond the instrumentalities and institutions used in the past and adopt a new approach—a new plan—for peace. We must look forward, not backward. We must make a new start based upon a new concept. We must think and act boldly and meaningfully to adapt our peace-seeking effort to the realities of today and tomorrow.

I do not say we should abandon our diplomacy, our weapons, our agreements, or our other present mechanisms, but simply that we must go beyond them and do the job they have not done.

We cannot stand still and let the world dissolving time bomb of all out nuclear war explode. Our circumstances are urgent. The time for forward movement toward peace and away from war is now. The opportunity to move in that direction may be

lost forever if we do not grasp it while we can.

4. A UNIVERSALLY COMPREHENSIBLE NEW PLAN: THE RULE OF LAW

To pull the world out of its present drift toward destruction, and to set it on the path of progress toward peace, a dramatic new approach to peace is essential. Such a plan must capture and fire the imagination of men the world around. It must be a plan which all peoples can understand. It must be related, therefore, to their ordinary everyday knowledge and experience. Settlement of international disputes through law in the courts is such a plan.

"Law" and "courts" are universal terms all men comprehend. All peoples know the law and courts have proved their worth as a keeper of the peace within nations. They will readily grasp the concept, content, and the value of this plan of going to court instead of to war. They know what law and the courts have done nationally, and if proper leadership is given they can be brought to see what law can do internationally.

5. LAW IS CIVILIZATION'S BEST CONCEPT TO CREATE PEACE

An evaluation of the ideas, ideals, and concepts which mankind has developed since the dawn of history leads to the inescapable conclusion that the rule of law offers the best attainable route to peace. In a world sundereed by differences of language, color, creed, and belief, and by background in diverse forms of government, the rule of law is the one concept universally understood as an ideal nearly all men have in common on a worldwide basis. It therefore offers a common ground which mankind possesses upon which to erect an edifice for peace.

In the beginning of social order disputes between man and man were settled under the rule of the jungle by brute strength. Later sticks and stones were used, then spears and arrows, then guns and powder. Today in all civilized nations, disputes between man and man are settled in the courts under the rule of law. But the law of the jungle still prevails as the ultimate mechanism to settle disputes between nations.

Of all human concepts, law has the best historical claim as an instrument to satisfy the need for peace and order. Man knows that peace reigns where law prevails. People everywhere experience law's use almost daily in courts in their local communities. Out on the vast new frontier of the international community disputes previously settled by the bloodbath of war must come to be settled by similar tribunals of justice.

Man has not realized what law can do for him internationally, and that is the reason why law has not been used in this field as it can and must be. The basic ungrasped fact of our time is that the lack of the rule of law in the world community is today the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. A community, whether local, national or international, can remain peaceful only so long as it is subject to the rule of law. Down through the ages, people have lived in terror and fear wherever the rule of law has not prevailed within nations. And this is true today in nations under Communist domination. We of our generation must find a way to implement the best answer to our number-one problem of peace—the application of the rule of law to relations between nations. We must apply this formula for living together before we dissolve together in nuclear flame.

6. THE RULE OF LAW DEFINED

The rule of law is not a new concept. There is no mystery about its principles. Throughout the recorded history of mankind the rule of law has meant the application of

reason and fairness.¹ All peoples understand it to carry such a connotation. They know it means a decision according to what is morally right to insure liberty, equality, and justice in relationships between man and man and between man and government. It will have the same meaning when applied between nation and nation.

Contrary to the thinking of many, the principles of our Constitution, including our renowned Bill of Rights, do not represent original ideas created by the draftsmen thereof. The Constitution is in fact a restatement of the principles of the rule of law as borrowed from the great lawgivers of the ages. The world and our Nation have changed beyond the imagination of the writers of our Constitution, yet their restatement in that great document of the fundamental principles of the rule of law still stands relatively unchanged. This firm foundation in the wisdom of the centuries is the reason our Constitution of basic legal principles has been able to meet the ever-changing needs of our rapidly growing and expanding Nation.

A study of Hammurabi's Babylon Code of 2100 B.C., the law of Moses in 1450 B.C., Justinian's Roman Codes of 600 A.D., and the Magna Carta in 1215 A.D. reveals that there is no basic difference in the legal principles espoused by the great lawgivers of the ages. A survey of the writings of Solon (600 B.C.), Confucius (500 B.C.), Skotaku Taishi (600 A.D.), Bracton (1250 A.D.), Bartolus (1350 A.D.), Colbert (1165 A.D.), and other celebrated legal scholars down through the centuries, reveals that in all the great legal systems (i.e., Chinese, Hindu, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Germanic, Japanese, Islamic, Slavic, civil and common law) there is no fundamental difference in concept of the underlying legal principles. The rule of law has no boundaries, and is of its very nature international in character.²

There is no need to await the writing of an elaborate new code of international law³ before utilization of the rule of law in the settlement of disputes between nations. To wait until a written code is perfected and accepted could delay interminably the progress toward world peace through law. The fact is that utilization of the principles of the rule of law could begin today.⁴

The rule of law of which I speak is applied daily by all lawyers in assessing the legal problems they evaluate. It is not law known only to international lawyers under the mysterious title of "International Law." The fight for application of the rule of law internationally—or, to state it more bluntly, the fight for mankind's survival through law—is therefore the duty and responsibility of every lawyer. None can shirk this task on a plea of ignorance or lack of experience. All lawyers know the rule of law of which I speak. All lawyers, therefore, share the responsibility that flows from that knowledge.

7. LAW PLUS A WORLD COURT SYSTEM

History reveals that success in the use of the instrumentality of law has always required the institution of a court system.

For Moses to have received the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai and then to have done nothing about them would have rendered them worthless. Moses realized his responsibility and set about preaching and teaching the value of living under the law. He also created an excellent system of courts. He knew that the law could not function to end friction without a court system. The message and work of Moses should be an inspiration to us lawyers of today. But unless we set up the courts to use the rule of law internationally the lesson taught by Moses will have been wasted.

History also teaches that creation of a court system must precede disarmament

within nations. One excellent illustration of this lesson is what happened in England where only after the King's courts were created, and had proved their worth, did the lords and the barons dissolve their armies and let the courts decide their disputes. Another illustration is what took place in the western part of our own country where, after the courts began to function, disarmament for both the good and bad men gradually came about.

The law is in many ways like a giant river. A river can run on for generations with slight use for navigation, and it is only when the river is harnessed for hydroelectric power development that tremendous service and its greater potential for the benefit of mankind is realized. So it is with law. Law has been around since time immemorial. It has a tremendous potential value, but in any given area, until the institution of the courts is created so that law can be used there, the law is never harnessed to realize its full potential in benefits to mankind.

8. EXISTING COURT INADEQUATE

We therefore have the instrumentality of the rule of law readily available; but the sine qua non of this plan for peace is a worldwide court system to make law accessible and usable. Within nations we have thousands of courts, local, state, regional and national. But for the entire world community we have only one court. It is the International Court of Justice. The Court has 15 judges. It has decided 10 cases in the 12 years of its existence. The major nations of the world seemingly ignore its availability and utility.

Our own country—despite the American Bar Association's express opposition to this policy⁵—reserves to itself the right to decide whether complaints filed in the International Court of Justice are within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. Such a stultifying provision says to the world that we decline to trust the Court to rule correctly on such an issue. This lack of respect by us, and by other nations with similar reservations, has largely destroyed the prestige and usefulness of the Court. The inaccessibility of the Court also contributes to the failure of nations to use it. It is the present practice of the Court to hold all of its hearings at The Hague.

The United States should assume leadership in creating respect and prestige for the Court by removing our reservation on jurisdiction. The Court can itself make its processes more useful and accessible by sitting constantly at the seat of the United Nations in New York. The Court should also announce its willingness to sit all over the world in chambers of three judges. Its charter now authorizes such action by the Court, but it has done nothing to make this provision meaningful. These are things which the United States can do, and which the Court can do, to move the Court forward toward its potential use as a mechanism for peace. But more is needed to make law and the courts serve as they can and must in this vital field.

Applying the lessons of history, we need to go beyond the present structure of the International Court of Justice and create an entirely new and additional worldwide system of courts to make law as an instrumentality for peace accessible to the people throughout the world. A system of circuit courts under the International Court of Justice is needed. Perhaps we should go beyond that and have one judge sitting constantly in a branch of the world court system in each sovereign nation. There could be intermediate courts of appeals on a regional basis with a final appeal to the International Court of Justice. Such a world legal system would parallel in the international community the setup of the Federal court system in the United States.

Without the institution of the courts the

rule of law cannot be made effective internationally. An international judicial system would throw a blanket of law over the world. Any nation refusing to participate would be automatically branded as "outlaw" by world public opinion.

The cost of a world judicial system is estimated at about \$10 million per year. The cost of military expenditures for our Nation alone is \$40 billion, and worldwide it is more than \$100 billion yearly. Elimination of all military costs is not a reasonable expectation, but the small cost of a world judiciary and its great potential stand in stark contrast to the ever-mounting budgets for military needs.

9. JURISDICTION OF NEW WORLD COURT SYSTEM

The jurisdiction of the new world court system should include all disputes between nations whose resolution depends upon facts and the application of the principles of the rule of law. Such cases as our flyers who recently wandered off course behind the Iron Curtain, the truth or falsity of propaganda charges which so often bring the world to the brink of war,⁶ the Suez controversy, the Spanish-Morocco boundary dispute, many of the current Middle East controversies, and hundreds of similar incidents and disagreements which are fast multiplying in our shrunken world with its rising number of international contacts. If the proposed treaty guaranteeing world investment becomes a reality, disputes thereunder could go to the international judiciary for resolution. Disputes arising under the European Economic Community already are resolved by the new international court created for that express purpose. I have not the slightest doubt that a world judicial system will prove its value once it is in operation.

10. ENFORCEMENT OF WORLD COURT JUDGMENTS

Enforcement of World Court decrees and judgments would depend in the first instance, as it does now within nations, upon voluntary compliance. The pressure of public opinion is such that very few nations would want to stand before the world branded as an outlaw for defying a decree of a world court. Full faith and credit could be granted also by national courts to the decrees and judgments of world courts, thus permitting enforcement to be sought in such national forums. If enforcement is refused, or prevented, diplomatic and economic sanctions could be imposed. Finally, some kind of world police force has been suggested for use in extreme cases under proper safeguards. The latter idea would certainly require extreme caution, care and insurance against misuse and abuse but experience with such a force already indicates it can be useful in proper situations.

11. SUPPORT FOR WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Support of the idea of world peace through law comes from many of the leaders of the world. President Eisenhower said in his Law Day, U.S.A. message that "the world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

Secretary of State Dulles said in his Law Day, U.S.A. message:

"In international affairs it is impossible to sustain a just and lasting peace unless that peace is based upon law and order."

Henry R. Luce, who has done more than any other person to further world peace through law, wrote in a full-page editorial in *Life* magazine:

"There is a hunger and thirst for the rule of law throughout the thinking part of the world."

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Japan, Kotaro Tanaka, has said:

"The realization of justice is a thing which interests not only one nation, but all the nations of the world."

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Chief Justice of Pakistan, Muhammad Munir, in dedicating the new Pakistan Legal Center, paid tribute to the rule of law and called upon lawyers to lead toward a lawful world, saying:

"The task is essentially one for lawyers because they are the technicians of democracy and specialists in man's relation to man."

The president of this center, Chaudri Nazir Aham Khan, said:

"For us Muslims the rule of law is like an article of faith. When we talk of the rule of law we are talking of an Islamic concept and an Islamic way of life."

Daulet Ram Prem, editor of the Indian Law Quarterly Review, in an open letter to the American Bar Association, concludes:

"Let us join hands and cooperate in the sacred trust of bringing about equality, justice, right of self-determination, and dignity of man not only in our respective countries but throughout the world."

These are illustrative only. There have been many other recent statements from leading jurists, lawyers, and laymen all over the world strongly supporting world peace through law.

In our own country many leaders of the bar and others have expressed strong support for this great ideal, and have urged the American Bar Association to intensify its work in the field. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has headed a special American Bar Association committee on international law planning which will report to this convention on the current status and future possibilities of peace through law. State and local bar associations have created new committees to work specifically on this idea.

The International Bar Association has made world peace through law its major program. Many newspaper editorials written in connection with Law Day, U.S.A. and our association's effort in the world law field have strongly endorsed the objectives of this idea. And judging from letters to magazine and newspaper editors, as well as from other writings and discussions, the public at large is evidencing a rapidly increasing interest.

A world law conference is being planned for May of next year. Duke University has created a new world rule of law center and one of President Eisenhower's assistants, Arthur Larson, has resigned to head that center. The President retained Mr. Larson as a special Presidential consultant, however, and charged him with the responsibility of reporting on ways the Federal Government can help achieve world peace through law.

Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn have written a most outstanding book entitled "World Peace Through World Law" which presents a plan for reorganization of the United Nations. While theirs is a different, more far-reaching, and more complicated plan than that of utilizing law in a world court system the ideal is the same.

There is, therefore, a rising tide of interest throughout our country and the whole world in peace through law. But we need to get beyond words to action. The ideal of today must become the reality of tomorrow. Pious phrases and slogans will not create peace. For if mere wishing would create peace, we would have had peace years ago.

12. OBJECTIONS TO WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

World peace through law is not put forward as a Utopian scheme for a perfect world community, and the plan here espoused is limited to use of law in a world court system. But there are those who oppose even this modest beginning toward settlement of conflicts between nations in a civilized manner. The objections can be classified as follows: (1) This plan is an idealistic dream, (2) law has been around from time immemorial but has not stopped wars, (3) the international judiciary might

make some wrong decisions, (4) the plan is just too difficult to create and get into operation, (5) such a plan would never work because Russia would not join in it, and (6) the world community needs more than just a judiciary.

To say that peace through law in the courts is an idealistic dream which therefore cannot be realized is to deny the facts of history. America was built on idealism. Idealism burned fiercely in the breasts of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and all of those other great forefathers of ours who founded our Nation as a government under the rule of law. They utilized law and the courts to make our rulers subject to the ruled. Such a plan was pure idealism when adopted, but it has worked. If we ever reach the stage when idealism is a curse rather than a virtue our Nation will have lost the ingredient which has made it the greatest the world has ever known. Woodrow Wilson said: "The world is run by its ideals. Only the fool thinks otherwise."

Certain it is that law has been around for many years, and granted, it has not stopped wars. The outlawing of war through the Kellogg-Briand Pact did not stop wars because that pact had no institution of a world court system to implement it. The mechanism of law plus the institution of the courts has never been tried in the way herein urged. In this respect, law is like religion. It has not failed; it has never really been tried. Within nations law plus the courts has certainly brought peace. On such a record of accomplishment it is reasonable to believe that such a mechanism can do the same if utilized in the world community.

Certain it is also that the world court system would be manned by humans and those humans may sometimes decide contrary to our wishes and even make wrong decisions. Law plus the courts is not a cure-all. It will not end disputes and quarrels between nations. It does not end them now within nations. There will still be conflicts, and there will still be lawbreakers among nations as there are now within nations. But court decisions if contrary to fact and reason are always subject to change, while the millions of gravestones all over the world are mute testimony to the unchangeability of the results of war. A few wrong court decisions do not destroy the value of this plan, any more than a few wrong court decisions destroy the value of the use of law in the courts within nations. Few will deny that it is better to have a few wrong court decisions than millions of deaths in all-out nuclear war.

As to the objection that an effective international judicial system will be too difficult to create and get into operation, 20th century man has not let difficulties prevent him from accomplishing other seemingly impossible goals. A short time ago the splitting of the atom was looked upon as an unrealizable dream but now it is a reality. A short time ago the satellite was a fantastic dream, but now it is a reality. Twentieth century man has developed a technique for concentration of the talents of many people on seemingly insoluble problems so as to achieve a "breakthrough." So it was with the atom and so it was with the satellite. And so it can be with world peace through law. We know the goal and the general outline of the mechanism just as well as we knew the goal and the general outline of the mechanisms to use in connection with splitting the atom and launching the satellite. If we move forward with the same kind of crash program, the same concentration of brainpower and money, that we utilized in reaching those goals, the achievement of this great goal of peace through law is not only possible but extremely probable.

We must face the fact that despite the interest expressed by Russian lawyers on the

recent visit of the American Bar Association delegation to the Soviet Union, Russia will probably not agree to use of the rule of law in a worldwide court system as a mechanism for settlement of international disputes, particularly those in which she is involved. But to let Russia exercise a veto preventing the creation of this world court system would give the Kremlin an unthinkable control over world progress toward peace. The world court system can operate without the Soviet Union. After this court system is established, and as it demonstrates its worth by use outside the Iron Curtain, it will have a tremendous attraction for the neutral and uncommitted nations. These nations want peace so that their social and economic development plans can go forward and will want to join in any system which brings world peace. Russia's propaganda which is now directed so strongly to those nations would have no answer to the liberty, equality and justice which the world court system offers as contrasted with slaughter on the battlefield. If Russia refuses to use this mechanism, and the free world does use it, Russia's adherence to lawlessness would be crystal clear to the whole world. Here only actions would count. With the increasing education of the Russian people, and the strong desire for peace which persists in the hearts of men even behind the Iron Curtain, perhaps this plan might even reduce the depth of the Iron Curtain itself. Adherence to this plan by nations seeking freedom from the Russian Colonial Empire is certainly a very real possibility. The lawyers of Yugoslavia with whom our American bar delegation conferred in Belgrade recently indicated tremendous interest in this idea.

I quickly concede that the world community has been reluctant to make much use of law in the past, and that it needs more than just a new world court system. All I contend for here is that use of law in the courts will aid in preventing wars so that the other needs of the world community can be met through other mechanisms. It is my sincere belief that law in the courts could settle many disputes between nations and thereby create a favorable—a peaceful—climate within which better progress can be made toward solution of the other great problems of mankind. And any war that is prevented leaves more living people to work on such problems and more material strength to devote to constructive rather than destructive purposes.

13. OTHER PLANS FOR PEACE

Disarmament agreements have been given much prominence as a plan for peace. But since the failure of the London disarmament discussions last year that idea has lost much force. Disarmament conferences have been held down through the centuries but no agreement resulting from such a conference has ever contained a successful formula to maintain peace. The best evidence of this is the fact that every disarmament agreement has been followed sooner or later by an arms race—then war. A study of these agreements reveals that the reason they have failed is an inherent inability to devise a method for so weighing armed might that all participants would always feel that they were treated equally. The rule of law avoids this inherent defect, as all nations would be on a basis of equality before the law.

World government has not made progress because a world legislative assembly with weighted representation has not gained widespread acceptance. The idea of redoing the United Nations into an effective world government has now been put into a concrete proposed plan by Clark and Sohn. But a study of their plan reveals that there is too much to do, and too many stumbling blocks, to hope for rapid progress toward such a

mechanism. Applying the judicial concept on a working basis seems to be a much more realistic approach to peace in the world of today.

Religion as a moral basis for peace has strong appeal to those of us who believe in God and the natural law. But there are differences in dogma and belief which have stood as roadblocks to the use of religion as a universal foundation for peace. Separation of church and state is basic in our way of life even though our system of government is in its ultimate essence based upon strongly felt religious and moral principles. But religion is, as was said so well by Dr. Harold A. Bosley in his recent baccalaureate sermon "Pardon My Idealism" at the Duke University commencement, something beyond and above government under law. He said that religious faith "stands far beyond the forms of democracy as we now know and enjoy it and says 'come on up higher.'" Acceptance of law as a plan for peace can be a first hopeful step toward a climate for better acceptance of the great principles of religion in places where they are not now favored. After we arrive at such a step we can concentrate on "coming on up higher."

14. HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE THROUGH LAW AND THE COURTS

We already have the principles of the rule of law, and the beginnings of a world judiciary in the International Court of Justice. Our problem is how to put this mechanism to work to achieve and maintain peace. We should begin by putting the International Court of Justice to work now while awaiting the creation of the additional world system of courts which is essential to the achievement of world peace through law.

We live in a world of ideas. Strength today resides in man's mind. When people throughout the world understand what law and courts can do to prevent the unimaginable horrors of world war III, public opinion will crystallize behind the rule of law in such a powerful way as to insure its use. When the value of going to court instead of to war is fully understood, the people of the world will demand, and get, the worldwide judicial system that effective application of the rule of law requires.

The immediate need here is for leadership—for leaders who can see beyond the turmoil of today and take the initiative to lead toward a peaceful tomorrow. Lawyers are by training and tradition leaders in the discussion of the great public issues of the day. Already our profession through Law Day, U.S.A., has laid the beginning of the foundation in public opinion for progress toward peace through law. We have identified law and lawyers with man's yearning for peace. But this is not a job for the short-winded. It is not a task which can be completed in a day, or in a month, or in a year, or even in a decade. There is an old Chinese proverb that "the longest journey begins with the first step." The sooner we take this first step and many more steps the sooner the world will move toward peace and away from its present drift toward war.

Public opinion largely controls governmental action today. Without a demand from the people new programs are rarely adopted. It is the lawyer's job to create the ground swell of public support that is needed to advance the concept of law in the courts as an answer to war. The legal profession must continue to educate our people on the value of law by another Law Day, U.S.A. We must help other nations of the free world conduct their own "law days" so as to create a favorable climate for law on a worldwide basis. We must then join hands with lawyers all over the world and stage World Law Day. Finally we must plan and execute a World Law Year to focus the attention of the people of the whole world upon what law can do for mankind. Just

reflect upon what the International Geophysical Year has done for science. And remember that law, unlike science, can be used only for peace. Expansion in the use of law can mean only peace. But our people do not yet realize that great truth.

We need to convince the leaders of governments that they should assume leadership in the cause of peace through law. Governmental acceptance of this concept and governmental action toward its effectuation is obviously essential to its success. And it is governmental creation and use of a world judiciary which is our major objective.

Our Nation which prides itself upon its government under law should announce to the whole world that the rule of law is our No. 1 plan for peace. It is logical that the United States be the nation which proposes this plan and which takes the lead in an active program to make it work.

We must remind our leaders in Government of what James P. Warburg said: "The United States cannot, alone, save civilization, but by default of affirmative leadership, it can come perilously close to insuring civilization's end."

We American lawyers have a tremendous duty and responsibility. We of all groups appreciate that law used in a world judiciary is the key to world peace. We can and must explain this idea to all peoples. We must explain our mission of peace through law in such a way that it will ring a bell whose clarion call will reverberate around the entire world. President Eisenhower is correct in his thesis that if we do not adopt the rule of law, civilization cannot survive. Our job as lawyers is to make that point clear to all peoples.

The lawyer's responsibilities from the world of today therefore present the greatest challenge ever faced by any professional group. I am proud of our profession and proud of its tremendous accomplishments of the past. I feel certain that it will rise to this challenge and live up to this new responsibility. We lawyers will give to this task all the hard and arduous years of effort that are required to make peace under law a reality. We will succeed because we must. Failure is unthinkable when the result of our failure could be a world reduced to ashes.

The most important public service open to our legal profession today is this opportunity to mobilize the prestige and the power, the sanity and the skill, the judgment and the judicial temperament of the lawyers of the world in behalf of this goal of peace under law. Never in all history has the climate been more favorable for success if we but move swiftly, surely, and carefully to meet the need that exists. We must build upon the experience of the past and the possibilities of the present to insure a peaceful future for the world.

An idea can be more powerful than the atom. And nothing can deny an idea whose time has come. We lawyers must make certain that the time of this idea of peace through law arrives before atomic annihilation overtakes mankind.

I am confident that we will.

¹ Aristotle defined the rule of law as "intelligence without passion." Bodenheimer, "Jurisprudence" (1940), p. 44.

² Briefly in "The Law of Nations" (1955), writes: "It was out of the conception of a law of nature that the early writers on international law developed their systems . . . under a terminology which has ceased to be familiar to us the phrase stands for something which no progressive system of law ever does or ever can discard" (p. 16).

"Over against the theory of sovereignty, standing for the new nationalistic separation of the states of Europe, was set the theory of a law of nature denying their irre-

sponsibility and the finality of their independence of one another . . . the belief that, in spite of all appearances the whole universe, and included in it the relations of sovereigns to one another, must be ruled by law, remained" (pp. 18-19).

* The International Law Commission is compiling and codifying the rules of law in many fields of international intercourse. Where applicable such codifications should be considered along with the principles of the rule of law in deciding any case before any international court. As Dean Pound has said so well: "The vital, the enduring part of the law is in principles—starting points of reasoning—not in rules. Principles remain relatively constant or develop along constant lines. Rules have relatively short lives. They do not develop. They are repealed and are superseded by other rules."

* Briefly, supra, note 2, says at page 68: " . . . International law, as well as domestic law, may not contain, and generally does not contain, express rules decisive of particular cases; but the function of jurisprudence is to resolve the conflict of opposing rights and interests by applying, in default of any specific provision of law, the corollaries of general principles, and so to find . . . the solution of the problem. This is the method of jurisprudence; it is the method by which the law has been gradually evolved in every country resulting in the definition and settlement of legal relations as well between States as between private individuals."

* 71 Abar 91, 316.

* Factfinding would be an important part of the functions of the New World court system. John Watson Foster, grandfather of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in an address entitled "The Foreign Wars of the United States," delivered before the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes on December 15, 1910, reviewed the facts leading up to all the wars of the United States up to that date, that is the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish War. He concluded that some began under mistakes as to existing facts and that each could have been settled under the rule of law in tribunals of justice without resort to war. His final observation was, "I do not say that we shall have no more foreign wars, but I do say that our experience teaches that if we exercise justice, forbearance, and patience, and seek peace through methods proposed by this society (i.e., the law and a judiciary) an honorable way may be found of adjusting all our international differences."

The Enemy Grows Bolder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

OF

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, about a year and a half ago a nationwide drive was started by the Communists and apologists in this country to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to curtail the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, discredit its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and repeal the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954.

This Operation Abolition was sparked by decisions of the Supreme Court which handcuffed investigating committees and

nullified much legislation aimed at meeting the Communist threat from within.

Members of Congress and the news media have been bombarded with anti-committee and anti-FBI propaganda, instigated by the Communist apparatus and joined in by some well-meaning and not so well-meaning people.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, in a lead editorial entitled "The Enemy Grows Bolder," effectively analyzes this Operation Abolition. In its January 1 issue the American Legion publication Firing Line makes an equally good analysis. I feel that my colleagues in the House should have the benefit of excerpts from this editorial and the Legion publication:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Jan. 7, 1959]

THE ENEMY GROWS BOLDER

Although numerically small, the American Communist Party is becoming bolder and more powerful. This is no paradox. Communist influence grows because non-Communists, consciously and unwittingly, are doing the party's work.

Perhaps the greatest assistance comes from the Supreme Court, which in the past 2 years has handed down no fewer than 20 rulings favorable to the Communist conspiracy. Today America's legal defense against communism are a shambles, chiefly because the High Court has willfully destroyed them.

Equally helpful to the Communists are the civil libertarians who seek to repeal every antismuggling law, to hamstring the FBI, and to abolish the House and Senate investigating committees that have told the American people what little they know of the traitors in their midst.

As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said in his annual report: "Sensing a more favorable atmosphere, the Communist Party, USA, and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms." Mr. Hoover knows whereof he speaks.

The program of the Communist Party, published recently in its official organ, Political Affairs, calls for the repeal of all anti-subversion laws and the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. As an illustration of the party's mounting influence, consider the platform of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC):

"The House Un-American Activities Committee has denounced the ECLC for our avowed campaign to end it. . . . They are correct. The purpose of ECLC in 1959 is to work unceasingly for its abolition.

"We will work for congressional investigation of the FBI's unlawful and unconstitutional conduct, and we will support individuals who resist such conduct.

"We will seek the introduction and passage by Congress of bills to repeal the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, the Communist Control Act, the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and various industrial screening provisions."

Recognizing the chief source of their blessings, the ECLC adds:

"We will oppose . . . legislation undermining the Supreme Court decisions on civil liberties and civil rights."

On December 15, at the Hotel New Yorker, the ECLC raised \$33,000 within a half an hour to accomplish its goals for 1959. Pledges rained down from such notorious fellow travelers as Corliss Lamont and from such eager liberals as Judge Hubert T. Delany, identified by the New York press as "a mem-

ber of President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Commission for the State of New York." The judge gave \$1,000.

Confident that the Supreme Court has been won, the ECLC is turning to Congress, where the climate has warmed encouragingly as a result of November's elections. Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, has promised the ECLC that he will work to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. So has Representative ROBERT N. C. NIX, of Philadelphia. Other stalwarts praised by the ECLC include Representatives ROY WIER, of Minnesota, CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, QUENTIN BURDICK, of North Dakota, and W. H. MEYER, of Vermont. . . .

Few patriotic Americans know their Communist enemy or the many guises he assumes. Only a small minority are familiar with the fully documented reports circulated by the House and Senate committees that are now under attack. And very few informed Americans, who call themselves anti-Communists, are as ready with their checkbooks as Corliss Lamont, Rockwell Kent, or Judge Delany, who do not seek tax exemption to reinforce their convictions.

Thus, the ignorance and apathy of most Americans lend immeasurable strength to the Communists, who already are bulwarked by a gullible High Court and by influential civil libertarians. Actually, in the crucial contest that looms in the 86th Congress, the pro-Communist minority is far stronger than the anti-Communist majority, for the former are fully mobilized and the latter are not. Without a swift, unyielding counterattack by those who understand America's peril, the success of the Communist blitzkrieg of 1959 is virtually assured.

[From the American Legion Firing Line, Jan. 1, 1959]

REPORT ON THE CAMPAIGNS TO DESTROY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

With the convening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress on January 7, 1959, certain subversive and leftwing organizations in the United States are expected to launch vicious attacks against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) for the avowed purpose of terminating the committee's existence. Activities of several of these groups which have been mentioned in previous issues of the Firing Line, while strikingly similar in purpose, do not all reflect origin from a common source.

One of the major organizations initiating an abolition campaign is the leftwing American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and its southern California affiliate. Foundation for the latest ACLU attack against the HUAC was actually laid on February 19, 1958, when the ACLU's national organization petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States "to rule conclusively that the House Un-American Activities Committee has no right to inquire into a person's political beliefs and associations." The ACLU statement was in support of Lloyd Barenblatt, a former Vassar College psychology instructor, who appealed a contempt of Congress conviction. Barenblatt was cited for contempt following his appearance before the HUAC on June 28, 1954, based upon his refusal to answer numerous questions regarding alleged membership and activities in the Communist Party. (See ACLU, Civil Liberties, March 1958, p. 1.)

Following his conviction, Barenblatt appealed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. When the court of appeals upheld Barenblatt's conviction in January 1957, he promptly took his case to the Supreme Court. On the basis of the Court's decision in the John T. Watkins case, the Supreme Court remanded the Barenblatt case to the court of appeals for reconsideration on June 24, 1957. For a second time, the court of appeals on January 16, 1958, upheld Barenblatt's conviction. Shortly

after the ruling the ACLU joined in a second appeal to the Supreme Court, on which there has been no decision to date. (See HUAC, annual report, 1957, p. 10; the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1958, p. 18; and the Washington Daily News, Nov. 18, 1958, p. 14.)

According to the ACLU, "the significance of the union's petition (in the Barenblatt case) lies in its request that the High Court rule that its decision June 17, 1957, in the Watkins case specifically prohibits inquiry by the Un-American Activities Committee into political beliefs and associations. The Watkins decision, in a case also supported by the ACLU, reversed a contempt conviction because the witness was not informed of the nature of the inquiry and the 'pertinency' of the questions concerning Communist associations. However, it also criticized the committee's 'exposure' of persons accused of Communist ties and the vagueness of the term 'un-American.'" In announcing the ACLU had "assumed primary responsibility" for the Barenblatt case in February 1958, ACLU Executive Director Patrick Murphy Malin said, "the union hoped the Supreme Court would 'finally determine the unconstitutionality of the committee's (HUAC) mandate.'" (See ACLU, Civil Liberties, March 1958, p. 1.)

On July 31, 1958, Malin stated the ACLU "believes that the letter and spirit of the first amendment make the mandate of the HUAC unconstitutional or unwise, or both. That has been the union's belief ever since the committee was established in the late 1930's. . . . So this is the time to urge that no committee with such a mandate should be appointed when the new Congress convenes next January (1957)." An ACLU brief filed with the Supreme Court on September 6, 1958, on behalf of Barenblatt directly challenged the authority of the HUAC. The ACLU brief asserted that the HUAC "lacks authority to conduct any investigation or to compel testimony . . . (and that the Committee violates due process and unconstitutionally tries to restrain freedom of belief, expression, and association protected by the first amendment." (See the New York Times, Oct. 27, 1958, p. C-29.)

ENTER ACLU OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Supplementing the national ACLU's spearheading attack against the HUAC is the probing flank movements of its southern California affiliate. The September 1958 issue of the Open Forum, a monthly organ of the southern California ACLU, stated it had filed a \$20,000 damage suit in the Ninth United States District Court charging that the HUAC "is an illegal committee of Congress." The suit was on behalf of Donald Wheeldin and Adm. George Dawson, who had been subpoenaed by the HUAC to appear before committee hearings scheduled to commence on September 2, 1958. The complaint asked the court to "quash the subpoenas issued to Wheeldin and Dawson pending a hearing on the legality" of the HUAC.

According to the Open Forum, Wheeldin and Dawson claim they would be publicly accused of disloyalty, adjudged guilty without a hearing, and rendered unemployable if forced to appear before the committee. Wheeldin left the Communist Party because of fundamental differences with it, but would not be a cooperative witness before the committee. Dawson also would not be a cooperative witness. It is noteworthy that the September 1, 1958, edition of the National Guardian reflected Wheeldin was a former employee of the People's World, "the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast." (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, p. 100.)

The Southern California ACLU, at its legislative action conference held at Baces Hall, 1528 North Vermont, Los Angeles, on November 15, 1958, launched a month-long petition

campaign urging 17 California Congressmen to offer at the opening of the 86th Congress a resolution to eliminate the Committee on Un-American Activities from the list of Standing Committees of the House of Representatives. On the basis of the Southern California ACLU's total membership of 4,000, every member was asked to secure 25 signatures to meet the petition campaign goal of 100,000. Alan Barth, who has been an ACLU national committeeman since 1952, was the keynoter at the aforementioned conference. Currently on leave as a chief editorial writer for the Washington Post and Times Herald, Barth was identified in the March 15, 1954 Firing Line as a severe critic of the FBI. In addition to mailing out petitions to its own members, the National Guardian of November 24, 1953, p. 1, reported the Southern California ACLU has asked other organizations and individuals to do the same. The Los Angeles edition of the People's World, dated November 15, 1953, page 3, stated one organization to announce immediate support and assistance was the Los Angeles Committee to Preserve American Freedoms (accurately known as the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms), whose central aim has been the outlawing of the Un-American Committee and similar State inquisitorial committees. Mrs. Dorothy Marshall is the citizens committee's chairman and Frank Wilkinson is the group's executive secretary. (See the Open Forum, November 1953, p. 1.)

Both Mrs. Marshall and Wilkinson described the southern California ACLU "petition campaign as 'the most important development in the country' in the move to end the 20-year reign of the un-Americans (HUAC)." Accompanied by a letter, Mrs. Marshall reportedly mailed ACLU petitions to "5,000 homes" in that State. In its report entitled, "Operation Abolition," dated November 8, 1957, the HUAC stated the "major adjunct of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) in the California area is an organization designating itself as the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms." Full disclosures concerning the activities of the ECLC, an identified Communist front, have appeared in recent issues of the Firing Line. (See HUAC, "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1957, p. 38.)

On August 13, 1958, the House of Representatives cited Wilkinson for contempt of Congress and forwarded his case to the Department of Justice for possible prosecution. This action stemmed from Wilkinson's uncooperative appearance before an HUAC hearing in Atlanta, Ga., on July 30, 1958. Wilkinson has been identified as a member of the Communist Party. HUAC Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER stated on August 8, 1958, the HUAC "had information that Wilkinson is 'the guiding light' of the ECLC, and had been designated by the Communist Party to manipulate that committee and some of its affiliated organizations." According to an ECLC mimeographed letterhead, dated August 12, 1958, Wilkinson amicably left the employ of the ECLC prior to August 1, 1958, however, remains a member of the ECLC's National Council. (See the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 14, 1958, p. A-21.)

During September 1958, the southern California ACLU inserted political advertisements in five Los Angeles newspapers attacking the HUAC for conducting hearings in that city. The ACLU statement was signed by 98 individuals who urged that letters of protest be sent to Members of Congress. In addition to the ACLU sponsored petitions and letterwriting campaigns, the Communist Party and its 600 fronts are obviously very actively engaged in similar projects to attempt to abolish the HUAC during the 86th Congress. It is reliably reported the Communist Party, "making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their 'united

front tactic,' can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours." As a Legionnaire or as another patriotic American who has wholeheartedly endorsed the effective anti-subversive efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, What are you going to do to counteract these intensified abolition campaigns?

Failure of Britain's Experiment in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we hear ever increasing demands for Federal participation in management and greater Government investment in ownership of enterprises that have been privately operated.

Before we advance any further along this line we should pause and study Britain's experiment in socialism, which is now an admitted failure.

I am firmly convinced that our country grew and became great as the result of our private enterprise system.

If wise investment and sound economic practices are to continually be threatened by intervention and competition from the Federal Government we are in for some gloomy days ahead.

Let us take a lesson from Great Britain's disastrous experiment, the results of which are related in the U.S. News & World Report for January 9, 1959:

BRITAIN'S VERDICT ON SOCIALISM: IT'S A FAILURE

LONDON.—Britain's 13-year-old experiment in socialism, it now appears, is being written off as a failure. Private enterprise emerges stronger than ever.

Searching inquiries just completed by a parliamentary committee, by industrial and management organizations and by individual experts reveal that the British public has soured on Government operation of basic industries. Even the Labor Party, which brought socialism to Britain, is reversing its stand.

Facts emerging are these:

Efficiency in nationalized industries is shown to be considerably lower, over all, than in comparable private industries.

Costs are higher because managers of nationalized industries are not under pressure, as are private owners, to show a profit or even to make ends meet. Deficits are covered by huge Government subsidies.

Prices in most nationalized industries are kept artificially low by political pressure, bear no relationship to costs. The consumer gets stuck for higher taxes and inflationary financing that is required for subsidies.

Labor relations in nationalized industries turn out to be no better—and sometimes considerably worse—than in private industries, contrary to Labor Party expectations. The record of strikes and noncooperation between workers and management in the nationalized coal mines and transport industries is among the blackest in Britain.

Coal, a case report: Between 1946 and 1951, the Labor Party's program to make Britain a Socialist state took over as public enterprise coal, electricity, gas, rail and highway

transport, steel, cable communications, the Bank of England, and civil aviation.

A case study of coal shows this:

One billion dollars has been poured into the mines since 1946 to modernize and maintain them.

Despite this investment program and the recruitment of 11,000 additional miners, British mines in 1957 produced slightly less coal than in 1951. Rationing of coal, held over from wartime, was in effect until a few months ago.

Red ink and strikes: A parliamentary committee that investigated the coal industry in 1958 termed the investment program for the mines a failure. It warned that a second program, now underway, also is in jeopardy.

Year after year, with a few rare exceptions, the nationalized coal industry has gone into the red in its current accounts. During a 10-year period of scarcity and a sellers' market, the mines accumulated a \$75 million loss. This had to be covered by government subsidies in addition to the \$1 billion provided for capital investment.

The attitude of the miners is blamed in part for the coal industry's troubles. Strikes and absenteeism are chronic problems. In 1947, production of more than 1.6 million tons of coal was lost because of labor disputes. The loss from such disputes in 1957 was slightly greater.

In steel, a contrast: Steel, an expanding industry, was nationalized for a brief period and then returned to private ownership. It provides a striking contrast to the declining coal industry.

Steel production has increased from 12.7 million tons in 1946 to 21.7 million in 1957. The target for 1962 is 29 million.

The steel industry has not only earned a profit, but has financed a substantial part of its \$1.5 billion program of expansion from its own resources, while still managing to cut prices and pay its workers wages that are among the highest in British industry.

The record of labor relations in the steel industry is equally impressive. There have been no major strikes, and losses due to labor disputes are less than in almost any other industry.

A promise unkept: The promise by the Labor Party that nationalized industries would, in time, stand on their own feet without Government subsidies is proving to be as unrealistic as the party's promise of labor cooperation.

Here is the record so far:

The cumulative deficit of the nationalized coal industry in the 11-year period of 1947 through 1957 exceeded \$80 million.

For the British Transport Commission, which operates railroads and all other public-transport facilities except long-distance trucking, the deficit was nearly \$425 million.

British Overseas Airways Corporation lost \$75 million, while British European Airways lost nearly \$40 million, if direct Government grants are omitted. BEA is now in the black but BOAC continues in the red.

Cable & Wireless, another Government-operated facility, has barely broken even.

Only the nationalized gas and electricity industries show a profit over the years—\$280 million for electricity and \$44 million for gas.

Government to the rescue: This record, dominated by deficits, is only part of the picture. All of these industries have relied heavily on the Government for assistance in their capital-investment programs. The gas and electricity industries, between 1949 and 1956, obtained Government help in the amount of \$625 million. Since 1956, these and other nationalized industries have received Government loans running into hundreds of millions.

Private industries, meanwhile, have managed to meet more than two-thirds of their capital-investment requirements from sav-

ings, and have raised the balance from private investors.

These contrasts have caused many Britons to ask: What's really wrong with nationalized industries as they've operated in Britain for the last dozen years? Why can't they pay their own way? One answer that shows up in both private and public inquiries is this:

The men who run Britain's nationalized industries are influenced more by political pressures than by commercial realities. The Government in power, whether Labor or Conservative, finds it expedient to keep consumers and workers happy.

To keep consumers happy, the Government resists price increases when they are indicated. To keep workers satisfied, the Government is loath to take a strong stand against union demands for wage increases and other concessions. Opposition might bring the risk of major strikes.

The result is that managers of nationalized industries have been forced to hold down prices while allowing wages to rise. That invariably has meant a loss at the end of the year.

Extra employees: There are other things, too, that cut profits.

The Government-operated BOAC, for example, reports a substantial deficit every year. Its management blames high costs. Yet a recent investigation revealed that BOAC employs 3,000 more workers on its engineering staff than the investigators felt are needed.

As part of a multi-billion-dollar program of modernization, the nationalized railroads are replacing steam locomotives with diesels, which can be operated by one man. Yet, under union pressure, the railroads are keeping two men in the cabs, nullifying much of the anticipated saving.

In the transport industry, there is this example: A number of bus lines in the London area have been steady money losers. The management wants to drop them and cut costs. The unions have resisted, and, until recently, political considerations prevented management from forcing a showdown.

Victory for capitalism: The experts who have been conducting inquiries into this 13-year experiment in socialism have reached the conclusion that most Britons—after watching socialism and private enterprise working side by side—have made private enterprise their choice.

Nationalized industries, they agree, are often wasteful and inefficient, and are kept solvent only by continuing transfusions of Government funds. Private industries, generally speaking, provide better service at lower cost without dependence on tax revenue for financial help.

One result is that political lines are being redrawn.

In effect, more and better capitalism is the new campaign slogan of Britain's Labor Party. Old-fashioned socialism is quietly being ditched.

Battle Against U.S. Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will shortly be considering the President's budget for fiscal 1960, it seems wise to review information bearing on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following

column by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1959.

BATTLE AGAINST U.S. BANKRUPTCY—NATION'S SOLVENCY SEEN ENDANGERED BY ADVOCATES OF HEAVY SPENDING

The battle of the century has begun. How it turns out will affect the future of the American dollar for decades to come. On the way the die is cast in the next few months depends the purchasing power of the pay envelopes of millions of Americans. Will the dollar remain stable or will it decline still further? For today the dollar is worth 48 cents in terms of what it was worth just 20 years ago—and if the forces of confiscation have their way, it could go down to 25 cents in another decade. The whole world is watching to see what America does. It affects trade everywhere.

The battle against a stable dollar is being waged here right now under respectable auspices by men in Congress who scorn the label "radical" but who would commit the United States to expenditures far beyond the President's budget. Already the American people are being told by the political partisans that a balanced budget means insecurity or indifference to the military safety of the country. To play upon such fears, the devotees of the doctrine of spending evidently believe, is to get sanction for big appropriations—more billions for missiles or expeditions to the moon.

The insidious argument made is that the President gives too much weight to the balanced-budget idea and that he is neglecting national defense. Will this campaign undermine the President's influence and open the floodgates in Congress so that billions more than he recommends will be appropriated even in the face of a \$12 billion deficit this year?

Mr. Eisenhower has been absorbed for months formulating the new budget. He has held lengthy conferences with our military leaders and with our economic experts. Honest, patriotic, experienced military men, without any political bias, helped to make the new budget. It was no casual decision by one man that led the President to announce that he believed the budget for the next fiscal year could be balanced.

What is the biggest single fact about our military position? The intercontinental missile is not yet perfected, but the intermediate missile can be fired from bases in Europe close to Soviet Russia.

The truth is, moreover, the Soviet leaders know their country can be devastated in a matter of hours. Both sides know a mutual deterrent has come into being. There's a stalemate on the military side.

The urgent question now, therefore, is not the spending of unlimited amounts on military defense, but giving more attention than ever before to economic defense. As for those who say that military spending should be expanded, no matter what it costs, there is a simple test of sincerity. Would they support heavier taxes and—more important even than higher taxes—would they vote for Government wage and price controls? Why. If the cold war is so hot, shouldn't American labor unions and business corporations be held in check so that the price of the same bomber that the Government buys today will not be twice as much 2 years hence? For that's what has happened in the last 5 years to push a large part of our defense budget upward.

President Eisenhower's well-reasoned state of the Union message was printed in full text only here and there in a few newspapers of the country. He will have to go on the television, again and again, and issue more and more written expositions of his policy to make real headway against his opponents. The critics get more space in the press and on the air than do the defenders.

What is needed now is confidence in the Nation's Chief Executive—the very man who commanded all the Allied armies in Europe just a few years ago, and whose integrity and lifetime devotion to the military security of his country ought not to be questioned. Would Dwight Eisenhower ever fail to recommend any military proposal that was really needed? Would he neglect the defense of America?

Partisan-minded people and those Members of Congress with a vested interest in currying favor in their home States and districts through more and more spending on defense factories and local facilities, which could mean bigger payrolls for their constituents, are demanding more defense and arousing fears about the Nation's security. Only an informed public opinion can win this crucial battle against bankruptcy. For this is what the battle of the century in Washington really means.

Unless the American people can see through the maze of propaganda and alarmist talk, and put into proper perspective the selfish ambitions of some of their legislators, Macaulay's prophecy of more than 100 years ago that the American Ship of State is doomed to destroy itself because it is "all sail and no anchor" could, indeed, come true.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the following bills which I have introduced for the benefit of our veterans:

A bill to provide that veterans age 65 shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502, title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years".

A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502 (a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the period and inserting a semicolon and "or" in lieu thereof, and by adding a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) active pulmonary tuberculosis, but only during periods of hospitalization thereof".

A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, and their dependents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 522(a), title 38, United States Code,

is amended by deleting "\$1,400" and "\$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,800" and "\$3,000", respectively.

Sec. 2. Section 545(a) Title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "\$1,400" and "\$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,800" and "\$3,000", respectively.

Sec. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month after its enactment. Pension shall not be paid for any period prior to the effective date of this Act to any person whose eligibility for pension is established solely by virtue of this Act.

A bill to provide pension for widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as is provided for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 543(a)(1), title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting (a) the comma following the word "title" and (b) the words "and at the time of his death had a service-connected disability for which compensation would have been payable if 10 per centum or more in degree disabling".

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at \$1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, Before National Conference on Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Public Interest Demands Clean Air," which I delivered before the plenary session of the National Conference of Air Pollution, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on November 18, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS CLEAN AIR

(Speech of U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the plenary session of the National Conference on Air Pollution, November 18, 1958, Washington, D.C.)

Several recent days of intense personal discomfort in a choking atmosphere which sometimes envelops Los Angeles make me intensely aware of the deep importance of this conference.

So, as a recently escaped smog refugee, I welcome this opportunity to engage in thinking out loud on the matter of the public interest in air pollution. I appreciate the invitation to present some personal reflections to this assembly because of the inescapable fact that the communities in which I have spent most of my entire life often are painfully plagued by contaminated air in its worst form.

This conference is unmistakably a significant event. Scientific and technical problems of great moment will be discussed and examined in the earnest hope, I am sure, of promoting the public interest and serving the public welfare.

There is no question in my mind that public interest is the overriding consideration which must be the goal of all efforts to overcome the curse of air pollution. Certainly there can be no private interest, especially from a pecuniary viewpoint, in prolonging smog and other atmospheric contamination.

All of you present are aware that this meeting is occasioned by the fact that a little more than 3 years ago the Congress enacted legislation known as Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research Act. By that measure, the Federal Government entered the fight to identify causes of air pollution and an assortment of Federal agencies became allies of public and private, State and local bodies endeavoring to conquer this public enemy.

The enactment of this legislation was no simple accomplishment.

Unfortunately, for a number of years, smog was regarded as a unique Los Angeles phenomenon. Comedians attached to it a made-in-southern-California label.

With the passage of time, and after the laughs became strained, our Nation gradu-

ally and thankfully came to the realization that air pollution is one of the distinguishing, built-in, undesirable features of the growth and advancement which our country has been enjoying.

The progress of all agencies operating under the Air Pollution Research Act is of deep concern to me because I authored that act. The conclusions of this conference will be equally meaningful to me because my interest in removing this curse of our industrialized, motorized civilization is of long duration.

When I first came to Washington as a new Senator appointed by the then-Governor of California, Chief Justice Earl Warren, I eagerly attempted to bring about Federal participation in the fight to eliminate smog. I did this because my experiences as a State official indicated plainly the problem has so many ramifications it must be attacked on a nationwide basis.

Personal exposure to the discomfort and the inconvenience from day-long sieges of greasy, eye-irritating murk encountered in Los Angeles undoubtedly has strengthened the determination of many of you here today—as it did me—to employ all of the resources of our great Nation in eradicating a scourge which menaces the physical health and well-being of millions of Americans, which causes vegetables and fruits to wilt and shrivel, which brings property deterioration, which adversely affects livestock, and which triggers a host of economic consequences.

The public interest in air pollution at that time was not so widely appreciated in Washington as to bring success to the first efforts in which I participated. Happily, however, the public interest had attracted the attention of people in the executive branch of our Government. It was a matter of considerable satisfaction to me, therefore, when President Eisenhower, in response to a suggestion I made in association with my colleague Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, formed what carried the formidable label of "Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Community Air Pollution."

Even though smog still occurs, millions of people should be eternally grateful for that committee, because from its deliberations resulted the legislation which I introduced, with the cosponsorship of several Senate colleagues from divergent areas who agreed something must be done.

Underlying all of my thinking and my conversations was a conviction that actual control over air-pollution sources and causes was and must be a local and a State responsibility. This view was shared by all of those who took part in framing and pushing through the Air Pollution Research Act. Throughout, the principle has been observed that the Federal Government should not and cannot impose or enforce regulations designed to prevent air pollution, regardless of how desirable such activity might at times appear.

Yet, the Federal Government has a natural and a proper role in our national war against smog and other forms of atmospheric pollution. It has unequalled resources and unmatched experience in the field of meteorology, for instance. It has immediate access to basic statistics assembled from every corner of our country on health conditions. It is in an unmatched position to coordinate investigation and research. It can mobilize

from assorted sources skilled scientific and engineering personnel.

Those are among the reasons I wanted the Federal Government to play an active part in the smog fight. Those are the reasons why I am prepared to introduce next year new legislation which will implement, extend, and carry forward Public Law 159 under which present work is carried on.

As a Californian from a semiarid region, I long have been aware of the precious character and the imperative necessity of adequate water supplies. As a human being, I likewise know that clean air is basic to existence, comfort, and happiness. As a southern Californian I also realize that my section of the country, unfortunately, has encountered serious and prolonged difficulty in assuring itself of a sufficient, reliable supply of both clean air and clean water.

Those grave needs are not peculiar to California. Today they are nationwide in scope. With constant and steady increase in our population, with characteristic continuing movement of people, with development of an economy almost wholly dependent upon industrialization and motorization, the public interest demands basic factfinding which will make possible sound measures to conserve and to prevent pollution of air and water alike.

Regretably, despite startling achievements and amazing discoveries, science has not yet found a way to purify air in quantities or with the ease with which we do water. We must reduce and, to the maximum possible, prevent contamination of our atmosphere.

When a room becomes smoke-filled, one generally can open a window or turn on a blower. But no one yet has come up with a means of lifting a veritable ceiling over an entire metropolitan area which would be the only way of ventilating a community filled with smog of the sort which occasionally plagues many American cities. We still do not know how to sweep away what meteorologists call inversion layers of superheated air which serve as a lid over our steaming kettle of closely packed people.

The lack of a window to bring in sweet, fresh air to whole communities is the justification for control measures such as have been adopted in several regions of California. Such regulatory procedures have a palliative effect and have been evolved through costly and painfully trial-and-error approaches. In many instances, they have been remarkably successful. Yet, they have not solved the problem because the problem itself is so complex.

Unfortunately, a permanent solution apparently still is some distance off. Hence, the significance of this conference.

Congress will be guided by the conclusions of this meeting. Our committees will be indebted for your evaluation of the progress made thus far, for your criticisms and your recommendations about the future course to be followed.

We on Capitol Hill are highly conscious that our people want relief from the curse and the menace of air pollution. Daily it is made plain to us that the human stake in this fight is great, because of the tremendous price our Nation may pay for continued contamination of the air all of us breathe, every moment of our lives.

The American people have been disturbed by reports of qualified medical observers that air pollution has harmful effects on persons with respiratory troubles. Is it any wonder

there also is grave concern among our populace which repeatedly undergoes irritations of eyes, nose, and throats?

From many quarters comes evidence that smog causes slums and upsets the balance of communities. Foul, polluted air influences our citizens in building homes and selecting places to dwell.

The public interest in the war on air pollution has reached the point where monetary, selfish aspects cannot be ignored. Take, for instance, the situation in Los Angeles County where constituted authority can order a shutdown of industry and a cessation of motor traffic when smog reaches a specified degree of intensity.

The cost of such countermeasures are incalculable, but they are beyond question tremendous. Businesses and industries, particularly small enterprises, cannot long afford to absorb the expense entailed by drastic action to curb pollution of our air. Yet, until we learn the secrets of what causes smog, we are merely fumbling in our attempts to prevent its occurrence.

Even though periodic shutdowns because of "smog alerts" may be infrequent or brief, a community which gains the reputation of being afflicted by serious air pollution inevitably loses its appeal to tourists and visitors. Unchecked continuance of atmospheric contamination undeniably and eventually will halt the growth and progress of any community as surely as a Chinese wall around its perimeter.

The urgency of identifying every single source of pollution and of laying bare all secrets about the mystic natural forces which cause smog is emphasized by the fact that effects of contamination can be and often are far reaching. Counties surrounding heavily populated cities are not immune since the vagaries of the winds can roll clouds of fumes across man-made boundaries. Contiguous territory from which come food supplies no longer is unconcerned following discovery that some 40-odd separate crops can be injured by polluted air.

Problems of such character cannot be solved at local levels. Nor can public agencies of Government—whether State, Federal, county, or municipal—cope with all the factors. Active cooperation of industries and private organizations is essential.

We are fortunate indeed that some of our leading enterprises, notably the petroleum and the automobile industries recognize the serious implications in the presence of air pollution. Their efforts to help check the menace have been substantial and are most commendable. Yet, they and others with related interests continue to have a public obligation to work unceasingly in the public interest in finding means by which aerial garbage will be eliminated from our environment.

For their own welfare, the petroleum and automobile industries cannot shirk their responsibility. Already public clamor has been heard in some quarters for action on the part of constituted authority which would have heavy consequences to those industries. Though scientists may scoff, none of us should lightly regard a wave of suggestions that certain types of motor fuels be prohibited by ordinance or regulation. We cannot overlook the resolutions now reaching Washington urging Federal promulgation of standards governing the emission of hydrocarbons and other products of combustion.

The program envisioned when Public Law 159 was enacted was to be of 5 years' duration. The authorized total expenditure was to be \$25 million. Our Federal agencies now are in the fourth year of that program, for which the Congress has appropriated almost \$12 million. A host of research and investigation projects has been set in motion.

This law expires at the end of fiscal year 1960. Hence, it will be incumbent upon the Congress in its forthcoming session to decide whether activities should be halted or the law

extended. For my part, I am convinced the act which I sponsored should be continued in effect, and I wonder if possibly it should not be broadened.

I regret that more funds have not been made available. However, there were forceful reasons and circumstances for limiting the appropriations. But our people, especially those who undergo from time to time the irritation and inconvenience of smog occurrences, now and then wonder whether the expenditure has been sufficient. Others question whether it has been worthwhile.

It is difficult for the man in the street to appreciate the proportions and the complexity of the air pollution problem. This conference has a rare opportunity to reassure every citizen that we are expanding our knowledge and that we are pressing forward for his relief with undiminished determination.

This is vital, because the people of America, from the earliest moment of comprehension, believe in free air.

More and more, it is being demonstrated that freeness is relative.

Just as we have seen water supplies in various regions near the point of exhaustion, so must we awaken to the fact that our supply of pure air is in real danger of running out.

Public apprehension about effects of radioactive fallout—notably about what might happen when and if—has been expressed often in dramatic fashion. Yet the insidious influence of air pollution right now is a present and a continuing threat to physical and economic health.

Air is a natural resource and like all natural resources must be husbanded and conserved with all the ingenuity and determination we possess.

Public and private agencies join hands to solve the increasingly acute water problem. Local irrigation districts participate with the Federal Government in building dams and reclamation projects. Our Department of the Interior shortly will embark on an ambitious program of erecting full-scale field-test plants for converting saline water to sweet, potable supplies for municipal, agricultural, and industrial uses.

The problem of air pollution is of comparable importance and warrants similar earnest mutual attention. Perhaps it should receive a higher priority. For, without fresh, uncontaminated air, people will not congregate or remain in thickly settled communities. In that event, the demand for ever-larger water supplies might easily be altered.

The foundation for future growth and development of many American communities may well rest on solution of the smog problem. Suggestions already have been thrown out that air zoning be undertaken. This would attempt to make certain that industrial expansion—vital and welcome as it may be—is so directed as to take advantage of prevailing winds or features of terrain in reducing potential air pollution.

Likewise, the public stake in cleansing our atmosphere may warrant radical innovations in traffic engineering. Admittedly, our Nation as a whole, and most of its major cities, confronts real headaches in constructing and rebuilding streets, highways, freeways, and other arteries to handle the furiously mounting traffic volume. But unless other means can be found to control the way mechanical horses emit foul-smelling breaths, it is conceivable that we one day will ask engineers to channel fume-spouting automobiles, buses, and trucks away from smog-prone centers.

The obvious public interest in relieving air pollution appears to be multifaceted. In promoting that interest, I sincerely trust this conference will be dedicated to the principle of pooling resources in the traditional American fashion so that the public welfare may be benefited to the greatest degree of which we are capable.

Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, Before American Federation of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] last evening, Friday, January 16, 1959, addressed the annual civil service banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, in Portsmouth, Va. His address was delivered on the occasion of the 76th anniversary of the signing of the Pendleton Act, the Civil Service Act.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia formerly was chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and has a splendid record in support of the civil service and merit system.

I commend to the reading of all Senators this splendid address. The Senator from West Virginia has traced the history of the development of the Civil Service Act and has set before us a challenge in terms of improvement of the civil service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from West Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT ANNUAL CIVIL SERVICE BANQUET, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, PORTSMOUTH, VA., FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE PENDLETON (CIVIL SERVICE) ACT

It seems fitting to me, ladies and gentlemen, on this occasion of the 76th anniversary of the Pendleton Act, to present a brief consideration to the context out of which the act emerged—as well as the historical development of the Federal service—and thereby attempt to gain some view of the tendencies and needs of the future.

Now I do not intend merely to catalog the milestones in the advancement of the Federal service, important though such achievement may be.

I am concerned, rather, with the pattern of development and the relation of the career Federal service to the other branches within our structure of government. One might argue with considerable force that the civil service, which has grown from a few thousand people in 1883 to approximately 2½ million in 1959, has assumed the proportions of a fourth branch of the Government, equal in importance—if not in constitutional status—to the traditional branches of the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

It behooves us, therefore, to pause occasionally—amid our concern for the multitude of details of classification, efficiency ratings, retirement plans, health insurance, and others—and give thought to the overall condition of the civil service.

In this respect, it is worth noting—as Professor Van Riper has remarked in his "His-

tory of the U.S. Civil Service"—that the original reform movement which brought forth the Pendleton Act was animated by the desire to maintain individual liberty of opportunity in the Federal service.

Such men as Carl Shurz, John Jay, and Richard Henry Dana, among others, were strongly moved by John Stuart Mills' doctrine of liberty and by the denial of that doctrine in the spoils system of the Grant administration.

The fervor of this movement is aptly expressed in the concluding statement of the first report of the Civil Service Commission by George William Curtis in 1871, when he stated that "the improvement of the civil service is emphatically the people's case, the people's reform, and the administration which vigorously begins it will acquire a glory only less than that of the salvation of the Union."

However, this reform was not to be won by rhetoric alone. Another decade of a predatory and acquisitive spoils system and the assassination of a President were required before a merit system would be inaugurated. It is worth observing, in passing, that although the classified civil service has grown from coverage of only 10 percent of 140,000 employees in 1883 to 85 percent of approximately 2½ million employees today, the Pendleton Act has remained without any fundamental changes.

But just as the act itself was a long time in arriving, so have further improvements in the civil service been characterized by obstructionism and delay.

For example, from 1883 to the expansion of Federal activities in World War I, there existed no coherent pay-classification system in the Federal service, while the pay of Government clerks remained stationary from 1854 to 1916. And yet the New York Evening Post, at the turn of the century, editorialized that Government employees "average to receive twice as much, on a conservative estimate, as persons similarly employed on the outside world." That sounds familiar; doesn't it?

Not until 1923—40 years after passage of the Pendleton Act—was there any further basic legislation to improve the condition of the civil service. This came in the so-called Classification Act of 1923, which covered barely 10 percent of the total employees.

One could well ask: Why, in a democracy, do we handle the needs of our Federal service in such a casual and dilatory manner? Although we might find the explanation in the times, for example, in the belief then that the business of America is business or in the lack of concern on the part of the individual Chief Executives, or in the opposition by such men as Senator Smoot, the cause, I believe, lies deeper than any of these. It is to be found in the popular American attitude which places service in government in a lower category than private endeavor. Surely this is an incongruous and anomalous condition for a democratic society, the development and even the survival of which depends so heavily upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the creativeness of its Federal service.

As a Nation we can ill afford the license of ignoring the people of our civil service, much less the practice which was so widespread a few years ago—and still lingers on in some quarters—of making them the whipping boys and girls for default in our affairs as a Nation.

But in spite of the persistence of the national attitude of devaluing the Federal service, we can look back to significant advances in recent years. A number of these gains, I am pleased to report, occurred under the administrations of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, while I was a member—and, later, chairman—of the House Civil Service Committee.

During that period we passed the Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act of 1937, the Hatch Act of 1939 and 1940, and the Ramspeck Act of 1940. Under the latter we authorized the President to extend the merit system to an additional 200,000 employees; we extended the authority of the President and Civil Service Commission in the field of position classification; and we provided for the revision of the efficiency rating system.

Under the provisions of the Ramspeck Act, President Truman, in 1945, extended Civil Service Commission authority of position classification and merit system to the field service.

In addition, one of the major advances during this period—one in which I took a particularly keen interest in drafting—was the first Federal Employees' Health Act of 1946.

Finally, we also passed in 1946 the efficiency rating legislation which led to the Performance Rating Act of 1950.

I have not intended, in this brief survey, to do more than touch the high spots of the developments of the past 75 years. Nor have I intended to convey the idea that the status of our civil service is satisfactory. Your own views on this matter have been noted with interest in your legislative proposals for the present Congress. And I hope that this Congress will give earnest and attentive concern to your program.

However, in the light of this summation, I believe we can safely make at least two generalizations:

First, that the principle of the merit system in our Federal Service is assured; and,

Second, that—belated though the progress has been—Federal employees are beginning to share increasingly in the welfare benefits that have come in recent years to employees in private industry.

But there is an issue more fundamental than either of these which I would now consider. I mentioned earlier that the Federal service has, in a sense, become a fourth branch of the Government. In stating this I am implying, of course, that government bureaucracy has become a permanent and integral part of American life. Therefore, rather than rail against the existence of a bureaucracy as such, it is time that we give thought to the kind of bureaucracy our society demands.

Our civil service, in recent years of relative political stalemate—when we have moved with increasingly less strength of purpose and direction—has been subjected to a degree of congressional and Executive scrutiny never before experienced in our history.

But from both sides—from Congress as well as the White House—this scrutiny has too often been of a restrictive nature, rather than a positive one. Some people believe too much attention has been given to the business of policing the actions of the Federal service and too little to finding ways of releasing the creative potential of our public servants. And herein lies one of the chief responsibilities in the years ahead—to reconstruct our ideas of administrative responsibility in keeping with the present complexion of our civil service.

My esteemed colleague, the Honorable OLIN JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is deeply interested in furthering a strong civil service.

We have at last achieved what Professor Mills calls a representative bureaucracy, having tried the closed system of the Federalists and the spoils system of the Jacksonians and early Republicans. We now have a bureaucracy which shares the same values and interests as the community at large—and it is time that we tap the tremendous creative potential which such a system implies.

But this can hardly be done when the basic legislation under which our civil serv-

ice operates still bears the mark of a reaction to a spoils system that we no longer need. Present concepts of personnel management and administrative responsibility have outdistanced the centralized and hierarchical system of administration of our Federal service.

I would, therefore, in closing, offer the suggestion that your organization might profitably consider the question of some such study of our civil service as the Rockefeller studies of our military security system, our international economic policy, and our educational system—a study which would be made with a view toward releasing the creative potential implicit in the most responsive and representative civil service of our time.

Inaugural Address of Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on January 1, 1959, G. Mennen Williams took the oath of office as Governor of Michigan for the sixth consecutive time.

His election to this high office on six occasions sets a Michigan record and is a national achievement of considerable magnitude.

On assuming office for his newest term, Governor Williams delivered an inaugural address outlining Michigan's gains over the past 10 years and setting goals for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Williams' inaugural address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 1, 1959

On behalf of all of us in your State government, I extend most cordial greetings for the New Year. May God bless you all in the years which lie ahead.

In electing me for the sixth consecutive term, the people of Michigan have honored me above any Governor in the history of the United States. I am profoundly grateful. I accept this honor with deep humility. And I solemnly pledge to serve all the people to the utmost limits of my ability.

We've come a long way together in the past 10 years. The magnificent Mackinac Bridge, then a fond hope, now a majestic reality, symbolizes the progress of this decade. The people have built new schools and hospitals, improved social services and health care, embarked on a mammoth highway program, gained national recognition for traffic safety, enlarged farm marketing programs, expanded the tourist industry, acted to end job discrimination, and done many other things to carry Michigan forward. At the same time, business and industry have grown and diversified and new jobs have been added. By all important measuring rods, Michigan has grown bigger and stronger.

It is my firm belief that the growth we have known in the past 10 years is only a preface to the growth we're going to achieve in the next 10 years. Ahead of us lies a

better life of almost unlimited material and spiritual abundance. I have every confidence that the people are going to realize that abundance to the full for themselves and for their children.

But to get where we want to go requires a frank recognition that we live today in a time of great change. Scientific and technological advances occur with amazing rapidity. These advances permitting new and expanded products and services open the way to a greater economic abundance. But they involve new industries and new skills and far-reaching transition.

Michigan has been vitally and heavily involved in providing the leadership for the Nation's economic successes to date. There is now a real challenge to also provide new leadership in our new and changing era.

Michigan has a history of always being in the front ranks in times of great change. We put the whole world on wheels in the first 40 years of this century; and then we turned to producing the vehicles of war, and by gargantuan feats of production we brought about the ultimate victory much sooner than anyone dared dream possible at the outset of World War II.

A people who did it so magnificently before can do it again. Let me make one thing crystal clear. We're going to rise to new peaks of prosperity in this era of electronics, missiles, atomic energy and automation. We're going to add a new industrial preeminence in these new industries as great as the industrial heights of the age of the automobile.

There is no easy path from where we are to where we want to go. It will require real vision, a deep understanding of the times, and courage to act. It will require present sacrifice in order to gain future dividends. It will demand unselfish leadership from labor, business, agriculture, and Government. It will need the best ideas of people everywhere. It will require a deep understanding of the human hardships brought on by times of transition, and a compassionate determination to relieve these hardships. It will require cooperation—cooperation of labor, business, agriculture, Government, cooperation of every section of our State and every segment of our society.

It will take the same kind of productive teamwork on which we built our industrial supremacy in the age of the automobile. Inventive genius combined with managerial know-how and labor skill then brought both record profits and high wages by pouring out products at prices people could pay.

We need to strengthen that teamwork so that we can again outproduce, outsell, outprofit, and outearn any competitors in our changing world.

Today, management hesitates to utilize fully competitive automation for fear of labor reaction, and workers tend to fear automation will result in loss of jobs. We must bridge this gap, or our plants and labor skills will lose out in competition with our neighbors. We must transform any outmoded facilities and obsolescing skills into ultra-modern automated plants and upgraded workers, and take care of the human problems created during this transformation. Then automation will become the friend, rather than the bogeyman, of labor and industry in Michigan.

The goals we seek are worth the effort to attain them. A Michigan of full employment, full production, and full prosperity, making possible a full and better life for everyone, can be attained if we cooperate in common effort to achieve it. I see a Michigan where diversified industry provides employment opportunity for anyone able to work, a Michigan where high wages, high profits, and high prosperity go upward together. I see a Michigan with great centers of research serving as magnets for clusters of new business enterprises. I see a Michigan of such economic size as to be able to care for the aged as

they should be cared for, and for the mentally ill, the youth in trouble; a Michigan which generously supports education at every level, where recreation facilities are adequate, where discrimination is banished, where the arts flourish, and where morality and religion are cultivated.

State government has a vital role to play in all this, but to play its role financial stability must be restored to State government. We must provide funds not only to pay off the deficit, but also to permit services to keep up with the growth of our State.

This will require new taxes. Let me assure the people of this State that we will seek the fairest formula that can be devised, whatever that formula may be.

While we face the fiscal problem, we need to proceed rapidly with plans for the future.

To this end we have set up a blue ribbon commission of leading Michigan citizens, headed by an outstanding business leader, William Day, president of Michigan Bell Telephone Co., to assess realistically our present assets and liabilities. This is the Commission on Michigan's Economic Future—or COMEF for short—and from its work will come a blueprint for progress for the coming quarter of a century or more.

COMEF numbers among its members leaders of all phases of our business life, with farm and labor representation as well. It is in itself a splendid example of the kind of cooperation we need to do the job.

At the same time that COMEF develops broad plans for progress, we will be pushing for action in direct and immediate ways. Our economic development department must be strengthened. Local industrial development organizations must be encouraged. Small business opportunities must be promoted.

A science advisory board, composed of top research men from industry and the universities, is helping Michigan get more fully into the missile field and into other pioneering industries. Along this line we need to establish an institute of science and technology at the University of Michigan both to enhance our leadership in learning and to attract more new industries.

As I said at the beginning, I have every confidence that the people of Michigan are on the threshold of an era of unparalleled achievements. It will take our best cooperative efforts to get to where we want to go, but I have no doubt that such effort will be put to the task. Michigan will then enter an era more fruitful for private profit and wages, for public good and for the spiritual well-being of our people than any previous time in the remarkable history of our State.

A time of inaugural is a time of renewal. I believe the people of Michigan want to set their hands, their hearts, and their minds to the great tasks before us. I believe they want those who have been entrusted with leadership to face up to the job of leading. I believe the people are not afraid to make sacrifices today for the sake of a better life today and tomorrow for themselves and for their children.

It is with these beliefs that I pledge my administration to cooperative effort with the leaders of Michigan so that we can, with God's help, achieve the new Michigan we know lies within our grasp.

Problems of Metropolitan Area Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the great problems presently confront-

ing the country is what to do about the explosive metropolitan growth which is occurring all over the Nation and, indeed, all over the world. I hope very much that the 86th Congress will come to grips with this problem, particularly as regards Federal relationships to it.

The mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, made a significant and timely address on the subject before a group of community leaders in Philadelphia earlier this week. The group was called together by the publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, Walter H. Annenberg, who has taken a great interest in the development of the Delaware River Valley. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mayor Dilworth's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. RICHARDSON DILWORTH, MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY 14, 1959

I have been asked to present for your consideration what we believe the next 10 years will bring to the great Delaware Valley; and especially, what Philadelphia can contribute to the Valley's growth and welfare.

Population is rapidly moving into our urban areas. Almost 95 percent of the Nation's 15 million increase in population since World War II has settled in some 140 urban areas. Those same 140 areas now contain more than 65 percent of our population and produce more than 70 percent of our wealth, and there is no doubt that the present trend to an urban civilization will continue throughout this century.

Let us just see what this will mean to the Delaware Valley. The population of the 11 county metropolitan area, which makes up the Delaware Valley is now approximately 5 million. In 10 years, it should be at least 6,100,000 persons. Ninety percent of that increase will be in the suburban counties.

A few people view this startling growth with alarm.

It does present tremendous challenges, but even greater opportunities.

Now, what must we do to meet this challenge? We must plan and think and act in terms of the entire area. We cannot permit sectionalism, or county boundaries to thwart us.

As to the basic problems, the most serious are (1) crime; (2) the problem of population; (3) the problem of housing, which is very much tied up with the population problem; (4) the problems of transportation; and finally (5) the problem of area cooperation.

First, crime: The crime situation is serious in every big city, and adds to the difficulty of reattracting people and industry. What must be done in this field is a speech in itself. Just let me say that we are moving vigorously; we are beginning to get results, but there is no use kidding anymore, it is going to take time and great concerted effort by all of our law enforcement agencies and the public's support to get the crime problem under proper control.

Second, the problem of population, and of the great increase in the nonwhite population: This problem, too, requires a speech in itself, and it is a problem which affects the entire area. I want to re-emphasize that this problem affects the entire area, not just Philadelphia. Let me just say here that certain chronic pessimists, including David Lawrence and his U.S. News & World Report, are determined that the great Northern cities are headed for disaster because of this problem. And this has been their constantly reiterated chant. But, they are people of little faith. The fact is that in the past 100 years our cities have been confronted at least

three times with a very similar situation. On each of those occasions, confronted with great migrations of persons with little education, no preparation for living in large cities, and no background of democracy, a few people of little courage literally deluged the newspapers and magazines with articles and letters predicting the death of the cities.

Let's just look at a few facts. The statement is frequently made that politicians encourage nonwhites to come here from the South. The fact is that of the five cities of over a million, Philadelphia is receiving less non-whites, both in numbers and percentages than the other four largest cities. Fear-mongers say that another 10 years will see nonwhites in the majority in our large cities. The fact is that the nonwhite population of the Delaware Valley is a little less than 14 percent, and a little less than 25 percent of the population of Philadelphia.

The fact is that less than half as many nonwhites are now coming here each year as during the war years when the demands for labor were high, and produced an immigration of 15,000 nonwhites for a period of several years.

The fact is that better than 95 percent of the nonwhites come here to find work and freedom from oppression, not just to go on relief. The proof of this is that there is every indication that despite a continued flight from the South, Philadelphia has had no substantial increase in its nonwhite population in the last two years. Employment opportunities for nonwhites here having apparently reached the saturation point, the nonwhites are spilling over into surrounding industrial communities, such as Reading, Allentown, and Bethlehem.

It is also said that crime by nonwhites is out of hand. There is a high incidence of crime in nonwhite areas and a high incidence of senseless crimes of brutality, but the crime rate is no higher than the crime rate in corresponding very low income white districts.

In addition, there are encouraging factors. Per capita income of nonwhites is steadily rising. Ten years ago, the per capita income of nonwhites in Philadelphia was only 55 percent that of whites, today it is almost 70 percent that of whites. Twenty years ago, only 10 percent of the nonwhites owned their homes, today 45 percent of all nonwhite families own their homes. And, they are improving their homes. Ten years ago, 35 percent of the homes owned by nonwhites were in violation of housing regulations, today that has been reduced to 20 percent.

What's more, three-fourths of the total increase in population in the entire Delaware Valley area in the past 10 years has been white; and it is anticipated that the large increase in population in the Delaware Valley in the next ten years will be more than 80 percent white.

That brings us to the problem of housing. The real danger which threatens the Delaware Valley in this regard is the attempt to make of the city a sort of ghetto into which all of the low income minority groups are thrust. That would endanger the health, and growth of the entire area; but, I am confident it will not occur for several reasons: First, the increase in income and improved living conditions of all minority groups; and second, the efforts Philadelphia is making through redevelopment to hold and reattract middle and upper income residents.

Now, as to transportation. Our overall highway program is in fairly good shape. And the \$2,500,000 area survey now being made of the Valley's entire transportation needs should be most helpful.

There is, however, much which must be done with regard to mass transportation. It is clear that if we are to move freely in the area, we must do something to solve our commutation problem. We are fast ap-

proaching the complete saturation point on highways and automobiles. We must, of course, have a fine and extensive highway system; but, if we let it get beyond a certain point it becomes a wasteful, consuming extravagance.

In vision in the next 10 years a rail commutation system which will carry people frequently, rapidly, and comfortably throughout the area in modern equipment. In order to accomplish this, the communities in the entire area will have to join in a plan which will make such service possible. It is our rough estimate that the annual added cost of such service should not exceed \$5 million a year; and, that's little more than \$1 per person in the area.

Our Operation Northwest has demonstrated that rail commutation service can be made attractive to riders at not too great a cost to the communities being served. As regards essential new equipment, we shall have to seek Federal aid, probably in the form of a Federal guarantee of long-term, low-interest purchase agreements for the acquisition of modern equipment. As you know, we are working on that now.

In addition, we must arrive at an areawide agreement for better station facilities, to be served, if necessary, by feeder buses as well as greatly increased and improved parking facilities at all commutation stations.

Finally, we have the problem of area cooperation. I feel confident that each year will see increased cooperation, not so much because we'll all be so much more enlightened, but because our problems will become more and more alike, and more and more pressing each year. The areas in which I foresee such cooperation are in planning, in air-pollution control, in sewerage and water supply, in transportation, and regional parks. And, that is one of our critical problems. A recent National Park Association survey makes it clear that the 5 southeastern Pennsylvania counties should now have a minimum of 66,000 acres of area parks; yet, today we have only 1,500 acres of such parks. Open space is one of our most precious resources, and it is rapidly vanishing; and, the price of what there is, is soaring. We must, therefore, act promptly, and in concert with the State to remedy this situation.

To conclude, we have many problems, both in our city and our area. But, there are none we cannot solve, provided we work together and have bold, courageous leadership.

Our greatest asset is our people. We are blessed with wonderful people, devoted to the area, and confident of its future.

We must not be afraid to plan, and to dream. Not just idle dreams; but fine dreams which we shall labor to translate into reality.

We can, and we must make the next 10 years the finest this grand valley has ever had.

Address by Former Representative Robert Hale, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by former Representative Robert Hale at Portland, Maine, on December 30, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, as the year draws to its end the term of office for which I was elected to serve you in Congress also draws to its end. Indeed I have spent the last few weeks closing my office here in Washington just as I closed my Portland office in September. This has not been an easy task, nor shall I pretend that it has been a pleasant one. Every file—every letter even—brings reminders of the past and oftentimes revives the memory of warm friendships with those who are no more. So some sadness is inevitable at the close of my eight terms in Congress.

The 16 years which I have passed here in your service have been crowded, crucial, and difficult ones. The responsibilities have been heavy and the work arduous. However, my service has brought me many satisfactions and rewarding experiences. I should be indeed ungrateful if I did not take this occasion to thank you again for your confidence, your support, and your consideration over all these years. No one ever represented in Congress or anywhere else a better constituency than the First Maine District. Bigger constituencies there are, and richer, but there are no people anywhere who will ever stand so high in my affections as those of Oxford, Sagadahoc, Cumberland, and York Counties. I have with them every tie of affection and spiritual kinship.

Often here in Washington, as years ago in the State legislature, have I been besought by proper means to vote for this measure or against that one, but seldom have I been pressured or threatened. The voters have not sought to put fetters on my judgment or my conscience; they have trusted to my discretion. I have exercised my discretion fearlessly, well knowing that no decision of mine or of any legislator could ever meet with unanimous approval.

If the time ever comes when a Member of Congress from this or any other district is obliged to be a mere rubber stamp for some particularly powerful or well-heeled pressure group in his constituency, membership in Congress would cease to be either an honor or a pleasure. This would be all the more true if the pressure group were one based on a selfish class or economic interest or on social or economic prejudices.

In the 16 years that I have been here, I have seen many changes in Maine, in our country, and in the world at large. I have seen the end of World War II and the tragedy which came in the wake of victory when we realized that our wartime ally, the Soviet Union, could not share our desire for a free world—was in fact opposed to anything that we hold dear. The hot war which raged when I took my seat at the beginning of 1943 was succeeded by 5 brief years of uneasy peace and then by the localized but tragic war in Korea lasting from 1950 to 1953. We are now back in a cold war which shows no sign of slackening. It imposes on any Member of Congress, and indeed on everyone connected with the Government, problems as difficult and situations as dangerous as any that ever confronted this country. In my years in the Congress I have put the objective of national security above all others. If we cannot remain a free people we shall have lost all that matters. No statesmanship that endangers our liberties or suffers them to be endangered can be anything but sterile.

In my years here I have served under two Democratic Presidents and for the last 6 years under a Republican. I have served in two Republican Congresses and in six Democratic. In Maine, Democratic Governors have succeeded Republican, though our legislature remains Republican. Through all these political changes I leave Congress as I entered it, a strong party man, believing that in a democracy such as ours responsible political parties alone can provide sound government.

It may be that the charms of television have romanticized political personalities, built up personal loyalties, and weakened concern for the principles of government, for political ideas, and for such serious and critical issues of the day as defense, foreign policy, inflation, and education. If such be the case, I hope that as television loses its novelty, the political party to which the candidate belongs will again be recognized as the major instrumentality of popular government.

Of one thing I am certain: no profession can be nobler or more rewarding than public service in a democracy. I hope that no future generation will be forgetful of this. It is easy to speak slightly of politicians. No doubt, ignorant, selfish, and evil men seek and obtain political office. No electorate can be too vigilant in its choice of public servants. Bad men may discredit a great profession but we must see the profession above the men.

For Congress as an institution I have the highest respect. Undeserving people obtain seats in both House and Senate. Sometimes they succeed in holding office for many years. They may deceive their constituents but they seldom deceive their colleagues in the Congress. Just as the best measure of the worth of a lawyer or a doctor is the esteem which he enjoys in his profession, the best criterion of a legislator's worth lies in the appraisal of his fellows. SAM RAYBURN, after nearly half a century of service in the House, has said that every Member of the House has two constituencies; that which elects him and the House itself. This is true. Partisanship often runs high in the House, but integrity and ability never fail of recognition, regardless of party lines.

When in 1898 Thomas B. Reed made his farewell to the people of this district after more than 20 years of service he said:

"Office as a ribbon to stick in your coat is worth nobody's consideration. Office as opportunity is worth all consideration. That opportunity you have given me, untrammelled, in the fullest and amplest manner, and I return you sincerest thanks. If I have deserved any praise, it belongs of right to you."

I am proud to have followed in the footsteps of Speaker Reed and of having served this district longer than any of his successors. With a heart full of gratitude and good will, I wish you all a happy new year and a happy succession of new years. I hope that I shall enjoy your friendship and your society through many years to come.

Difficulty of Obtaining College Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record one of a series of reports by Erwin Knoll, education writer of the Washington Post and Times Herald, on the serious problems faced by American students who wish to continue their education beyond the high school. Mr. Knoll's article, published on January 11, 1959, highlights the discussion of a group of educators who met recently in Carmel, N.Y.

His report notes that Frank H. Bowles, president of the college entrance examination board, predicted increased use of facilities for evening classes and development of the 2-year community college.

During the 85th Congress I proposed consideration of an emergency program of Federal aid to provide classrooms at 2-year colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. I intend to introduce similar legislation in this Congress.

The 2-year college would bring colleges to many areas where such facilities are now unavailable. For the youth who lacks either dormitory fees or tuition, or both, it may be his only chance for higher education. In general, the 2-year colleges would try to meet the needs of two groups of students: First, those seeking 2 years of college preliminary to taking 2 or more years at another institution; second, those planning to wind up their college career in the 2 years and who therefore want terminal courses in general education and vocational fields. Many colleges which now offer this kind of program have attempted further to meet the needs of the community by adding a program of adult education for those who are employed, but feel the need for additional training.

We must approach the critical problem of expanding educational facilities with the constant awareness that if we fail to act soon, the Nation will forever lose much talent and brainpower. Unless we move quickly, the chance for an adequate education for life, for a profession, and for citizenship will be denied to many of our finest youth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLLEGES SEEN FACING HUGE INFUX IN 1968 (By Erwin Knoll)

The number of Americans going to college will triple in the next decade. By 1968, 2 out of 3 men and women in the college age group of 18 to 21 will be getting a higher education.

These predictions come from Frank H. Bowles, president of the College Entrance Examination Board. They highlight a problem that is perturbing to more and more parents—how to get their children into college and how to foot the bills.

The problem was discussed last week at a Carmel, N. Y., conference of college admissions officers, high school principals, and education writers, held under the auspices of the college board.

The consensus among the educators present was that the nature of higher education would change radically in the coming years, that costs would rise substantially, but that educational opportunities would not be denied to students who are capable of college work and flexible in their plans.

TEN MILLION STUDENTS

Within 10 years, Bowles predicted, about 10 million students will be enrolled in the Nation's colleges. It will be as customary to attend college as it is to attend high school now, he said. And many who now settle for 4 years of higher education will go on to do 2 to 4 years of graduate work.

But a college education in 1968 won't be precisely what it is today, Bowles warned. He referred to the "emergent vocationalism" in higher education, which will include the training of shop foremen, technicians, and industrial workers.

CHANGES PREDICTED

He predicted increased use of facilities for evening classes, development of many 2-year community colleges and incorporation into formal higher education of many programs now regarded as adult classes.

"The colleges which attract most of the candidates are east of the Alleghenies and west of the Rockies," he declared. "With a few exceptions, the inland colleges are not crowded."

The "prestige colleges" of the East will not be increasing their capacities very much, educators at the conference agreed, and they will be pricing themselves out of the market for many students.

The result will be an increasing realization that it is the student, not the college, that makes an education. State universities and less famous colleges will be bearing the brunt of much of the enrollment boom.

BETTER COUNSELING

The educators agreed that most colleges have done a poor job of letting the public know what standards must be met for admission. They called for better high school counseling—only one school in five now has an organized guidance program, closer liaison between high schools and colleges, and more informative college catalogs.

College admissions officers stressed that no one criterion assures acceptance or rejection by any school. Despite increased use of college entrance examinations, test scores are only one factor considered.

"There is no such thing as an ideal candidate," said C. William Edwards, director of admissions for Princeton University.

There is an ideal class, but no two boys in that class are alike. We don't want all geniuses or all athletes or all editors of school papers.

"We want some Joe Smiths—the boys who haven't been No. 1 in anything. You can't select students by formula or machine."

QUALIFICATIONS TOLD

John S. Hafer, dean of admissions at Syracuse University, outlined the qualifications considered by his school. In the order of precedence they were:

1. High school record.
2. Score on the college board examination or other standardized test.
3. High school class rank.
4. Recommendation of high school principal and teachers.
5. Geographic representation.

Admissions officers said much of the present chaos in college admissions will be eliminated as schools develop better coordination in handling applications. Some predicted eventual development of a single admissions center which would screen applications to all or most schools.

As costs of higher education continue to rise, another desperation round of tuition increases is in the offing, Bowles asserted. What of the youngsters who can't afford to pay the price?

TIPS FOR INDIGENT

He shouldn't look to too much help from scholarships, the educators agreed. Though there is a trend toward awarding them more on the basis of need than as prizes for outstanding work, no great expansion of scholarships programs is in the offing. Instead the emphasis is now on student loans—on buying education by the installment plan.

Here are some tips for students who think they can't afford to go to college. They come from Rexford G. Moon, Jr., director of the college board's scholarship service:

Consider a nearby college. It's better to go to any college than to go to none—and your money might better be spent on education than on railroad or airline fares.

Don't neglect city or State institutions. Their fees are lower because they have tax support.

Borrow. In an inflationary period, you get more by learning now and paying later than by saving now to learn later.

Work. Students now earn 30 to 45 percent of their education costs.

Write to the college of your choice for information on available financial aid.

Enter national, State, and regional scholarship competitions.

Preservation of Old Films and Prints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Old Films and Prints Making Historic Movie," written by Grace Bassett and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 5, 1958. Last year Congress, because of the interest which has been manifested in this subject, appropriated money to the Library of Congress to refurbish priceless prints which are in the possession of the Library, but which, unfortunately, have been crumbling and are in a state of decay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD FILMS AND PRINTS MAKING HISTORIC MOVIE

(By Grace Bassett)

A 5-year job of converting brittle film and faded prints into a motion picture record of America since 1891 has begun at the Library of Congress.

Renocare of Hollywood won the first contract for the unique operation ordered by Congress last session.

The California corporation will work within a \$60,000 appropriation. Its bid was on a film footage basis. Library officials hope the contractor will finish work on about one quarter of the prints to be saved.

In all, 1,803 paper prints and 35 million feet of old-fashioned film filed between 1894 and 1912 would have disintegrated except for the congressional action.

Among the prints are pictures of the battleship *Maine*; the world's first atomic submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*, and an on-the-spot record of the Klondike gold rush. The Baltimore fire of 1904 and the San Francisco earthquake of 1906—these and thousands of other headline events and personalities are saved for posterity only on paper rolls, many tattered and warped.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS NEEDED

Preserved on film that crumbles and gives off toxic gas are shots aboard the ill-fated Titanic and along the C. & O. Canal at the turn of the century. These old fashioned nitrate films almost beyond repair are protected in vaults at Suitland, Md.

Urged primarily by Senator KUCHEL, Republican, of California, Congress appropriated \$60,000 to shift pictures onto modern film. This is the first chunk of \$300,000 needed to finish the preservation chore.

The focus of fuzzy prints is sharpened by a Rube Goldberg kind of mechanism developed first by the Academy of Motion Pic-

ture Arts and Sciences, according to Col. Willard Webb, who heads the Library's Stack and Reader Division.

Firms bidding for the job are bound to use a similar process—which involves dunking old film into a chemical solution, watering, drying, doctoring, and then transferring picture images onto movie film that can be projected.

NO MOVIE COPYRIGHTING

Pioneering movie producers filed pictures at the Library to get copyrights. Thomas A. Edison, inventor of the moving picture, sought the first protection by filing 8-by-10-inch cards with still picture frames of his movie, "The Sneeze," printed on them.

This was in 1894 when there were no motion-picture copyright laws. So picture makers simply filed sequences of their stills as evidence of their pictures. Nobody saw any use for the filings except to win copyrights.

The practice continued until 1912, when copyrighting of motion pictures was written into law. After that the Library took only descriptions of the films, not the actual reels except in selective cases.

Fifty years later, Library officials realized their early American films were priceless. Film scenery in those days was real. Props were few. If a railroad were in a picture, it was a real railroad. Cameras caught major sociological and historical developments of the Nation in one of its most flourishing periods.

DUBBED-IN SOUND

"We are not in the entertainment business," Colonel Webb emphasized. "But because we are not does not mean that we should not make available to a biographer of President McKinley, motion pictures of his career."

He said the films, dubbed with sound recordings, could be displayed to the public, too, in educational shows like the recent Theodore Roosevelt exhibit at the Library. After they push a button, visitors hear the ringing, cultured voice of Mr. Roosevelt at the same time his career as Rough Rider, big-game hunter and statesman is flashed on the screen.

Once converted, all the old films will be stored in the basement of the Library Annex. Colonel Webb, with no money but lots of organization, has set up an ambitious file there already. When it's filled with America's film firsts, Colonel Webb—a job done for future generations—plans to retire.

Curbing the Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial published in the Washington News of January 14, 1959, complimenting the Senate on its solution of the controversy over the modification of rule XXII.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STOP-TALK RULE

The Senate has brought off its dispute over curbing the filibuster a good deal more peacefully than might have been expected.

The result is a compromise, the Senate's usual method of doing business, and ex-

tremists at neither end are satisfied. But it is a reasonable, workable compromise. The Senate can live with the new rule and get on with its work.

The issue was how to prevent obstructive yack-yack and still preserve the right to free debate which is the essence of the parliamentary system. The Johnson compromise permits two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to shut off a filibuster.

Under the old rule, it took two-thirds of the total membership to do this. Thus a Senator could support a filibuster by merely staying away.

There is such a thing as the tyranny of a minority, and its weapon is the filibuster. The new rule diminishes its power. There also is the tyranny of a majority. If the rule were so relaxed that a mere majority could silence a near majority, free debate, and hence the public interest, would be jeopardized.

The two-thirds rule is standard on other issues—on ratification of a treaty, on overriding a Presidential veto, on proposing a constitutional amendment. It has worked well on these questions; it should work well on the filibuster question.

We think the Senate has solved this problem with practical good sense.

Carlton Putnam Presents South's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1958, Mr. Carleton Putnam, of Washington, D.C., addressed a letter to President Eisenhower, stating in a very forceful manner the South's position on the segregation-integration controversy. Mr. Putnam, prominent writer and airlines executive, has through the years been active in various business interests in the South and is exceptionally well informed on the region's problems, opportunities, and aspirations.

Mr. Putnam's letter to the President has received wide distribution through the effort of individuals and also through the editorial and letters to the editor columns of many of our leading newspapers. Last week a group of citizens of Birmingham, in my district, after having raised funds by private subscription, inserted the letter as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times. It is planned to run additional advertisements in the Christian Science Monitor and several other papers.

With the thought that my efforts will lend assistance in giving the letter the type of currency it merits, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under permission heretofore given.

Mr. Putnam, a member of the famous New England Putnam family, is a native of New York City, a graduate of Princeton and Columbia, and founder and president of the Chicago & Southern Airlines—1943-48. He is presently on the board of directors of Delta Airlines. In addition to being an outstanding business executive Mr. Putnam is also a writ-

er of note. He recently published a widely praised biography of President Theodore Roosevelt.

The letter which follows is commended to the careful reading and study of every Member of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 13, 1958.

THE HONORABLE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago I was reading over Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the recent Little Rock case. Three sentences in it tempt me to write you this letter. I am a northerner, but I have spent a large part of my life as a business executive in the South. I have a law degree, but I am now engaged in historical writing. From this observation post I risk the presumption of a comment.

The sentences I wish to examine are these: "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feelings will yield, gradually though this may be, to law and education."

It is my personal conviction that the local customs in this case were hardened by time for a very good reason, and that while they may not, as Frankfurter says, have been decreed in heaven, they come closer to it than the current view of the Supreme Court. I was particularly puzzled by Frankfurter's remarks that "the Constitution is not the formulation of the merely personal views of the members of this Court." Five minutes before the Court's desegregation decision, the Constitution meant one thing; 5 minutes later, it meant something else. Only one thing intervened; namely, an expression of the personal views of the members of the Court.

It is not my purpose to dispute the point with which the greater part of Frankfurter's opinion is concerned. The law must be obeyed. But I think the original desegregation decision was wrong, that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found not to disobey it but to avoid it. Failing this, the situation should be corrected by constitutional amendment.

I cannot agree that this is a matter involving "a few States," as Frankfurter suggests. The picture in reality is of a court, by one sudden edict, forcing upon the entire South a view, and a way of life, with which the great majority of the population are in complete disagreement. Although not from the legal, in fact from the practical, standpoint the North, which does not have the problem, is presuming to tell the South, which does have the problem, what to do.

To me there is a frightening arrogance in this performance. Neither the North, nor the Court, has any holy mandate inherent in the trend of the times or the progress of liberalism to reform society in the South. In the matter of schools, rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association and, in the South at least, may require that both be considered simultaneously. (In using the word "association" here, I mean the right to associate with whom you please, and the right not to associate with whom you please.) Moreover, am I not correct in my recollection that it was the social stigma of segregation and its effect upon the Negro's mind and heart to which the Court objected as much as to any other, and thus that the Court, in forcing the black man's right to equal education was actually determined to violate the white man's right to freedom of association?

In any case the crux of this issue would seem obvious: social status has to be earned. Or, to put it another way, equality of association has to be mutually agreed to and mutually desired. It cannot be achieved by

legal fiat. Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pureblooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization. Finally, he can inquire as to the number of pureblooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science. (I do not include singing or athletics as these are not primarily matters of character and intelligence.) Nor is there any validity to the argument that the Negro hasn't been given a chance. We were all in caves or trees originally. The progress which the pureblooded black has made when left to himself, with a minimum of white help or hindrance, genetically or otherwise, can be measured today in the Congo.

Lord Bryce, a distinguished and impartial foreign observer, presented the situation accurately in his "American Commonwealth" when he wrote in 1880:

"History is a record of the progress toward civilization of races originally barbarous. But that progress has in all cases been slow and gradual * * *. Utterly dissimilar is the case of the African Negro, caught up in and whirled along with the swift movement of the American democracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the most primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary, and the most highly developed, types of culture * * *. A body of savages is violently carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on the plantations of masters who are three or four thousand years in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force * * *. Suddenly, even more suddenly than they were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only free, but made full citizens and active members of the most popular government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear an equal part in ruling, not only themselves, but also their recent masters."

One does not telescope three or four thousand years into the 78 years since Bryce wrote. One may change the terms of the problem by mixed breeding, but if ever there was a matter that ought to be left to local option it would seem to be the decision as to when the mixture has produced an acceptable amalgam in the schools. And I see no reason for penalizing a locality that does not choose to mix.

I would emphatically support improvement of education in Negro schools, if and where it is inferior. Equality of opportunity and equality before the law, when not strained to cover other situations, are acceptable ideals because they provide the chance to earn and to progress—and consequently should be enforced by legal fiat as far as is humanly possible. But equality of association, which desegregation in southern schools involves, presupposes a status which in the South the average Negro has not earned. To force it upon the southern white will, I think, meet with as much opposition as the prohibition amendment encountered in the wet States.

Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition in recent years has been clouded by more loose thinking. Not many of us would care to enter a poetry contest with Keats, nor play chess with the national champion, nor set our character beside Albert Schweitzer's. When we see the doctrine of equality contradicted everywhere around us in fact, it remains a mystery why so many of us continue to give it lip service in theory, and why

we tolerate the vicious notion that status in any field need not be earned.

Pin down the man who uses the word "equality," and at once the evasions and qualifications begin. As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were equal in the sight of God. I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority for this conception. There is doubtless authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God—after earning that status, and with various further qualifications—but where is the authority for the sort of ipso facto equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and its not an automatic matter. What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races.

The confusion here is not unlike the confusion created by some left-wing writers between the doctrine of equality and the doctrine of Christian love. The command to love your neighbor is not a command either to consider your neighbor your equal, or yourself his equal: perhaps the purest example of great love without equality is the love between parent and child. In fact the equality doctrine as a whole, except when surrounded by a plethora of qualifications, is so untenable that it falls to pieces at the slightest thoughtful examination.

Frankfurter closes his opinion with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Negro owes more than to any other man. I, too, would like to quote from Lincoln. At Charleston, Ill., in September 1858, in a debate with Douglas, Lincoln said:

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office. * * * I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

The extent to which Lincoln would have modified these views today, or may have modified them before his death, is a moot question, but it is clear on its face that he would not have been in sympathy with the Supreme Court's position on desegregation. Many historians have felt that when Lincoln died the South lost the best friend it had. This also may be moot, but again it seems clear that for 94 years—from the horrors of Reconstruction through the Supreme Court's desegregation decision—the North has been trying to force the black man down the white southerner's throat, and it is a miracle that relations between the races in the South have progressed as well as they have.

Perhaps the most discouraging spectacle is the spectacle of northern newspapers dwelling with pleasure upon the predicament of the southern parent who is forced to choose between desegregation and no school at all for his child. It does not seem to occur to these papers that this is the cruelest sort of blackmail; that the North is virtually putting a pistol at the head of the southern parent in a gesture which every northerner must contemplate with shame.

Indeed, there now seems little doubt that the Court's recent decision has set back the cause of the Negro in the South by a generation. He may force his way into white schools, but he will not force his way into white hearts nor earn the respect he seeks. What evolution was slowly and wisely

achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

Foreign Aid Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 5, 1959, issue of the Concord (N. H.) Monitor Patriot newspaper.

This editorial, entitled "Foreign Aid Waste," presents clearly the situation with which Members of Congress are faced annually in connection with our spending of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID WASTE

Both of New Hampshire's Senators have from time to time cast a cold and appraising eye at items in the foreign-aid budget and even closer scrutiny should be given when demands for more funds are considered.

In the years since 1950 this country has spent more than \$42 billion in its foreign assistance programs. About \$20 billion was earmarked for technical and economic help and about \$22 billion went to military build-up.

There is a tendency in Washington to label any criticism of foreign-aid spending as a personal attack upon Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. But there is ample evidence that a considerable number of foreign-aid projects have been misdirected and poorly administered.

BRIDGES and COTTON should do everything possible to halt at once, so far as they are able, the appalling waste in expenditure of money abroad. There are few areas where American aid has not produced records of shocking misuse of money taken from taxpayers.

A lot of Americans are wondering why their money is being poured into areas where there are strong indications of Communist support and equally strong evidence that heads of some countries have ample funds for their own use.

The sheik of Kuwait is boasting over construction of a new palace that will cost millions. The structure will have 90 rooms, all completely air conditioned. There will be a 20-room section for a harem whose occupants will enjoy an elaborate swimming pool. A theater will have 500 seats and a dining room will be a forest of crystal chandeliers. Kuwait is a small British protectorate on the Persian Gulf. Its sheik would be just another Arab in a drafty tent save for the fact that his land reeks with oil. This enables him to engage in personal extravagances while most of his subjects live in squalor.

Kuwait is in a global area where American dollars are being poured out to raise living standards. It is in that part of the world where the United States is grimly fighting Soviet propaganda and promises of a better life. And it is not too far distant from where another Arab named Nasser is spreading discontent.

There seems to be agreement in both political parties that foreign aid cannot be wholly eliminated. There can and should be insistence that where and how this money is spent should be more closely watched.

The Battle in the Ether

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in thinking of that phase of the cold war usually referred to as the battle for men's minds we are usually prone to consider only United States and Soviet efforts beamed at third countries. Nevertheless, there are a substantial number of broadcasts beamed to American listeners, in English, from every corner of the world, Communist, free and neutral. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 1959 issue of Town and Country by Arthur Settler, director of public relations of the Metropolitan Educational Television Association—META, describing this activity.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOOD LISTENER

(By Arthur Settler)

Little did my father dream when he told me, an incurably shy and a social creature of 13, to be a good listener, that some day I would not only carry out his injunction to the letter but make it a highly enlightening if frequently expensive pastime as well.

Everyone has his weakness. Mine is listening. To this exnewsman and former expatriate, there is nothing so intriguing as the happy game of gluing myself to my radio set and listening to the nations of our allegedly civilized world screaming insults and invectives at each other through the unvalued ether.

With a simple receiving set which can be purchased at any appliance shop or department store for as little as \$139, any resident of the United States or its possessions can enjoy a ringside seat on the main arena of the cold war, observing first hand the war of words, sometimes called by more succulent names such as the battle for the minds of men, the war of ideas, the truth campaign, psychological warfare, and others ad infinitum.

Call it what you will, it is a Zollean game apparently without end, waxing and waning while one side regroups its forces, its sputniks, its muttniks, and the other builds bigger and better transmitters on land, on ships at sea—making use of leaflets, folders, balloons, musical jingles, postage stamps, trade fairs, grants-in-aid, and even match box covers to put across an idea, tell a story, convey a message, or just let people on the other side know they haven't been forgotten.

Tuning in to the correct frequency can be frustrating to the beginner in the art of listening, who sits back enjoying a charming little fireside chat in the Russian language only to discover, after a few minutes, that it isn't Moscow at all, but the Voice of America broadcasting on shortwave from Washington, D.C., beamed to the Russian listening public.

On the other hand, an English-language broadcast is likely to originate anywhere—Moscow to Dakar, and back again. Or the curiously pleading voice can just as readily be the Voice of Germany, the Voice of Spain, the Voice of Turkey, or—yes, it could even be the BBC, London.

The listener soon ascertains that the ingratiating and fawning Moscow newscasters with the New York accent aren't giving the news at all, but something far different and alien and charged with little bolts of electricity—news which is not entirely in accord either with the facts or with the best interest of anything or anybody except the policies of the Kremlin.

It is essentially for the benefit of the international eavesdropper that I've tried to unscramble the modern Tower of Babel which modern radio broadcasting has created, although my glossary will doubtless be useful to the reader of present-day political propaganda as well as to the radio listener.

The first point, then, is that content and slant, rather than language as such, are the clues to the source and origin of a broadcast. Thus, while the Voice of America in Washington addresses itself to the Soviet Union in Russian, you can readily pick up, with the right kind of shortwave apparatus, such other oddities as Spanish-language broadcasts originating in Peiping, capital of Communist China; Arabic-language broadcasts from Tel Aviv, in the State of Israel; Hebrew-language broadcasts from Cairo, Egypt; talks in French with a pure Parisian accent coming from Cologne, Germany; Indonesian from Holland, and so on.

The second point I should like to make is that no one need feel excluded from the big brainwash simply because he can't afford to own a shortwave radio. The copywriters of Agitprop, a department in the Kremlin which devotes much of its time to the business of planting subversion in the United States and elsewhere, are just as anxious as anyone else to have listeners, and so quite naturally they make it as easy as pie for Americans to tune in and be brainwashed. Thus, they are on the air daily and Sundays on a bewildering variety of wavelengths, offering a not unimpressive assortment of music, news, and commentary which reveal that the people who masterminded the transmissions were well trained for their jobs.

Once you own your set and have settled down to a quiet evening of eavesdropping, you will find that European, Asia, and even some African states are vying for your sympathetic attention and think the best way to do this is via the propaganda route, interspersed with music by Gershwin, Nat King Cole, and Elvis Presley. You will listen to Radio Sweden from Stockholm; Radio Nacional de España from Madrid; the Thai National Broadcasting Station at Bangkok; the Radio Sarawak from Broadcasting House in Kuching; and programs from a host of other cities—all bombarding you, Mr. and Mrs. Average American, with their ideas as well as their ideologies.

Thus, with our own little sputniks in the propaganda business via the unstoppable voice of radio, a conscientious listener who wants to know who is saying what may find himself hesitating before definitely identifying the source of a broadcast. Even the seasoned practitioner may find himself in difficulty, unless he has familiarized himself with the A B C of modern propaganda.

As an aid to the perplexed shortwave listener to assist in spotting instantly the subtle brainwash, in separating fact from fiction, to keep you and you and you from becoming a member of the Ananias club—I have drawn up a set of helpful suggestions which are the first, I believe, ever published. They are designed to make the battle of the ether as simple as possible to the American public, which is at one and the same time a prime target and a sideline observer of the

most decisive struggle in history and is scarcely aware of it.

LANGUAGES

As already indicated, the only language you need to know is English. If you are interested in shortwave monitoring. Of course, if you know the Russian language, you can listen to the Voice of America broadcasts, although you should be cautioned that these programs generally consist of straight news which you've probably already heard on your domestic radio program. With a mastery of English, you can listen to any of two score nations, all trying to win over the mind of America.

TUNING HOURS

The best listening time is after dark. Broadcasts are clearly audible with a good set and a radio antenna virtually any time of the day on Sundays, and during the evening on weekdays. Program schedules are obtainable from the broadcast capital of each individual country in which you are interested.

GLOSSARY OF RADIO PROPAGANDA

Aggressive bloc: Name-calling device, used by Radio Moscow and Egyptian Broadcast Service (Radio Cairo). Refers to anyone Moscow doesn't like.

Atomongers: Fell into disuse with the advent of sputnik.

Aspirations: The striving of Western nations to be liberated from the yoke of capitalism.

Baghdad Pact: Conspiracy of certain Western and Middle Eastern nations bent upon some kind of mischief not clearly defined.

Blackmail: Any action by Western (NATO) Powers taken in self-defense against the Soviet bloc.

Bourgeois rightists: Mysterious forces in the Western World conspiring to preserve the evils of capitalism against the march of utopia; phrase employed in Peiping transmissions and not heard recently from Moscow.

Bourgeois intellectuals: Misguided egg-heads who resist subversion by Kremlin propagandists.

Bulwark of defense of world peace: Soviet description of its position in world affairs—not employed in radiocasts beamed to United States or Western Europe.

Capitalist rightists: Tycoons and empire builders who would just as soon crush their wage slaves as not, all for the sake of political and territorial advantage.

Colonial adventures: Any activity involving U.S. economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

Colonial servitude: The association of any country with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Also used to describe supposed attitude of an anti-Communist-orientated nation after receiving a defense appropriation.

Creative labor: Peasants working in a collective farm. Agricultural workers in capitalist countries are referred to as "subjected peoples" and "slaves of capitalistic monopolistic exploitation."

Cultural delegation: Usually a cadre of propagandists for communism.

Democracy: Loosely used term, often employed in derision as well as in praise. Impossible to define out of context. Beware of trying to fix meaning with precision.

Eisenhower doctrine: Booby trap for unsuspecting countries in the Middle East; purpose, to perpetuate their enslavement to capitalistic imperialism.

Exploitation: Bleeding an underdog nation white by plundering its wealth; e.g., Britain's exploitation of Egypt until latter country joined Soviet bloc.

Forces of peace: Members of the "peace-loving bloc" of nations (under Moscow control).

Forces of reaction: Members of war-mongering bloc of nations (under U.S. control).

Also, those forces which drag modern man back.

Fraternal friendship and cooperation: Soviet economic and political penetration of a country not yet under Communist domination but willing to accept Russian grants and other economic aid and know-how.

Imperialist circles, imperialist cliques: Malodorous messengers of evil bent on enslaving independent nations of the world in some sort of imperial network, with general headquarters in Washington.

Landlords: Human birds of prey who, without a twinge of conscience, rob families of their sustenance for the benefit of capitalism.

Little peoples: Defenseless nations of the NATO bloc who can't do a thing about it.

"Long live world peace": Phrase employed by Kremlin inspired orators to punctuate every public speech.

Mendacious fabrications of the ideologists of colonialism: Expletives by anti-Communists.

Paper tiger: Sneering reference to America's military posture. (Used by Communist China. Not heard elsewhere since 1949).

Path of progress: The road to socialism (i.e., communism).

Peaceful coexistence: (The Big Sock in propaganda.) Phrase has been used tirelessly for the last 5 or 6 years in Moscow and in her political satellite broadcasts and is the supertrademark of all Agitprop output. Has hypnotic power over the unwary because of its appeal to peace-loving people everywhere.

Peace-loving countries: All captive nations within the Soviet orbit.

People's republics: Countries living under Communist utopia, supposedly with the people, rather than capitalist warmongers in charge.

Position of strength policy: America's naked military might, employed as a threat to support political and economic policies not in accord with Moscow's way of doing things.

Proletarian internationalism: Obscure, but generally meaning a workers' paradise in which monopoly capitalists have been obliterated.

Push-button war: Capitalist-engineered war.

Propaganda: When it comes from capitalist sources, it's propaganda. From Communist sources, "enlightenment" and "rectification."

Puppets: Tools of the monopoly capitalists. Rectification campaign: Campaign currently being waged by Communist China, to rectify deviationists; e.g., ideological non-conformists and peasants who refuse to give up their land to cooperatives.

Rightists: General category; includes capitalists, monopolists, warmongers, deviationists, and even bourgeois intellectuals.

Socialist camp: The Communist-dominated bloc; includes Communist China. No relation to socialism.

Socialist realism: Recognition of the "facts of life" by writers, artists, etc., under Soviet domination; e.g., art has to be harnessed to Moscow ideology and purposes.

Solidarity: Union against the decadent capitalist states by the "forces of freedom," i.e., Soviet utopia.

Soviet satellites: Within Soviet orbit, "satellite" means sputnik; outside, "satellites" include countries in the Soviet political orbit.

War-thirsty elements: Any country not inside the Soviet political orbit which wants to defend itself against aggression; those accepting defense armament given by Western countries.

Working class: Labor within Soviet-controlled areas; any group opposed to capitalism.

Worker-peasant state: Synonym for country which has accepted Moscow ideology.

Seaton Defies Congress in Refusing To Build Powerplant on Trinity Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, while the administration talks about balancing the budget and saving money, it is preparing to cost the Federal taxpayers money by failing to request funds for the power installation on the Trinity River project. This project is currently under construction as part of California's Central Valley project, and unless the powerhouses are started now they will not be ready to operate when the dam fills with water. Every day those powerhouses are idle, when they could be operating, will cost the taxpayers of this Nation the income from power sales, which will be substantial.

The Trinity Project Act provides for a federally built powerplant. An effort is being made to amend that act and to give approval to the so-called partnership deal whereby the power-generating facilities would be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. However, this legislation failed in the last Congress, and has less chance of being passed in this Congress. The Secretary of the Interior, in failing to request funds, is in effect telling the Congress of the United States that he does not intend to build and operate the project the way Congress authorized it. An editorial in the *Modesto Bee* of January 11, 1959, points this up very clearly. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BLOCKING TRINITY FUNDS WOULD BE IMPROVIDENT

Speaking at a convention of the California Irrigation Districts Association in Santa Barbara, Elmer F. Bennett, Undersecretary of the Department of the Interior, stated:

"The position of the Secretary of the Interior is clear. He does not propose to request funds for Federal construction of the Trinity power facilities."

He made it clear also that the Eisenhower Administration plans to continue its rear-guard fight for approval of the so-called partnership deal whereby the power generation facilities at Trinity would be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

And this notwithstanding the fact such legislation failed to budge out of committee in the last session of Congress and Bennett admits:

"In the coming year it will be even more difficult to obtain such legislation."

Seldom has a statement so inconsiderate of the public welfare been made by a high public official.

If the generators at Trinity are to be ready to turn when falling water is available, a start must be made this year on the powerplant.

Each year the construction of the plant is delayed means the loss of millions of dollars in potential revenue for the Federal Treasury from the sale of electricity.

And yet, by Bennett's admission, the Administration is willing to sacrifice this revenue to continue its fight for partnership, which he concedes has little chance to succeed.

From what Bennett says it is plain the Administration has no intention of including funds in the budget for Federal construction of the Trinity power facilities.

The Trinity Project Act provides for a federally built plant.

If the Administration, in its obeisance to the private power company, fails to carry out this mandate, then Congress on its own should make funds available and thus end this improvident nonsense.

The Views of the Supreme Court on Integration and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column appearing in the December 1958 issue of Farm and Ranch magazine signed by Tom Anderson. The article is entitled "Straight Talk" and deals with the views of the Supreme Court on integration and civil rights.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LIFERS: Just because President Roosevelt vilified the Supreme Court is no excuse for the common man to. After all, by rewriting the Constitution to suit modern life you are saving the people all the time, trouble, and expense of having to amend the Constitution.

The reactionaries who have to be pulled into the 20th century dragging their feet and clutching the Constitution to their breasts naturally can't understand you fellows. They're used to having judges on the Court. They don't realize that human values are what count today—not law—and that you Justices were appointed because of your social, economic, and political backgrounds and ambitions. How could you make America over if you were tied down to the rulings of past Courts, the laws of Congress, or that ancient Constitution?

You threw out the convictions of 14 California Communists; you ruled against firing a Government worker suspected of being a security risk; you turned loose a dope peddler because the Government agent who sold the stuff to him had to remain anonymous so he could trap other citizens; like good sports you decreed that FBI files must be opened to criminal or Communist when the contents of those files are being used to prosecute him; you ruled that past membership in the Communist Party is not a bar to the practice of law; you released three men who harbored a convicted and fugitive Communist leader because the FBI agents raided the house without a warrant; you held the Justice Department can't bar Communist activity by an alien who is under a deportation order; you destroyed the right of States to try Communists on sedition laws, saying all sedition cases must be tried by the Federal Government only. Betcha you can turn Commu-

nists loose faster'n J. Edgar Hoover can lock 'em up.

Since 1932 the Court has departed from decisions previously rendered on 35 occasions, whereas there had been only 29 such reversals in the entire history of the Court before 1932. So the recent law of the land is sorta like a movie actress' hair—whatever suits the mood and the occasion. The Constitution is your hula hoop to be played with according to your fancy.

Can't you make the States righters realize that schools and things must be federalized if we are to compete with Russian schools and things? Like the Kremlin, you must make all States under your domination conform to whatever national educational and social standards in your great wisdom you deem best for the world and us. Back when States and communities were free to run the schools any way they wanted to, they had little one-room schoolhouses where the only thing red was the schoolhouse itself and where about all they had worth having was freedom—and, of course, that's out of date now.

Let's not make the same mistake on integration and civil rights that we made on prohibition. Just because the people didn't want prohibition and it couldn't be enforced, Congress repealed it. But everybody knows people just can't drink equally, although many do separately. Separate but equal, you've ruled, is not equality. And all men are created equal as anybody who'll just look around him can plainly see. We must force togetherness in churches, parks, theaters, swimming pools, subdivisions, dancing classes, farm organizations, editorial staffs, boards of directors, garden clubs, fraternities, society pages, living rooms, and boudoirs. Twenty-four States have laws against intermarriage of whites and Negroes. Why don't you make that against the law of the land?

This head-on battle for power between the Federal and State Governments goes back to Noah. He had to bring into the ark "of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort." If he had just forced integration on the boat, we wouldn't have all this trouble now. Just think of the possibilities: A woodpecker housed with a carrier pigeon might have produced a pigeonpecker that not only would deliver a message across a continent but would knock on the door when it got there.

The racists should take a more tolerant view of racial amalgamation (they call it mongrelization). When we're like Brazil, Cuba, and Puerto Rico everybody will be the same color. For amusement, we can have white-face musicals and books like "Old Beige Joe" and "Grey Beauty." There won't be any more Sammy Davis, Jr.'s, on TV, cause there won't be any more Sammy Davis, Jr.'s. Ain't that fabulous?

Isn't it unfair that citizens in some areas of the Nation do not have an equal opportunity to really mix with their colored brothers? Would you please pass a law requiring those little exclusive commuter towns around the big eastern cities to benefit by living with, going to school with, working with, and socializing with their share of Negroes? I am sure you'll agree that it's unmodern-American to let the Negroes be discriminated against by being forced on poor whites only. The Burning Tree and Augusta National Golf Clubs, the DAR and the Junior League, Princeton and Groton must be Little Rocked.

Aren't you worried about the clear and present danger that the southern diehards might really make a go of private segregated schools? Suppose Arkansas decided to refund to each student his or her per capita share of school tax money to be used to go to the school of his choice—couldn't you make a law of the land against that? Some pupils would choose an integrated school, some a white, some a Catholic, some a

colored—what a horrible un-modern-American mess, freedom of choice.

Some people who recognize that the Supreme Court—not the Constitution—is the law of the land, say that integration is inevitable, we might as well accept it. Reactionaries say a people integrated against their will is a people unintegrated still. Abraham Lincoln said "To sin by silence when they should protest, makes cowards of men." But Abe lived a long time ago, before the Supreme Court chamber became a mixing mortar—which is a bowl in which the ingredients are broken, crushed, and ground together—with all deliberate speed.

TOM ANDERSON.

The Commuter Problem of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have heard from Mayor Thomas T. Taber, of Madison, N.J., and Mayor James M. Henderson, of Chatham, N.J., two leaders of a committee of mayors in Morris County which has been devoting a good deal of time to a study of the commuter problem in New Jersey.

I would bring to the attention of the Congress proposals developed by Mayor Taber and his committee. The program as outlined sets forth thoughtful suggestions of what might be done to preserve this indispensable service by the railroads, by government at all levels, and by an interested public.

The Newark Evening News has now commented on the efforts of the committee, applauding the industry and initiative of the mayors. The commuter problem is a matter of urgency and great importance to our people, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mayor Henderson, the suggestions of Mayor Taber and his committee, and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, suggestions, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOROUGH OF CHATHAM,

Morris County, N. J., January 6, 1959.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: As you doubtless know, the passenger service situation with the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad has rapidly worsened to the point where its president threatens discontinuance during 1959.

I know you are, and have been, actively interested in the matter and in trying to arrange some remedy so that this catastrophe would not fall upon the many thousands of commuters who use its service to and from their places of business employment.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad is currently seeking permission to discontinue 42 suburban passenger trains in New Jersey and, while it does not affect our Morristown line, in which I am most principally concerned, it does have implications or forebodings of what lies ahead with Mr. Shoemaker's threat.

A number of we mayors in Morris County have gotten together on a number of occasions and discussed all phases of the problem as well as possible solutions. The chairman of our group, Mayor Taber, of Madison, has gotten what I consider as some practical remedies on what could be done in preserving this indispensable service, and I felt that particularly those as to what Congress could do would be of pointed interest to you. Personally, I think all of the suggestions make sense, and I hope that it may be feasible to put into effect at least the most significant ones.

Your thoughts on this will be greatly appreciated as well as any other comment on what has been developed on the railroad situation in Washington.

With personal regards and all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. HENDERSON.

SUGGESTIONS FOR KEEPING NEW JERSEY RAILROADS IN THE SUBURBAN PASSENGER BUSINESS

(By Mayor Thomas T. Taber, Madison, N.J.)

Specific, practical proposals as to how to provide immediate and reasonable financial relief to New Jersey railroads, and to help them out of the "slough of despondency" in which they wallow, are now required. As endless talk continues without any constructive action resulting from it, railroads continue to take off trains, and further downgrade their passenger train service—and the end is not in sight.

There are two basic railroad problems. The immediate problem is that of keeping existing trains running without further deterioration of service, until the second, less-acute problem can be solved. This is equally important, however, since it relates to the future operations, coordination, and improvement of all railroad and other public transportation service in the metropolitan area, including the determination of how and by whom it shall be provided.

Although the Congress of the United States and the New Jersey State Legislature must provide the basic relief required, the railroads must show some interest in helping themselves and promptly divest themselves of the dubious distinction of being the world's worst merchandisers. All parties directly involved, or otherwise interested in the railroad problem share a common responsibility to do their part in achieving by cooperative effort, results which will be fair to all concerned and in the public interest. Everyone must contribute something—now—toward keeping the existing service operating.

The end of the road has been reached on fare increases, since the present fares are at their peak for the service rendered. Each time an additional increase is sought to bring in more revenue, more customers desert the railroad so the net gain in revenue is less than expected. More trains are then taken off to reduce expenses, and with poorer service more passengers leave the railroad—so a further fare increase is sought—further continuing the deadly, vicious cycle.

The suggestions which follow are "thought starters" and certainly can be improved or supplemented, but since they do provide a means for starting constructive action at all levels, they are preferable to the existing lack of specific, practical ideas.

WHAT CONGRESS COULD DO

1. Amend the Transportation Act of 1958 to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider and protect the public interest and human rights when interstate abandonments are applied for. Return responsibility for permitting intrastate abandonments of service or trackage to State regulatory bodies, which are closer to public local needs than the ICC.

2. Require a review of all abandonments of service, facilities, or trackage by the De-

partment of Defense to determine if the requested abandonment will impair national or civilian defense.

3. If national or civilian defense requires the maintenance of railroad service, equipment, or facilities, a suitable cash payment for the standby service should be made to the railroads concerned and be charged against the national defense budget.

4. Reduce all foreign railroad aid programs at least 50 percent, and make this sum available for the rehabilitation of such of our railroads as need help. So far we have given over a half billion dollars to foreign railroads, and if these railroads are important certainly ours are even more so.

5. Require the Post Office Department to use railroad service whenever practical to do so.

6. Eliminate all types of subsidies now granted to airlines, steamship, or other transportation companies, or grant equal amounts, and under the same conditions, to the railroads.

7. Merge the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Acts so that railroad contributions will be the same as those paid by other forms of transportation, instead of being double.

8. Permit railroads to provide contract, incentive, or experimental rates so that they may be better enabled to attract and compete for traffic. If a railroad wants to try lower rates, do not permit a competitor to block such action, if the proposed lower rate is expected to return a profit to the railroad.

9. Prohibit consolidations or mergers of railroads, unless it is proven that the public will benefit to a reasonable degree by such action.

10. Allocate 10 percent of the funds for the Federal roadbuilding program for low-cost long-term loans to railroads needing funds for capital improvements having an estimated minimum useful life of 20 years.

11. Repeal the wartime 10-percent tax on passenger transportation so as to encourage the use of public, instead of private, transportation.

WHAT THE STATE LEGISLATURE COULD DO

1. Immediately reduce assessments standing against all railroad property in the State by 25 percent; and then make a further reduction of 25 percent in the assessment of passenger equipment, facilities, structures, and property.

2. Levy some appropriate form of franchise, gross receipts, business, user, or other type of tax against the operations, activities, and properties of the Port of New York Authority in New Jersey, and distribute the proceeds of such tax among the counties and municipalities which would lose the most revenue through reduced railroad assessments. (There appears to be no good reason why the Port of New York Authority cannot contribute financially to the problem, since their activities and facilities have been the principal cause of the railroads' loss of passengers.)

3. Seek a new basis for railroad taxation in the State, whereby a substantial percentage of the total levied will be based on gross or net earnings within the State of New Jersey.

4. Increase the scope of activities of the rate counsel in the public utilities commission to serve as a public defender in all transportation operating matters brought before the board.

5. Prohibit issuance of all free passes for travel within New Jersey, except to bona fide railroad workers whose duties require them to travel and work over the railroad. No complimentary passes to be issued to other railroads and steamship lines, nor any pass to be used for commuting to and from work.

6. Create a nonpartisan joint transportation committee of the State legislature, to be charged with the responsibility for studying, coordinating, and improving all public pas-

senger transportation media within the State, and for working with all organized rail transportation groups.

7. Instruct the Port of New York Authority to postpone all new major projects, until the railroad transportation problems have been satisfactorily solved, and require the Port of New York Authority to do its part in achieving coordinated and improved rapid transit in the New York metropolitan area of New Jersey.

WHAT THE COUNTIES COULD DO

1. The board of chosen freeholders to create a county railroad transportation committee, made up of municipal mayors and qualified interested citizens; or designate a presently organized and efficiency-functioning group to represent the county, to serve an official watch-dog committee for the entire country. This committee should investigate, study, and report to the board of freeholders on all railroad service matters affecting the county as a whole, or any of its municipalities.

WHAT MUNICIPALITIES COULD DO

1. Encourage the greater use of railroad service, both passenger and freight.
2. Work with the railroads to improve commuter parking facilities.
3. Participate in and support the work of the county railroad transportation committee.

WHAT COMMUNITIES CAN DO

1. Write to Congressmen and State legislators urging that immediate action be taken to preserve existing railroad transportation facilities and service, as being in the public interest as well as that of national security and civilian defense. Urge friends to write such letters and do so promptly.
2. If possible to do so, commute by train instead of private car, in good weather as well as during periods when highway travel is hazardous.
3. Encourage the use of passenger-train service, and help to build up patronage, especially on the offpeak hour trains.

WHAT RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS COULD DO

1. Work with the railroads to achieve better utilization of personnel; to eliminate waste; to achieve more productivity per worker; and to eliminate unnecessary of "featherbedding" jobs.
2. Seek ways of improving service; improving public relations; raising employee morale; increasing pride in the railroad; and obtaining more traffic for the line.
3. Purchase stock of the railroad, so that there will be an added interest in it. If the employees purchased enough stock they might be able to have representation on the board of directors, and thus have a voice in the setting of policy.

WHAT THE RAILROADS COULD DO

1. Change present retrogressive policies and thinking to a constructive determination to improve the service, and build up patronage for the line. Work to divest themselves of the distinction of being the world's worst merchandisers of the service they offer for sale.
2. Establish and maintain good public and employee relations. Try to make friends for the railroad; raise employee morale, and restore pride in the line.
3. Encourage freight and passenger traffic men to seek ways and means of improving service; and give them bonuses based on the amount of new business they obtain for the railroad.

4. Subordinating the operating department to the traffic department. Require the operating department to furnish service as requested by traffic—which then has the responsibility of making it pay. Require prior approval of traffic department before operating department can downgrade or eliminate any service, equipment, or facilities. Devote the same amount of time and effort to the

acquisition of new business as is devoted to the cutting of expenses.

5. Confer periodically with county railroad transportation committees, or other recognized organizations interested in the subject, and always before initiating any formal action which could have a deleterious effect on the service to any municipality. Seek, consider, and try to adopt all good practical constructive suggestions, and regardless of the source of such suggestions.

6. Try to improve and build up traffic through coordination with bus lines, Newark city subway, etc., in an effort to have such services complement, rather than compete with, the railroad service.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Jan. 12, 1959]

MAYOR TABER'S PLAN

Mayor Taber, of Madison, has offered 34 suggestions which he thinks would help preserve railroad commuter service in New Jersey.

They would require action by Federal, State, county, and municipal governments, by the railroads themselves, the railroad brotherhoods and the commuters. They embrace tax relief and subsidy, more progressive management, more labor productivity and better coordination of public transport.

Some of Mayor Taber's proposals are practicable, some are debatable. He would tax the facilities of the Port of New York Authority to compensate for railroad tax reduction. This would be like taxing the New Jersey Turnpike or the Brooklyn Bridge. He would use 10 percent of the Federal highway fund for railroad improvement loans. This fund is being raised by a gasoline tax on motor vehicle owners, who will find it hard to understand why they should help subsidize those who prefer to travel by rail.

But to pursue a critical analysis of Mayor Taber's program would be to obscure its valid claim to consideration. It represents a thoughtful official's earnest effort to stimulate interest in a critical situation and it accurately describes the dimensions of the problem.

Mayor Taber makes a modest presentation. He refers to his suggestions only as "thought starters" and offers them as a basis for continuing constructive action.

On this basis, his plan deserves attention. The more people who start worrying about what is happening to local railroad service, the sooner we can hope for a solution.

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock entitled "A New Campaign Against a Tough Foe," appearing in the January 13 issue of the New York Times.

Mr. Krock, taking note of the President's expressed determination to halt the rising cycle of inflation, writes most penetratingly of the difficulties involved and candidly outlines the problems which must be met if inflation is to be halted. Mr. Krock echoes the point I have been making for some time that the

inflationary pressures of unbalanced budgets and deficit spending must be brought home to people by examples related to the family budget. The stability of our dollar, now viewed with some concern by leading economists, depends on a public awakening to fiscal problems and the dangers of inflation.

Mr. Krock has performed a distinct public service in his clear analysis, and his article should be distributed as widely as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CAMPAIGN AGAINST A TOUGH FOE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The forecast that the President had decided to engage in house-to-house fighting against the rising cycle of inflation began as a reliable report in the press, is now semiofficial and may become official when the President speaks Wednesday to the National Press Club. But experience must now have proved to the General that a commando tactic is necessary if he is to turn the tide against the principal, enduring threat to national solvency and the stability of the dollar.

It is predicted that the President will attempt to impress this threat upon the people by homely household examples of increases in the cost of living that have followed rising costs of production. These are statistics, readily available in Government reports, which cannot be successfully assailed as politically partisan or slanted to promote the interest of special economic groups. They are well supported by analyses from private sources of equally good reputation. They have been reflected in the budgets of every individual American. If there is any method by which the people can be roused from their apathy toward unbalanced Government budgets and the endless upward cycle of production costs, this is the method. And only the President can furnish the necessary leadership.

But he cannot win this most difficult of his battles unless he strikes at his targets with the force and the constancy he employed in the military field. Special groups already are massed against him, and these are fortified by economists of great diversionary skill and by Members of Congress who are debtors to these groups for support at the polls. And because of the national doubt raised by sincere and informed critics that the President can balance the national budget without sacrificing an adequate defense, he must persuade the public he can.

He will be required to assert all his personal prestige and the unmatched prestige of his great office to accomplish the task he is reported now to have undertaken with a resolution he had not shown on some other occasions. And his cause cannot be won merely by illustrations of inflation that citizens can plainly recognize in their own economic experience.

WHAT CANNOT BE DENIED

The labor unions, their economists and their political allies deny that the unending cycle of wage increases is a root cause of the steady increases in the cost of living. But they cannot deny that constant rises have been contemporaneous in the cost of the services, rents, and food which take the largest slices of personal earnings. If this time relation can be demonstrated by facts of common experience, the burden of proof will fall on those who contend that it is a mere coincidence, the product of other causes. People who live in every street and on every country lane in the United States have had word to the contrary from the mechanic, the grocer, the butcher, etc. Each

has explained his markup was due to higher costs of the producer (both of raw and fabricated materials), who in these instances has just had his own costs increased by rises in the pay of his labor.

Responsive to this same trend, the Federal Government has intensified its search for tax revenues, and maintains high tax levels because it is the largest buyer in the market and its expenses have gone up accordingly.

If the President plans, as some have forecast, to show how inexorably this inflation takes effect on the household budget, he can easily make the demonstration. But to arrest inflation he will have to specify the causes, with evidence that will bring popular support for correctives he may have in mind. And this would mean open political warfare against strong forces entrenched in politics and in the economy: labor unions which use their special legal immunities, and picket lines aided by deliberately lax enforcers of law and order, to compel employer submission in so-called collective bargaining; employers who make "sweetheart" contracts and pass the unwarranted increases on to the public; legislative wasters and the same breed in the executive establishment.

Also, in the anti-inflationary steps he proposes, the President must convince the people that he knows best what is required for the maximum military security obtainable and will provide it.

St. George never fought a fiercer dragon with more heads. But St. George's swing had followthrough.

Fallacies, Foibles, and Failures in the Halls of the Mighty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the economic fallacies, foibles, and failures of those in the seats of power in America were brilliantly dissected at the recent annual meeting of the American Economic Association, in Chicago, late last month. Yesterday, Mr. Bernard Nossiter, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, wrote a revealing and entertaining comment on what some of the top professional economists think of what has been going on in the halls of the mighty in America. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Heresy in Economics" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERESY IN ECONOMICS—LACK OF REVERENCE APPEARS GENERAL

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

If President Eisenhower, Budget Director Maurice H. Stans, Commerce Secretary Lewis L. Strauss, and Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson had gone to Chicago over Christmas week, they would have been mighty upset.

For there, the American Economic Association held its annual meeting. And this normally sedate academic body found heresy running rampant in the ranks. As Prof. Ben W. Lewis, of Oberlin College observed in a paper, "Recent years have witnessed the display of some questionable manners toward persons in High Places."

The capitalization is the professor's own. He was talking about the economic behavior of the citizenry—"When in due course we are admonished in the name of our way of life to stem the flood of inflation by spending less than we want to spend, we wave our checkbooks; and when we are admonished to break the bonds of recession by spending more than we are inclined to spend, we sit on our hands. All of this is very disrespectful to those in high places and may very well lead to dire consequences."

But his comments about a lack of reverence were equally applicable to his fellow salesmen.

For example, Robert J. Lampman of the respectable National Bureau of Economic Research was making statistical hash out of the "People's capitalism" idea. His complicated tables boiled down to findings that—

In 1953 the wealthiest 1 percent of the population owned about 30 percent of all wealth, at least 90 percent of all common stocks and virtually all State and local government and corporate bonds.

The richest group increased its share of all stocks from 70 percent in 1949, 53 percent in 1929, and 61 percent in 1922. However, the top group's holdings of all assets did decrease some from 1922, thanks to the widespread ownership of consumer goods (like TV's, autos, refrigerators and the like).

John Blair, the iconoclastic thinker for the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, was almost as disturbing. He concluded that no matter what, prices in the big concentrated industries (oil, steel, autos, aluminum and others) go up.

In depression, Blair figured, the producers cut output and hold prices steady because they figure a reduction won't generate enough offsetting extra demand; in prosperity, they go up for obvious reasons, although not as much as in highly competitive industries; in between times, like now, when plants are running well under capacity they still go up.

This, Blair contends, results from: a cost push by big unions seeking higher wages; the rising costs of nonprice competition (money spent on advertising to make similarly priced products seem different and model changeovers to make similarly priced items actually different); the drive by industrial giants like General Motors and United States Steel to earn a "target" rate of return on their investment (so that when demand falls, prices have to be increased to hit the "target" with a smaller output); and the fear by the lesser giants—Ford, Bethlehem—that if they don't raise prices to meet the leaders, the leaders will drop back to meet them and nobody will win.

Another Professor Lewis, John P. of Indiana University, said this is nothing to get very upset about.

"We are not wrestling with sin," the professor said, but "a plodding inflation" that stems from the nature of our economic institutions. He is much worried about the concentrations of power that are flowing to giant companies and unions. He wants some device to make their wage and price decisions more accountable to the general public.

The antitrust approach, he concludes, is a waste of time. He suggests some form of Government intervention before the key price-wage decisions are made. Lewis (John P.) warns against Government's trying direct orders, since the producer groups are political as well as economic power centers and the Government is in some respects an agent confronting its political superiors.

Lewis (Ben W.) also takes a dim view of antitrust, or making little ones out of big ones, as politically absurd and historically fantastic. "Bigness is here to stay," he observes, and we are being taught to love it.

He says this of the large corporations: "Tutored by its attorneys, bathed, barbered

and cosmeticized by Madison Avenue, nourished and sanctified by war and cold war, and enthroned by public opinion, which sees only 'goodness' in bigness that is well mannered and well behaved, bigness exhibits the supreme confidence and gracious assurance that bespeak stature, status, and a clear conscience. Bigness was once the bad boy in Sunday school; now it sits in the vestry. It may not yet have acquired a full-sized soul, but the contract has been let and the press has been alerted."

The trouble with these fellows, an orthodox economist might say, is that they don't tend to their knitting. They are squeezing political science, sociology, psychology, empiricism, and all kinds of alien thought into what used to be a nice, specialized little discipline. In the good old days, our man might say, economists talked only to economists and nobody else either listened or understood what they were saying.

Asians Lead Among Foreign Students in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the 1957-58 academic year there were 43,391 foreign students pursuing courses of education in United States colleges and universities among whom the greatest number were from the Far East. This number contrasts with the 1,099 students from the non-Communist world who are now studying in the Soviet Union and other nations of the Communist bloc. While the figure for the United States is the largest number in our history, the Soviet bloc can advance a similar boast, having doubled the number of free-world students from the previous year. The greater part of this increase is in students from underdeveloped areas. This is indeed a war for men's minds in which the Soviets are bending every effort.

It is also of interest that today there are 22 Americans studying in the U.S.S.R. while 17 Soviet citizens are in U.S. universities.

As the students of today are the leaders of tomorrow, it is encouraging to note the large proportion of young people from the Far East enjoying an American education. These students are following in the steps of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Kwame Nkrumah, all of whom received American education.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the September 16, 1958, issue of the Asian Student detailing the facts concerning the great number of young people from the Far East studying here. It tells an important story of our efforts in preserving the spirit of freedom and free institutions throughout the world:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAR EAST SENT MOST STUDENTS IN 1957-8

During the past academic year a total of 43,391 foreign students—the largest number in history—were studying in the United States and the greatest number of these came from the Far East, according to a report of the Institute of International Education. The previous record was 40,666 in the 1956-57 academic year.

These 43,391 students and scholars attending 1,801 schools were from 145 countries and territories.

By individual countries, Canada led the group with 5,271 students. Among the top 10 countries sending students to U.S. schools, Nationalist China was second with 3,230, India third with 2,589, Korea fourth with 2,404, Japan fifth with 2,017, and the Philippines sixth with 1,832.

TOP 10 COUNTRIES

The rest of the top 10 were Iran, 7th, 1,473; Greece, 8th, 1,157; Cuba, 9th, 1,046; and the United Kingdom, 10th, 982.

Setting a record for the same year was also the number of physicians studying in the United States, with 7,622 compared to 6,741 of the previous year. The Philippines headed the list with 1,598 medical students, Turkey was second with 587, followed by Canada, 535; Mexico, 500; Germany, 319; Korea, 313; Greece, 289; Iran, 279; Japan, 275; and Italy, 230.

An analysis of the IIE report shows that the typical foreign student in the United States in the year 1957-58 was from the Far East and was more likely to be an engineering major than anything else. The number of engineering students was largest with 4,881, followed by that of the social sciences majors with 2,289.

MEN OUTNUMBER WOMEN

Men students from foreign countries outnumbered women 3 to 1. An exception was the Philippines which sent more women than men to U.S. schools.

Among the American institutions, the University of California had the largest foreign student population (1,662), the largest number of foreign faculty members on its staff (129), and the largest number of its own faculty abroad (173).

OWN FUNDS

The IIE report also shows that most of the foreign students last year studied in the United States on their own funds, not on scholarships.

When they were asked for the first time if they would be interested in employment after graduation with an overseas branch of a U.S. corporation, more than 35 percent of the foreign students said they would. Almost half of these were engineering majors and approximately a third were from the Far East.

Boys Work To Improve Themselves and Their Community in Red Cross Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, young people traditionally form clubs—usually centered around a packing box clubhouse and often lasting for only a week or two, with no particular purpose.

There are, however, some young people organizations which constructively

channel the energy and enthusiasm of youngsters into activities which benefit both the participants and the community. To name a few, there are the Boy and Girl Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, Campfire Girls, Junior Achievement, 4-H clubs, groups sponsored by various churches and civic organizations, and several others.

The activities of seven young men, ranging in age from 7 to 11, in Corpus Christi, Tex., illustrate how a great many of our Nation's young people are seriously working at ways to improve both themselves and their community.

They formed a club, but it had a definite purpose—work with first aid and safety. Under the guidance of wise and understanding parents such as Dr. Charles D. Dixon and Mrs. A. S. Jones, and with the help of other interested adult leaders such as Mrs. Martina Florey of the American Red Cross, the boys began last summer to seriously study first aid and to work in behalf of safety. They have been at it ever since.

Their activities recently came to the attention of a Corpus Christi newspaper reporter, Miss Margaret Ramage, who is noted for her interest in and support of young people's activities.

Mr. President, as a mark of respect and esteem for these fine young men, their parents and leaders, and for all such young people's organizations who labor to improve our Nation's youth, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Miss Ramage's article on Red Cross Patrol 1, which appeared in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, January 11, 1959, under the heading: "Seven Boys Make Serious Business of Rescue Work."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RED CROSS PATROL 1—SEVEN BOYS MAKE
SERIOUS BUSINESS OF RESCUE WORK**
(By Margaret Ramage)

One of the busiest first-aid stations in town is located at 6050 Rio Vista.

There seven members of Red Cross Patrol 1 study and demonstrate first-aid procedures during after-school hours on week ends and vacations.

When near disaster struck in the form of a late December rainstorm, Patrol 1 was on hand to direct traffic on South Alameda.

Commanding this station are seven boys who are active members of the Junior Red Cross at Montclair School. They range in age from 7 to 11.

Headquarters is located at the home of the president, Bobby Dixon, 11, and his brothers, Tommy, 8, and Chalmers (Chuckie), 7.

Vice president is Armond (Doc) Jones, and secretary is Mike Lee, 10. Other members are Scotty Thompson and Joe McComb, both 11.

FATHER IS DOCTOR

Fortunately, the Dixon boys' father is Dr. Charles D. Dixon, medical director at Reynolds Metals Corp. This gives the headquarters a larger than usual amount of first-aid supplies.

The boys have a supply table stocked with bandages, tongue-depressors, cotton and other items, plus a stethoscope and other larger pieces of apparatus.

Later Dr. Dixon added an oxygen tank and showed the boys how it works.

Most of their other equipment came from Mrs. Martina Florey, director of the Junior Red Cross, at the Red Cross office, 1116 Laredo.

The youngsters actually started "on a shoestring," or on one bandage, as a Dixon boy explained.

It was after Little League season ended. Midsummer days were long. Then one of the Dixons cut a finger.

The doctor-father bound up the finger, to the intent interest of the patient's brothers and the neighborhood ex-little leaguers.

ASKED FOR SUPPLIES

Within a few days the boys composed a long letter to the Junior Red Cross, expressing their interest in first aid and asking for Red Cross supplies.

"It was only natural," casually explains Doc Jones, pointing out that all patrol 1 members gained initial experience in school.

Doc is Montclair representative to the elementary chapterwide council. Mike is vice president of the Montclair Junior Red Cross chapter.

The downtown office immediately dispatched first-aid books, badges, posters, and some equipment.

Next came purchase of war surplus Red Cross helmets.

Mrs. A. S. Jones, Doc's mother, made the boys a large flag. ("The red satin came from my sister's sash," confided Doc.)

All of the equipment and supplies were arranged in a small aluminum house in the backyard, formerly used as a playroom.

Sometimes the sessions are moved into the small apartment which the three Dixon members and their older brother, Jimmy, 15, share at one end of the main house, which is in a wooded area at the end of Rio Vista.

When Dr. Dixon saw that Red Cross Patrol 1 appeared to be a stable organization, he started contributing medical supplies.

STRICT ORDER OF BUSINESS

The order of business is strict. One patrol member reads aloud a lesson from the first-aid book, such as treatment for shock.

After a period for study, they put the lesson into practical demonstration, by role playing.

One member is the victim, while another finds his pulse and ascertains if his forehead, nose and chin are pale. He is stretched out and pillows placed beneath him, so that his head may be lowered.

If it is cold weather, a blanket is placed over the patient, in warmer weather, under him.

Red Cross Patrol 1 hopes to continue its work indefinitely. During the holidays members distributed safety posters to nearby stores and plan to help out where necessary and possible throughout 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND THEY ALL GET OFF

Abram Flaxer, once head of a Government employees' union booted out of the CIO for being pro-Communist and one of a series of witnesses who took the fifth amendment rather than deny or affirm questions as to his Communist activity, has been acquitted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Flaxer had been convicted of contempt of a House committee for refusing to produce records under subpoena. The High Court once sent his case back for a second look, but the lower courts again upheld the conviction.

And Monday the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled out fingerprints as evidence in a robbery case because the man who was tried and convicted by a jury had been arrested and fingerprinted without just cause.

In another case, the High Court, with only Justice Tom Clark dissenting, held that it is only one crime if a man shoots once and wounds two persons. Suppose he killed them both. With two dead bodies, would there be only one homicide?

We are not disposed to nit-pick these or numerous other related cases of recent months. Although, these judgments offer ample opportunity for criticism.

What is disturbing is the trend of court decrees in criminal and subversive cases. A rapist was freed, after conviction by a jury, because the court thought he had been detained too long before arraignment. Leftists in several contempt of Congress cases have been excused on the theory they didn't understand the purpose of congressional investigations.

It seems to us that in cases of this type the chief question is the question of guilt. In most of these decisions guilt has been an incidental issue. Technical questions of procedure have prevailed.

Convictions have been upset because smart and persistent lawyers have been able to pick flaws in the process, not necessarily in the evidence. Which makes us think something is amiss somewhere—and it ought to be corrected.

Defendants are entitled to every protection against rigged or unfounded prosecution. But the public is entitled to protection from the guilty, too.

Item Veto Power Is Desirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for many years the Presidents of the United States have been seeking the item veto power from Congress. President Eisenhower again asked for such power in his recent message before both Houses of Congress, but, in view of more newsworthy statements by the President, this request received little mention in the newspapers.

In South Carolina, the Governor does have the authority to veto separate items in bills. During my term as Governor, I found it most helpful to veto certain items in bills which otherwise were considered sound pieces of legislation. As a result of this experience, I feel that we

Effect of Recent Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, December 17, 1958. In this editorial some very timely comments are made upon the effect of recent court decisions.

should take some action to carry out President Eisenhower's recommendation for the item veto.

An outstanding summation of my sentiments is presented by the editor of the Greenville News in an editorial published in the January 15 edition of that publication. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Item Veto Power Is Desirable," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM-VETO POWER IS MOST DESIRABLE

In his annual state of the Union message, President Eisenhower again asked Congress to give the Chief Executive the power to veto individual and separate items in bills presented to him for signing into law or rejection according to the constitutional procedure.

It attracted far less attention than it deserves.

Especially with respect to the matter of balancing the budget and keeping Federal spending in line with actual needs, this could easily be the most important suggestion the President made to Congress. It would work this way:

Under the present law, the President must either accept or reject in their entirety bills passed by Congress. He cannot by the exercise of the veto, correct mistakes or eliminate appropriations which even Congress itself, on second thought, may recognize or find unnecessary or undesirable.

If he finds a single item completely obnoxious or unacceptable, he must veto the whole bill. Congress can either override the veto by a two-thirds vote, or start over and draft and enact a new bill.

Unfortunately, the bills most often laden with improper appropriations and provisions are enacted too late in the sessions for this kind of action to be taken.

Granting of the so-called item-veto power would make it possible for the President to reject undesirable portions of certain bills without jeopardizing matter that both he and the majority of Congress consider sound and desirable.

Again we note that the Governor of South Carolina has the item-veto power, and every Governor holding office in our time has used it with good effect and, more often than not, to the liking of both the public and a majority of the members of the general assembly. It has happened many times that members of the general assembly actually have asked the Governor to veto certain items which, on reflection, they themselves had decided were unwise.

The item veto power in the hands of the President would be especially valuable in dealing with appropriations bills. Take the annual rivers and harbors bill, for instance. This is the traditional and often rather smelly "pork barrel bill" in which logrolling Senators and Representatives make their grabs for "projects" for their people back home at the public expense. These bills, of course, provide for necessary functions and for creating essential projects. But they also contain much matter that should be eliminated in the public interest.

With the item veto power, the President could cull out the unnecessary and foolish from the necessary and wise. In most instances it would meet with congressional approval, for members of Congress often vote for things for political reasons that they know are not proper. In many such instances they would be glad to see a veto of such items upheld.

Mr. Eisenhower has suggested before that Congress grant the item veto power. Mr. Truman did so before him, and so did the

late Mr. Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, if the President in his day had been able to exercise the item veto, the famous split between Mr. Roosevelt and the late Senator and Vice President Alben Barkley probably could have been avoided.

During the war years, Mr. Roosevelt rejected in its entirety an appropriations bill because he could not approve certain portions of it. He sent it back with a blistering veto message. Mr. Barkley became very angry, and the process of orderly Government suffered in a time of crisis.

Congress can grant the item veto power. It should do so without delay—although it is most unlikely that a Democratic Congress will place such a tool in the hands of a Republican President.

Light in the Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the blind do not possess sight they do possess vision. The Sunday New York Times of January 4, 1959, carried a touching interview with a 12-year-old blind child. As the boy cannot see color, he cannot comprehend the barriers men erect on account of color. Being sightless, he appreciates the worth of seeing; however, he places one attribute even higher—understanding. I commend the article to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT IN DARKNESS—12-YEAR-OLD BOY BLIND SINCE HIS BIRTH, WISHES MOST FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

On occasion profound lessons come from unusual sources.

The following is a verbatim transcription of a therapeutic interview with a blind child. The child was not allowed to continue in school because he was said to be out of touch with reality.

This is a record the patient did not know was being taken—the pure, stark expression of a brilliant soul struggling to find itself.

Here is what the therapist says of the patient:

"Bob is 12 years old. He has been blind since birth. He is a bright boy, eagerly interested in the wonders of the world around him—a world that he has experienced in his own way, but has never seen. He is interested in science—especially electronics. He reads everything he can get under his curious fingertips. Bob has great potential. He is sensitive, intellectually gifted far beyond his years—and he desperately wants to find his place in the world."

In Bob's own words, here are some of the things he wonders about and believes in:

"There are so many things in this world that people could all reach out and touch and keep a part of them for their very own and spread it around for everyone. Not money—because money is only good for what it can do—only good if it is used to help. But people could reach out for kindness and fair play—and could spread it around for others."

"I've heard on the radio all this talk about integration in the schools. To give all children a chance to go to school together. And there seems to be such a fuss about it because some of the children are different. And I can't understand at all what this great difference is."

"They say it's their color. And what is color? I guess I am lucky that I cannot see differences in color because it seems to me that the kind of hate these people put in their minds must chase out all chance to grow in understanding."

SENSE OF DIRECTION

Another time he had this to say: "I noticed the other day when I had an earache and had cotton in one of my ears, that I was always veering to one side and bumping into the wall. I had not realized before how much I depend on my hearing—the sound of my step, the bounceback of the sound, to keep me in time with my sense of direction."

"Then, another time, I was walking down the hall and I passed a door and inside that other room was a lot of noise. So much noise that I lost all my cues—and I lost completely my sense of direction."

"It was an awful bottomless feeling. Afraid I'd bump into something. You never know whether you are going toward good things or toward trouble. Because you never know right off if it is something you like and need and want. Or something that is just in the way."

"That is why I would not kick it or blame it, or shove it aside. I would not make up my mind ahead of time, because if I did I could be so very wrong. I could destroy something that might be one of the most important and valuable aids to me. Destroy it in ignorance. Without giving either it or me a chance. That's like prejudice."

Another time he talked about the problems of keeping a sense of direction:

"I walked down the path toward the woods by the school. And all of a sudden a dog and another boy rushed by. They threw a branch of a tree in front of me. I was startled and I jumped back and fell into some bushes. When I untangled myself and got up on my feet I couldn't find the path. I couldn't tell which direction was which. I couldn't hear any telltale sounds as a guide."

"I called. Nobody answered. I was surrounded by silence and confusion. Then after a lot of trying and a lot of falls and scratches and bumps into the bushes, I heard the chimes on the old church, that is north of the school. I knew then where I was. And I got back all right. But—that awful feeling of not knowing where I was, which way to turn, which way to go. It was a terrible feeling."

REMEMBERS CAMPANELLA

"And suddenly I thought of Campy (Roy Campanella, former Brooklyn Dodger catcher). All of a sudden he finds himself paralyzed. All his life suddenly has to change. He can't turn around any more. He can't even walk."

"I asked myself would I rather be blind like I am or would I rather be flat on my back and paralyzed like Campy. I thought about it for a long, long time. I thought of how I felt when I fell in the bushes and couldn't tell where I was. I thought of the panicky fear when I didn't know which way to turn. I was asking myself which was worse. I always said there wasn't anything worse than being blind. Then I thought of Campy again."

"He had been a great ballplayer, one of the greatest. Now all of a sudden that was over. What was he thinking about now? Probably wondering what he would do now. Probably wondering which way he would turn. And I decided the worst thing that

can happen to a person isn't being blind or being paralyzed. The worst thing is to lose all sense of direction in your life. And feel that you haven't got anyplace to go."

Bob talked about his blindness one day. "I have often wondered what it must be like to see. I have never seen light. But if I have darkness around me all the time, I must learn to know that darkness. I think I do know it very well. Sometimes as a friend. Sometimes as an enemy."

"But then it isn't the darkness that I should blame. Because darkness can be either friend or enemy. If wishes could come true, I'd wish I could see. But if I only had one wish, I wouldn't waste it on wishing I could see. I'd wish instead that everybody could understand one another and how a person feels inside."

While endless debates go on in high places and political jockeying for position is the order of the day, here is the simple solution to the basic problem this confused strife-worn world faces in this new year.

Resolution Adopted by Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware at a meeting on Pulaski Day, October 12, 1958.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent, are assembled at Pulaski Park, this 12th day of October A.D. 1958, under the auspices of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and of the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress, to commemorate on this 179th anniversary the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who gave his valor, courage, and his life to the American cause for liberty and independence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski did not sacrifice his life in vain. Our founders had given a new order to the world based upon the principle that all rights came from God and were vested in the individual; that governments among men derived just powers from the consent of the governed, and that the importance of each person was over and above the importance of the state.

Whereas the great tragedy of today is that Poland and other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Central Eastern Europe were traditionally the most persistent enemies of communism and the most faithful friends of the United States; and

Whereas the record of our betrayal at Yalta, Teheran, and Geneva for hiding the facts on the Katyn Forest massacre, for permitting ourselves to be part of the betrayal of Korea, for neglecting our own troops and citizens in the dark prisons of Red China, Soviet Russia, and their captive nations, for our many sinful compromises with godless Russia, the darkest pages in our Nation's history is written; and

Whereas more than 100 years ago, the British historian, Lord Macaulay, predicted that the United States would collapse because of weaknesses and evils allowed to develop within it. His dire prophecy: "Your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid to waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th: with this difference, that the enemies that ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your enemies will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions"; and

Whereas the apathy, indifference, and inner decoy, fostered by self-interest, a passion for soft living and neglect of the individual responsibility has opened the way to well-financed selfish minorities, pressure groups, and unscrupulous political machines dominating our Government's systems. These groups are responsible for the present situation of confusion, tension, discontent, and discord throughout our country, endangering our unity, creating differences among the American people, who are being exploited by the advocates of socialism, internationalism, and world government, and by the Communists and their followers, to lose faith in our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and in the essential wisdom of freedom; and

Whereas we who are assembled this day are greatly concerned with:

1. Recent decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court. These decisions have more than once made it harder and harder to cope with the underground activities of the Communist Party in the United States. Avowed Communists have been freed, the powers of Congress to investigate communism have been limited, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been forced to abandon prosecution of many cases, the law passed to deal with the communistic conspiracy has been rendered harmless. We have a right to ask whether these interpretations and decisions are in accord with the traditional American constitutional principle, that our Government is one of law and not of men.

2. Reverence for truth is giving way to compromise and expediency, even among those who should be guardians of the truth.

3. Our Government's concern is directed to communism abroad. It is time for our Government to concern itself about the communism here at home.

4. The American people's minds are being molded to believe that patriotism and national independence are bad words that should be systematically discredited.

5. Our Nation is presently confronted by the deadliest, most powerful, and ruthless enemy in its history, an enemy whom we have purposely made strong at a time when the leadership of our Nation was at its weakest.

6. Our Nation has lost its way because we have failed to fulfill our sacred duties as custodians of a great Christian heritage. We have tolerated crime and wrong doing. We have ignored numerous acts of treason. We have let ourselves rot and fall apart on the basic eternal truths.

Therefore, we, Americans of Polish descent assembled this day to honor and to pay respect to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, on this 179th anniversary of his death, pledge to become more vigilant in guarding our priceless heritage left to us by the first Poles that came to this country 350 years ago, by General Pulaski, Kosciuszko, Krzyzanowski and by thousands of others of our ancestry, to uphold the Government under the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and our American way of life: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That to remain silent in the face of present dangers is to enhance communism and to lose our liberty. If we are to

survive as a free people, we must reaffirm our loyalty to American traditions, institutions, fundamental principles, and upon a great profession of faith in God. We must reject the ideology of collectivism, the welfare state, and all forms of world government. Our sacred responsibility is to fight against communism in our country. Therein lies our salvation in any and every emergency: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, Delaware's Representatives in the United States Congress, Governor of the State of Delaware, president of the Wilmington City Council.

CASIMIR CHETKOWSKI,
Chairman.

Attest:

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

Appointment of Roger W. Jones as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to go on record as saying that the appointment of Roger W. Jones as the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission is a tremendous step in the direction of a strengthened Federal service and Government.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Jones on occasions in the past and can say that his ability to cope with problems is exceptional.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the January 16 edition of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Appointment of Jones To Head CSC Hailed."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPOINTMENT OF JONES TO HEAD CSC HAILED

(By Joseph Young)

Federal employee leaders and key Members of Congress alike are hailing the appointment of Careerman Roger W. Jones as the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

They feel it will bring new strength and prestige of the Commission, the entire Federal service and Government employees generally.

The formal nomination of Mr. Jones, whose selection was first disclosed in this column, is expected to be sent to the Senate early next week by President Eisenhower. Mr. Jones' confirmation is regarded as a certainty. He presently is Deputy Budget Director.

Mr. Jones, 50, will succeed Harris Ellsworth, who leaves March 1 to return to his business interests in Oregon. Mr. Ellsworth did a god job as Chairman under difficult circumstances.

However, Mr. Jones' appointment is expected to bring a new era to the CSC and Government personnel administration generally. As a long-time Federal career official who has devoted considerable time to personnel matters, Mr. Jones has definite ideas

for revising Government personnel policies and operations.

Perhaps the best indications of Mr. Jones' ability is that he has served with distinction in important jobs under three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower—and has won the coveted National Civil Service League award as one of the top civil service careerists in Government and the President's award last year for distinguished civilian service.

A registered Republican, Mr. Jones, of course, as a career employee, has never taken an active part in politics.

The Revolutionary Farm Upsurge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it can be said that "America's business is business"; it can also be added that America's business is also agriculture. The past year has been one of record crop production while there has been a diminution of farm acreage thus making for an unprecedented high yield per acre. In addition, per capita farm income is at an alltime high of \$1,020. The article from the January 12 New York Times surveys the 20th century revolution in farming, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMING UPSURGE IS REVOLUTIONARY—11 PERCENT RISE IN OUTPUT LAID TO MORE EFFICIENCY AND RAIN IN DRY AREAS

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON.—"Crop Production, 1958 Annual Summary, Acreage, Yield, Production by States by American Farmers. Compiled by the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Services, Crop Reporting Board. Free."

This 107-page document is filled with statistics. Except for six pages of summary it consists of long, detailed tables. The index starts with apples and ends with wheat. It covers every State. It is not impressively printed, being mimeographed without an illustration.

Yet it tells one of the great stories of this or any age. As the Crop Board said, in what seems to be an understatement, farm production registered a surprising surge in a single year, a gain of 11 percent above the record highs of 1948 and 1957.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE MILLION ACRES HARVESTED

The index of yield an acre for 59 crops reported in the annual summary reached 143.1 on the basis of 1947-49 as 100. This was surprisingly higher than the record of 127 set in 1957, the Department said.

It was the fifth successive year in which the index had moved to a new high. The 1958 index also compared with 124 in 1956, 118.6 in 1955, and 109.2 in 1954. In 1929 the index was 84.

This surge came on the smallest acreage planted since 1918, an unusually high percentage of which was harvested. The total area harvested, 321 million acres, was slightly larger than that of 1957 and 1956 and, ex-

cept for those 2 years, was the smallest since 1936.

The last year brought other important developments. The cattle cycle was cut to 2 years. Traditionally, it had been 3 years. The rebuilding of cattle herds began with the end of the drought, which gripped western cattle States for more than 5 years. Grazing land came back strong under some of the best growing conditions in years.

Historically, it has taken 3 years to reverse the downward trend in cattle, after a drought or other disaster reduces breeding stock. But this time pastures and grazing lands came back fast and the decline was reversed in 2 years. A part of this was attributed to increased efficiency in handling, breeding, and growing of livestock.

Agriculture demonstrated in 1958 that it was in one of the great revolutions of our time, as many politicians told farmers during the congressional campaign.

To some observers, 1958 forecast a new breed of farmers, as yields increased under the impetus of better seeds and expanding knowledge of cultivation methods. The family farm is not likely to disappear, but the families on farms will be experts in production and management.

In 1958, farm profits climbed about 20 percent, a healthy gain after the drop in 1957, but the prospect for 1959 is a slide of 5 to 10 percent as new surpluses mount. The indicated net income for 1958 is about \$13 billion for the farm community, compared with \$10,800 million in 1957. Cash receipts from marketing last year were \$33 billion, a gain of about 12 percent.

For the first time, the average per capita income appeared to be above \$1,000, probably about \$1,020. Economists reported this was an important gain in the sense that it came from marketings, rather than from a decrease in the farm population, which rose slightly last year after drastic losses in the last decade.

However, the cost-price squeeze on farmers continued, and they stepped up their use of credit, as they should in 1959. This resulted from higher costs of production and increased investments in machinery.

Large yields were reported by the crop board. Corn, the major raw material for meat, milk and other dairy products, climbed even more last year than it did in 1957, when yields soared. The national corn average rose to about 52 bushels an acre, more than 4½ bushels above 1957's adjusted figure of about 47 bushels.

Wheat shot up to 27.3 bushels an acre, 5.6 bushels more than 1957 and nearly 10 bushels more to the acre than in the decade from 1947 to 1956.

The country's most serious surplus problem is in wheat. With this year's harvest, the Nation has sufficient wheat on hand to fill all domestic and export needs for the next 2 years without any further production.

The administration and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson attributed the glut to outmoded, unrealistic Federal price support and control programs in which the Government has \$2,210,389,619 invested. And this year's bumper output will add to the problem.

Mr. Benson's view has gained wide support but the annual crop summary also tells the story of a farm-productivity revolution, resulting from better seeds, better ways of making the seeds produce and better machinery.

A measure of the surplus problem may be seen in the percentage of production to which Federal price supports were extended in the last fiscal year through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the price support agency.

For example, price supports in the fiscal year ended last June 30, were extended to 52 percent of grain sorghum production; 32 percent of the cotton output; 27 percent of the wheat production, 33 percent of rye

grown, 19 percent of soybeans, and 10 percent of corn.

The administration hopes to hold the line on farm spending, which last year pushed the agriculture budget to a record total of \$6,400 million, but budget revisions in January are expected to push it higher.

Dick Meskill on Satellites and Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these days of satellites and science can sometimes seem to offer a confusing picture of the future. To a person who confines his view to only one facet, the outlook can be frightening.

However, I feel many people fail to consider the other side of the picture. The scientific advances of our day have many more peaceful uses than otherwise.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Dick Meskill which appeared in the January 8, 1959, edition of the *Alamo Messenger*, the oldest and largest Catholic weekly in the Southwest, under the heading, "In the Shadow of San Fernando."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SHADOW OF SAN FERNANDO

(By Dick Meskill)

When *lunik* hit the headlines, many people gnashed their teeth that Russia had again outstripped the United States in what had once been a near monopoly on technological advance. A few days before, we had heartily pounded ourselves on the back because of Atlas soaring around the heavens, and rightly so.

Even though the 350-pound payload in the Atlas was considerably less than the 1½-ton payload in Sputnik III, the fact that the entire Atlas missile, weighing nearly 8,000 pounds was guided into orbit, demonstrated our undoubted ability eventually to duplicate the astonishing feats of Russian technology.

Lunik, without the insertion of the "at", is a phenomenal feat, and we certainly would not wish to underestimate its importance. It is almost incomprehensible that man, with all his genius could place an artificial planet into the solar system. A Georgetown University physicist estimates that *lunik* will go on spinning in its planetary orbit for more than 90 million years. In doing so, there is a possibility it will outlive the species that fathered it.

But not one of these satellites, not one of these new planets goes into orbit without overtones of doom for the species siring it. The launching pads from which they flew are the same launching pads from which intercontinental ballistic missiles fly. The rockets which launched *sputnik* and *lunik* are fully capable of firing hydrogen warheads into any part of the earth. Atlas, more familiarly known as Big Annie, in its very inception, is an intercontinental ballistic missile, fully developed to carry a hydrogen payload to distances ranging up to 8,500 miles. Big Annie was guided into her orbit merely to demonstrate her effectiveness as a vehicle for transporting a lethal payload.

Cowed trepidation—must certainly be the initial reaction to the success of Big Annie and Lunik. That innate conservatism of man—a longing for the good old days—flinches from the grim reality of scientific achievement, which may eventually mean the annihilation of the species. But breaking through the fear, there may be a vague ray of possible hope. If nations channel their major efforts into scientific achievement—the exploration of space—perhaps they will step away from the development of earth-shattering devices designed for almost unfathomable destruction. Perhaps the fundamental purpose for which the missiles were perfected, can be diverted into this exploration of outer space.

The earth is grievously wearied and sick. We read, and hear, and see, with a sickening sensation of the communes in Red China, which reduces man to the status of inhabitants of the animal farm. We remember that this same species, man, sent a planet around the sun. We read and authenticate murder and torture, rape and hatred against men by tyrants in almost half of the earth, and we hear occasionally a voice crying in the wilderness for peace.

It may be that we have entered a period of world brinkmanship wherein our whole mortal fate may hinge on the pressing of a single button somewhere. Certainly this developmental age of man's scientific genius leaves most of us gasping and grasping to understand what is happening to us, why, and to what end. To emphasize the obvious: Almost nobody understands fully what is going on in the great sphere of man's genius. Equally obvious is the fact that the attainment of such vast successes as those achieved by Russia involves tremendous efficiency in planning. But what horrible price this efficiency?

And that is the point I am driving at. There is a distinct tendency in highly efficient nations to regiment people with free wills into automatons, whose sole purpose is the welfare of the state. A "free" society is hard-pressed when it is forced to compete with this highly efficient but highly immoral abuse of the genius of man. There will be, therefore—or there may already be—a trend on the part of free nations to regiment themselves toward the same end. This was the sickening picture produced in a little book I read several years ago called "Mr. Blue." This may have been the vision of Orwell in his novel "1984."

The communes in China, the "legal" deprivation of rights in Russia, the conformism in our own United States, the apathy of many people including some of our own, the haggard stopgap measures on which we must exert pressure interminably across the world, are all manifestations of the growing trend to regimentation, not only of the body of man, but of his soul, the source of his genius.

It is a sobering thought that most of the people born these days will see 2000 A.D., unless they are annihilated meanwhile by fissionable incineration. To know that in 2000 A.D. there may well be weekend trips to the moon or that tourist bureaus will feature a 2-week tour on a ferry-go-round of the sun is not fantastic speculation. It is distinctly, imminently probable. But here, today, I am wondering whether a great majority of the people in the world are not searching the far reaches of their own individual mentality for some answers about where it will all lead.

I don't know, but I do know that there is a way through the morass. We can be certain of two things: That we are here and that we are designed for eventual union with God. Therefore, using the sacraments as signposts, we should grope our way, hand over hand, toward that one end of which we are absolutely certain, the immensity of God.

Bell Gives Pro Football the Leader Baseball Lacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent in Congress the city of Green Bay, Wis., the home of the Green Bay Packers, one of the pioneer National Football League teams.

Professional football has made tremendous strides in the last decade, becoming one of our truly national sports. We in Green Bay are proud of our representation in this splendid league. Much credit for the success of the league goes to its commissioner, Bert Bell, who has provided the leadership which has given professional football such a national reputation for clean and exciting entertainment.

As part of my remarks, I include a news story which appeared recently in the Washington Daily News paying tribute to the league, its teams and Commissioner Bell:

BELL GIVES PRO FOOTBALL THE LEADER BASEBALL LACKS

(By Harry Grayson)

Next to the playoff itself, there is one thing we will remember about the 1958 football season. It is the picture of Larry MacPhail sitting in a Yankee Stadium box seat at the Colts-Giants championship game and comparing the situation to baseball.

"I never believed that pro football would catch on like this," said MacPhail, bundled in a great coat, a floppy hat covering his head. One of the great showmen of our time was looking at the third successive sell-out crowd enthusiastically responding to organized college-type cheerleaders. "I couldn't conceive the pros taking the play away from the colleges. They play so late I thought the weather would be against anything like this. But the pro owners who were around at the start deserve everything they get. They stuck with it through some lean days."

"Bert Bell, from out of its ranks, put the National Football League across. A real commissioner with unlimited authority and respect, he ignored every stupid restriction crackpots try to place on professional sports. He did what was best for the league and in his own way. He stuck to unlimited substitution, opening the door to specialists and permitting no letdown in the tempo of play. He put the goal posts back on the goal line, setting up the spectacular field goal."

"He put in the sudden-death extra period to assure the finality of the championship game."

The National Football League is paid-for television, but television where Bell wants it to be. No TV in a city where a game is being played.

Could baseball do the same?

"Of course it could," said MacPhail. "But they're so busy being silly in baseball that they don't have time to think like Bell, who acts while baseball officials talk."

Ford Frick, the baseball commissioner, contends the major leagues can do nothing about curbing the televising of their games into minor league territory because that might be in violation of antitrust laws. Bell obviously refused to listen to legal advice of that

nature; ordered the ban on TV where it would hurt.

"I told Dan Topping that if the National League was ridiculous enough to leave New York the American League should put another club in Yankee Stadium," added MacPhail. "That practically would turn the National League into a western league, which is about all it amounts to now anyway."

MacPhail, currently breeding cattle and running horses, has never had a flop, except when he was one of a group which tried to kidnap the Kaiser, and then it was close. He revived the Cincinnati and Brooklyn franchises, refurbished Yankee Stadium. He introduced night baseball to the majors, campaigned against it being overdone.

So when MacPhail puts the job turned in by Bert Bell in pro football over anything baseball has done in more recent years, it is worth reporting.

Bell perhaps is the most capable administrator in sports today.

Consider the champion Colts. Five years ago, when the Dallas Texans were moved to Baltimore, Bell went to Carroll Rosenbloom, the textile, plastics and electronics magnate, and asked him to buy the defunct franchise. Bell had coached Rosenbloom as a halfback at Pennsylvania.

"He did not ask me to buy the franchise," recalls Rosenbloom. "He beat me over the head until I came up with the money."

Bell practically shoved Don Kellest into the Colts' general managership.

Rosenbloom gave the franchise financial security. Kellest got the coach, Weeb Ewbank, and the players, Johnny Unitas and Alan Ameche, for two. Baltimore got a winner and now is one of the superior professional football properties.

As Larry MacPhail stresses, baseball could use a little leadership of this type.

The Senate Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the December 27, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Someday Freedom May Depend on a Senate Filibuster."

In my opinion this editorial presents a very keen interpretation of the situation regarding the proposed change in rule XXII, and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEDAY FREEDOM MAY DEPEND ON A SENATE FILIBUSTER

(By Draper Phillips)

The Democratic liberals are swooping down upon the Senate's rule XXII, which protects free debate in the Senate. If they are successful, they will have knocked down a bulwark of the States against complete national control of local affairs. They will have destroyed a fortress which has prevented many efforts of the majority to tyrannize over the minority.

Those who would limit debate to the wishes of the Senate's majority profess to speak in the sacred name of civil rights. Actually, the

filibuster has been used scores of times by minorities of all parties and from every section of the country to defeat bills which were repugnant to localities, or were regarded as in violation of a State's constitutional rights. Even majorities have used free debate to prevent minorities from defeating legislation. A majority filibuster in 1917 was at least partly responsible for the establishment of the cloture rule under which two-thirds of the Senators may limit debate.

Senators Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge looked upon the filibuster as a defense weapon against repressive majorities. Their threatened use of it was sufficient to force reconsideration of an appropriation for new post-office construction. Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, recalled that the prolonged debate against the force bill in 1890, which would have authorized Federal supervision of elections, actually altered the opinion of the majority which had proposed the bill. Progressive Senator La Follette, who held the alltime record for an individual filibuster until Senator WAYNE MORSE broke it in a filibuster which he refused to describe as a filibuster, offered to fight any cloture that would limit free and unlimited debate. Walter Lippmann, in opposing cloture in 1949, said the real issue is whether any majority, even of two-thirds, shall assume power to override the opposition of a large minority of the States.

We need have no real fear that vital national legislation will be defeated by the filibuster. If the whole people want a law badly enough, it will be passed in spite of delaying tactics. Thus, when Senator Herbert Lehman led a small group in 1952 to filibuster against the important national-origins quota system for admission of immigrants, the filibusterers were quickly routed. The vast majority in early every session of the country wanted the law and they got it.

The "liberals," in their zeal to secure the vote of, or to protect, the Negro in his civil rights, ignore history. Our Federal system was founded on the principle that the Senate represents the States, not a majority of the people of the Nation. Conditions vary among the States and among groups of States. The advantage of a federal system over a national system of government is that we can accommodate ourselves to these variations. That was the reason for allowing equal representation in the Senate and unlimited debate.

We ought to count 10 before changing the Senate rules to limit debate substantially. Such a change would rival F.D.R.'s Court-packing bill as a challenge to established concepts of government. It required hard work by leaders in both parties and "unlimited debate" to dispel that threat. It is to be hoped that there are enough Senators left with sufficient courage to resist this politically tempting assault on an important bulwark of the Federal structure.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Imagination in Government Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the inaugural address of Oklahoma's new Governor, the Honorable J. Howard Edmondson.

The text of the address is as follows:

IMAGINATION IN GOVERNMENT URGED

We meet here today, on this 15th day of January in 1959, in a time of great trouble and great challenge for free men and free women all over the world.

I would like to talk to you today, with a gravity and seriousness straight from the heart, not only as friends and not only as Oklahomans, but also as American citizens—all of us with a deep and most important obligation at this hour in history to the greatest republic in all the world—the United States of America.

During the past year, we have enjoyed once again in this State of ours a great privilege of American citizenship—the privilege of a free election, by secret ballot, after a fair and free campaign to illuminate the issues.

The campaign of 1958, like most Oklahoma campaigns, was hard fought and hotly contested, and most of our citizens became keenly interested in some candidates and took an active role in some part of the campaign.

We enjoy our politics in Oklahoma, and we are proud of the privilege of taking sides and fighting for the side in which we believe.

And we find it difficult to understand, and completely impossible to appreciate, that more than one-half of the men and women who live today on the face of the earth do not enjoy this Oklahoma privilege—the right to take sides and to campaign for one candidate against another.

More than one-half of the world's people today live under forms of government which are not democratic, in totalitarian countries which teach little children that men and women alike exist and live to serve the state, in countries where human life is cheap and human liberty is an unknown commodity.

In Communist China alone a population more than three times as large as our own has been enlisted under the banner of this kind of government.

In Soviet Russia, and in the satellite countries under Russian domination, a population more than double the American total is today enslaved by the same totalitarian system.

The existence of these other systems of government, and of these other nations, is of concern to American citizens for one reason, above all others:

We are aware of our open and declared objective to win the entire world for their way of life and government—and we know that they pursue this objective, constantly and relentlessly, by subversion, conspiracy, and revolution, in every corner of the free world.

A BIG CHALLENGE

We know that they prepare constantly for aggression, that more than 40 percent of their national energy and production go into the machines and the weapons and the manpower for war—and we know that they not only possess the terrible secrets of destruction, but also have made alarming progress in the field of long-range missiles.

We know these things, and we live each day in the shadow of this knowledge, and from this knowledge there must come to each of us a new and sharp awareness of our responsibility as Oklahomans and Americans today.

The challenge to American ideals and principles and institutions—and to the freedom and the liberty which all Oklahomans treasure—is far more serious than it was in the dark days of Pearl Harbor and the Battle of the Atlantic.

In 1959, the challenge exists not only along lines of military battle, but also in the laboratories of science, in the schools and universities, in the wheat fields and in the factories, and even in outer space—thousands of miles beyond the surface of the earth.

The challenge exists here today, in Oklahoma City and across this great and beloved State of ours, as we meet for this inauguration—and as the legislature meets in the halls of our capitol.

It is a challenge demanding the very best of all of us, not only those of us in government, but also those of us in the classroom and the pulpit, in the offices and the factories and the farms of Oklahoma—and most of all, in the homes.

In meeting that challenge, we can no longer afford to be complacent about waste, or inefficiency, or corruption, in the vital organs of our society—and this is equally true in our essential industry, in our educational system, and in our government.

The people of Oklahoma are aware of this fact.

Deep within our people, not only in our State but all over the Nation, there is an awareness today of the challenge from behind the Iron Curtain—and there is a growing impatience with political groups—and politicians—who do not move and act vigorously to eliminate waste and inefficiency, and corruption, in the machinery of government.

I firmly believe it was the awareness on the part of our people, and the desire for new leadership which went along with it, which accounted more than anything else for the record-breaking majorities of last summer and last fall.

With those majorities, and the mandate for action which they represent, the people of Oklahoma have handed a tremendous and a grave responsibility to this administration.

RECALLS WILSON

In the light of that responsibility, I can appreciate fully the feeling expressed by Woodrow Wilson 48 years ago, when the people of New Jersey inaugurated him as Governor.

At that time, Governor Wilson told the people of his State:

"No one dare be sure that he is qualified to play the part expected of him by the people—in the execution of this high trust."

And Wilson went on to say:

"It is best for him, as he sets out, to look away from himself and to concentrate his thought upon the people whom he serves and

the sacred interests which are entrusted to his care."

What about these two things which Woodrow Wilson said should be of primary concern to a governor—the people whom he serves, and the sacred interests entrusted to his care?

How do they stand in Oklahoma, in this year of 1959?

In their pioneering brand of democracy, in their generosity and their simple honesty, in their courage and determination in the face of adversity, in their capacity to learn and their willingness to work hard and to build for the future, we can all be proud of the people of Oklahoma.

In every kind of competition between the young people of the Nation, our young people reflect credit upon the State.

In every time of war and crisis, our fighting men have served with bravery and with honor and distinction.

We are proud of our good neighbors, and of the neighborly spirit that is part of the Oklahoma tradition.

And yet, there is need to face squarely today the problems that exist among our people.

MANY NEED JOBS

Many Oklahomans today are in need of jobs or vocational training, or of more adequate incomes to support themselves and their families.

Many Oklahomans today are in need of better homes in which to bring up their children.

Many Oklahomans today are receiving medical care, or treatment for disease or mental illness, in institutions that urgently need improvement and enlargement of staff.

Many Oklahomans have lost confidence in some branch of our Government, or in the process of justice, because of our failure to keep pace with the needs and requirements of a modern Oklahoma.

Many Oklahomans, who have great skill and ability in the field of education, are leaving our State or leaving their profession because other fields or other States offer better opportunity, and many Oklahoma students in our schools and colleges are being short-changed in the process.

These are a few of the many problems besetting the people of Oklahoma today, and for which we hope to find, in cooperation with the Legislature and all people within the State, some substantial betterment during the next 4 years.

During the campaign of last summer, I was impressed by the appeal of one candidate for governor, who advocated a program of "government with a heart" to meet the problems of the people.

We do need "government with a heart" today, and I hope and pray that the government of Oklahoma will always be that kind of an instrument to relieve suffering wherever possible, to protect the children and assist all the victims of poverty and need. I hope our policy will not only be one of assistance, but also one of encouragement, rehabilitation, and opportunity.

IMAGINATION NEEDED

In short, I believe we not only need "government with a heart," but also "government with imagination, government with foresight, and government with commonsense."

And what about the sacred interests of Oklahoma?

In addition to the people, we need also give attention to the conservation and de-

velopment of our natural resources, to the modernization of transportation facilities, to the encouragement of new industry and new construction.

We shall do all in our power to create a climate of government that is attractive to enterprise and initiative among our citizens—and we hope the foundation for that climate will begin with respect for and confidence in our State government.

In the office of governor during the next 4 years, every possible effort will be made to work constructively with other elected State officials, and with the officers and people of our 77 counties and all communities—without special favor to any region or any person.

Every effort will be made to carry out both the letter and the spirit of the program which was presented to the people of Oklahoma in the campaign for Governor last summer and last fall, and I have been assured by the duly elected leaders of the legislature, both in the senate and the house of representatives, that they are prepared to fight for the cardinal features of that program.

They have also assured me that every effort will be made in the legislature to pave the way for a special election, within the next 90 days, on the issue of repeal of prohibition. For both of these assurances, I am deeply grateful.

In line with other campaign commitments in this same field, the new appointed commissioner of public safety has already been instructed to begin a statewide effort at uniform and effective enforcement of the State's prohibition laws, and the legislature already has before it recommendations for new laws to close the loopholes in the present enforcement statutes.

We are going to do our very best to do the job which you endorsed, with a majority of more than 200,000 last July, and which you endorsed once again, with a majority of almost 300,000, on November 1. I hope and I pray that the job can be done. It needs to be done, if Oklahoma is to resume the splendid growth and expansion with which we led the Nation in the early part of this century. It needs to be done, if this great State of ours is ever to be as strong and dynamic in its development, as our people richly deserve, and our Nation requires it to be.

NEW INDUSTRY URGENT

Let me tell you about the dream which is in my heart for Oklahoma, as I take this sacred oath of office today.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can turn the tide of economic and population trends in Oklahoma during the next 4 years.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can put into operation a program that will attract new industry into Oklahoma and inspire industrial growth as never before—providing at least 75,000 new industrial jobs for our people by 1963.

It is my prayer and my hope that we can establish educational and teaching standards which are a model for all States in this part of our country—making Oklahoma just as famous for its great schools, as institutions of learning, as we are justly famous for football, basketball, wrestling and other school activities.

It is my prayer and my hope that by these means, and others, we can once again see a population that is growing by leaps and bounds, as it did from 1900 to 1920—and I believe it is entirely possible, with a dynamic program of progress, to see the population of our State increase by at least a quarter of a million in the next 4 years.

Seventy-five thousand new industrial jobs. A school system second to none in the Southwest.

And a population increase—by reason of new jobs and new hope—of better than 250,000.

These are 3 dreams, my fellow-Oklahomans, of a young fellow citizen you honored with election to the governorship less than 3 months ago.

They are dreams which I hope will become your dreams—and dreams that can only come true if you determine, with me, to make them come true.

When our Nation was in the middle of its first great fight for freedom and independence, more than 180 years ago, a fiery young writer and soldier named Tom Paine made an appeal to his fellow Americans for their help in a great cause.

Today, in 1959, I use the words of Tom Paine to ask for your help in making this dream of a greater Oklahoma come true. As Tom Paine said, 180 years ago: "I turn with the warm ardor of a friend to those who have nobly stood, and are yet determined to stand the matter out. I call not upon a few, but upon all, not on this one, or that one, but on everyone—lay your shoulders to the wheel. Better have too much force than too little when so great an object is at stake."

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three essays by students of the Lynbrook High School in my district on the subject of "Democracy in the Space Age." These make, I believe, very worthwhile reading. The first essay, by Donna Rosen, appears hereunder:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Donna Rosen)

"That government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." It is doubtful that democracy has ever been defined more completely or more meaningfully in so few words.

Delving into our country's colorful past, we find that government was as much a part of the average man's daily life as was attending church on Sunday. These men had fought to keep our Nation alive and they felt it their duty to support the legislature, that America's civilization might gain a strong foundation. They had placed their faith in our Nation's leaders, yet they knew that no one man could lead an ever-expanding country singlehandedly. Therefore, each man, in his way, strove to help our leaders guide a weak nation to glory and prosperity. It was, too, a sense of loyalty which bound these men to their country. They were determined that their land, the land for which thousands before them had given their lives, might gain security. Only through proper legislation might all these things come about.

Understand this, we find that solely through faith, pride, loyalty, and fine government, may we really conceive the true meaning of democracy.

Many will claim that politics had a more direct effect on the lives of our ancestors, and, therefore, government was of vital interest to them. These same people will say that it is no longer necessary for each citizen to take an intense interest in his government, for we are not, as a nation, undergoing crises of the same nature as those which affected our country years ago. Yet, how can the affairs of our country fail to arouse

the interest of her citizens? Our Government and leaders are deriving their "just powers from the consent of the governed." If we fail to give them our support we lose the entire meaning of the word "democracy" and disregard the principle on which our Government is based.

In this, the space age, many of us have a tendency to let the importance of democracy fade into the background when compared with the issue of conquering space. Yet, can missiles and rockets even come close in comparison with ideals which have been the roots of civilization for hundreds of years?

However, it is not too late for the flame of patriotism to be rekindled in the hearts of America's citizens. Once again faith, pride, and loyalty for one's country can become synonymous with democracy. This is a task which we must undertake armed with sincerity, concern, and dedication. Let us once again vow as our forefathers did, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the second in this series of three essays entitled "Democracy in the Space Age" by Sandra Brainum, a student of the Lynbrook High School, is indicative of thoughtful concern with our world of today. I commend it to the notice of my colleagues in the House:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Sandra Brainum)

As time goes on, and science advances, it distributes its uses both to those who destroy and those who preserve. The path of the unknown world of science has no end, yet in a democracy it is the path that public opinion wishes to pursue, while in a dictatorship it is one that is dictated.

Dictatorships, and the struggle of men for freedom, existed long before science became widely applied. The modern use of science for warfare has only given them concrete forms.

Communists wish to conquer the world or die in the final struggle, and that is how it will be. A world of slaves under a single or a small group of dictators will never live. For democracy is not only a form of government, it is a want for freedom born into every man's soul. If we lose our liberties it will be because we abandoned them. A world split in two cannot live either.

What the people believe in determines the type of government they will have. Upon the government depends their progress in science. Also upon the government depends their progress in securing justice and opportunity. Upon this depends the outcome of whether life is worth living.

Another great war would be terrible. It would destroy and kill millions of people. But, it could not destroy democracy. Organizations of free men tend to become refined under stress. Free men, and democracies meet their greatest hazards in times of peace and good will.

"The best answer to communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy—economic, social, and political. All we need to do is to stand up and perform according to our professed ideals. Then those ideals will be safe."

A democracy which is truly responsive to the will of the people, in which freedom and individuality are preserved, shall be triumphant in the long run, for it is not only the best system, the most worthy of support, it is the strongest system in a very harsh contest.

Time will change the world down through the ages. New discoveries of science will come and go and soon lose their importance. Democracy shall never lose its importance and will live forever.

Democracy in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the third in the group of three essays by students of the Lynbrook High School in my district appears hereunder. This is the work of Margaret Kaiser. Here we have some vital observations from a young mind:

DEMOCRACY IN THE SPACE AGE

(By Margaret Kaiser)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These words, taken from the Declaration of Independence actually are a definition of democracy.

In the past, democracy was purely political, and referred to government by the people. However, in more recent years democracy has come to mean more than that. It has broadened to include social, economic, and industrial democracy.

Today the Government aids foreign countries by means of financial assistance and the spread of knowledge. It helps the industries of this country by building dams, and allotting contracts for work. It helps the people by instituting such programs as social security and civil rights.

The democracy reviewed above would not be possible unless three basic conditions existed.

1. Every citizen must be able to express his will, without the fear of being punished for what he believes or the way he votes. True democracy must reflect the will of the majority and protect the right of the minority.

2. Those who make the laws must be subject to the will of the citizens. There must be means by which the people may replace the lawmakers if the lawmakers pass laws, that the majority of people do not like.

3. The people who enforce the law must also be responsible to the voters, because democracy could not exist if the people who enforce the law could do as they please.

Even these conditions do not guarantee true democracy. The people must be informed, must have social and political independence, must be interested, and must have an active faith in democracy.

Although it would appear that democracy today is far from being what it was originally, a close study would reveal that basically it is the same; the people still have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It has merely been changed to cover the world and conditions as they now exist.

Insofar as democracy in the space age is concerned, I cannot see that there would be any drastic change in the basic concepts of

true democracy. The people will have and must continue to have their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Changes, of course, will occur in the space age as countries and people are brought closer together, through swifter means of transportation and communication. It is hoped that by closer contact with other people in other countries we will be helped to understand one another's problems and beliefs. Perhaps we will even be able to instill in them the wish for democracy, as we know it, and the means by which it may be accomplished.

This would bring about a better, more peaceful, and happy world.

The Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express Reaches Its 80th Milestone in the Field of Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading daily newspapers of central Pennsylvania had a birthday, January 2, when the Du Bois Courier-Express celebrated 80 years of publishing news for its many readers in the Keystone State.

The observance of the fourscore anniversary provided the means for President Harold T. Gray, of the Courier-Express Publishing Co., to do a little reminiscing in an editorial titled "We Are 80," which appeared in the January 10, 1959, issue.

In addition to the editorial by Harold T. Gray, there appeared another editorial in the same issue titled "All Join Hands," which urges community cooperation in meeting the challenge of this scientific age. It is a timely appeal to the present generation to meet the future with the courage and inspiration of those who founded and developed the thriving third-class city of Du Bois.

It is a pleasure on this occasion to pay a deserved tribute to the Gray family for their fine contribution in the field of journalism in Pennsylvania through 80 years of editing and publishing a typical family newspaper that has been a daily visitor to thousands of homes in the Du Bois area. Members of the Gray family still active in publishing the Du Bois Courier-Express include Harold T. Gray as president; Jason S. Gray, vice president; and Mrs. Rosanna Gray Shields, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 80 years the Du Bois Courier-Express has been fortunate in having in its employ many outstanding citizens whose devotion to the ideals of journalism, as expounded by its founders, enabled this popular daily newspaper to enjoy success in the newspaper field. In this connection, the late William B. Ross and Frank I. Gillung successively filled the editorial chair in a highly acceptable manner for many fruitful years until death wrote the proverbial "30" to their journalistic careers. Until his recent retirement after many years of loyal service, the business and

administrative ability of Lloyd F. Mohny as treasurer and general manager of the Courier-Express played a large part in the success achieved.

In addition to the three members of the Gray family previously mentioned as present officers of the Du Bois Courier-Express Publishing Co., the popular daily newspaper has a talented and gifted managing editor in the person of George Waylonis, a hometown boy, who has won his laurels through his initiative, perseverance, and ability to measure up to the exacting standards of modern journalism.

Over a span of 80 years, the Courier-Express had many other loyal and faithful employees who share to a marked degree the credit due for the success of this popular daily newspaper. At the present time they include Marvin L. Bloom, general manager; Athol V. Shields, secretary; Spencer L. Cross, production manager; William H. Reay, advertising manager; Samuel Kaufman, circulation manager; Shelly Moyer, Herb Martin, and one of the finest groups of faithful newsboys to be found in any newspaper office.

In offering my sincere congratulations to the officers and staff of the Du Bois Courier-Express on the occasion of its 80th anniversary, I extend best wishes for continued success in the determination to serve the Du Bois area with a first-class daily newspaper.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the two editorials referred to previously:

WE ARE 80

It was just 80 years ago, on January 2, 1879, that the Du Bois Weekly Courier first appeared on the streets of the little new lumbering town of Du Bois. This was followed 4 years later by a competitor, the Express, and was followed in 1888 by the first daily edition of the Courier, following the big fire of that year, which wiped out most of the town.

The baby born during that first year, is now an old man. Fourscore years have brought many changes, not only to the newspaper and the individual, but to the town and the Nation. In those days the population of the country was a hundred million less than it is today. The West was being developed, but there were none of the superhighways which stretched from coast to coast, the transcontinental trains, and certainly the jet planes which encompass the 3,000 miles of the country were not even a dream in the minds of man. Electric power and the telephone were still in their infancy, and it would be years before the first automobile would chug down the dirt streets of the little community. Men still shaved with the straight-edged razor, and women had to provide their own means of making themselves beautiful, since such a thing as a beauty parlor did not exist.

But somehow, people got along in those days, and found entertainment and recreation, even though there was no golf course, nor movies, nor radio, nor television. Street railway transportation has come and gone, passenger rail service rose to its peak in the twenties, and disappeared. Sixteen Presidents have lived in the White House, and names of our leaders in the town, State, and Nation have flamed across the sky and disappeared.

The Courier started 2 years before the borough of Du Bois was incorporated. The population of the town was little more than a thousand persons, and it was not until 6 years after the first edition that telegraph

and telephone service came to the community. It would still be 4 years, too, before the first rail service would be provided by the B.R. & P., and 7 years after the Allegheny Valley Railroad had opened a way into the wilderness. Just 7 years before, too, the population of the town consisted of but three families. Not until a year later did the Du Bois Deposit Bank open its doors for business, to bring the first banking service to the community.

Just as the town has grown through the years, so has the Courier-Express. While old age may add stature to a man, an institution, or a town, the youthful zest for life should never be lost. So, although the paper is old in years, it is still youthful in spirit. In the same way it hopes that as Du Bois approaches its centenary, it will retain the vigor of growth which characterized it during the early days. There are indications of a revival of this spirit, which for a time seemed to lie dormant.

Like the old 99th Reserve Division of the Army, let's adopt the slogan, "Ours the Future," and look forward to the next 80 years.

HAROLD T. GRAY.

ALL JOIN HANDS

The fact that DuBois is reaching its maturity came to us recently with the realization that the Courier has passed its 80th birthday.

On attaining this advanced age, we thought back over the years, not nostalgically, but to seek some of the inspiration and stamina which enabled our fathers to create a town here on the wilderness, atop the continued divide in the Alleghenies.

It is a town literally hewn out of the forest, for between 1832 when George Shaffer and his wife and six children cleared out a couple of acres on Sandy Creek until 1865 when John Rumbarger first came into the area the family had as neighbors only the deer, muskrat, and coon. The coming of the Allegheny Valley Railroad in 1872 jarred Mr. Rumbarger out of his complacency, and it was then that he laid out the town of Rumbarger. He was helped in his efforts by John DuBois, who came here from Williamsport about the same time to build his lumber mills.

The material advancement of the town dates from the arrival of Mr. DuBois, who from 1873 to 1876 established an industry which attracted hundreds and later thousands of people. From 3 families in 1872 the population grew rapidly; and in 1877, 1 year after completion of the large sawmill, the town boasted a population of 1,307.

Rumbarger post office was established in 1874, and in the same year passenger service was inaugurated on the Low Grade of the Pennsylvania Railroad. In 1876 the post office was moved to the "East Side," and the name changed to DuBois. A year later "Rumbarger," as such, passed out of existence.

DuBois became a borough in 1881, with Louis Brady as first burgess. The town had three wards until 1892, when the fourth ward was added. After the turn of the century the fifth ward was established.

Up to this time DuBois was a typical frontier town, lacking all of those things we now consider as essential. With the creation of Sandy Township and the subsequent erection of a jail, much of the lawlessness of the early days was brought under control.

In June of 1885 the town got telegraph service, and in August of that year came the telephone. In August 1883 the B. R. & P. Railway was extended from Buffalo, through DuBois to Punxsutawney, and in 1899 was extended on to Butler, with connections with Pittsburgh. In 1870 the town got its first newspaper, and in 1880 its first bank.

The confidence of those early pioneers in the future of the city was evidenced by the almost complete rebuilding of the town after the disastrous fire of 1838. The town

grew rapidly until 1900, with the addition of 180 acres of land. New industries came to town, glass, tanneries and coal, a sewage system was built, and the town acquired a municipal water system. A 50th anniversary book, published in 1922, says that DuBois, at the time, "had railroad shops employing 1,500 people, and in addition, coal mines, and factories turning out glassware, overalls, silk, soft drinks, clay products, machinery, iron and steel products, lumber and millwork, and soot cleaners for boilers."

DuBois became a third class city on January 1, 1915.

The early history of DuBois is one of hard unremitting toil against tremendous odds. For carving a city-out of the wilderness our homage is due those sturdy pioneers, to whom no task was too difficult and no barrier insurmountable. If we are to prove worth the heritage handed down to us from those sturdy pioneers, we must in this generation, accomplish many things, so that our children's children may see a city of which our grandfathers might well be proud.

This editorial is intended as but a channel buoy in the living stream of the town, as we note the passage of time from the ancient past to the distant future.

We who participate for a brief time together to create the DuBois of the moment, lend our hands to a project with deep traditions builded slowly by the lifelong devotion of many men and women; the teachers in our schools, our mayors and councilmen, our businessmen and professional men, and laboring men, who have dreamed and planned and toiled for an even better town. They have left the imprint of their lives in the churches, streets, public and private buildings, and marks which are ours.

We stand today, among this galaxy of builders of our town, living and dead, mindful of our responsibility, not only to them, but to the generations that lie ahead. For if we fail in our custodianship, we shall have obliterated something of these founders, and builders, shall have shattered their dreams, and destroyed something that can never be recovered.

On some future day another channel buoy in the timeless stream of life will mark another point where we take stock of ourselves. When we have reached that point, may our descendants look back on our great generation of the fifties as having maintained and advanced the deep traditions of our past, a time in which we have made our contribution to a better town and community.

In this endeavor all must participate—labor, business, professions, city council, planning commission, public and semipublic boards and commissions, social and cultural organizations, juniors and seniors, every man, woman and child of our community.

May we not fail in our endeavors.

We'll Miss You, Joe Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine, January 15, 1959:

WE'LL MISS YOU, JOE MARTIN

"I love this House," said JOE MARTIN to it once. "In this forum is worked the will of

the people." That House, and everyone else who knows him well, has reciprocated JOE MARTIN's feelings for more than 30 years. For 20 years until last week he has been its undisputed Republican leader, because he is loved, because he is a superb political tactician, and because he has never broken his word. "When you make an agreement with JOE MARTIN," said his steeleier but kindred opposite number, SAM RAYBURN, "you don't have to remember it. He will."

JOE first earned his leadership by running a successful congressional campaign when the Republican membership was even smaller than it is now (89 seats, which he nearly doubled in the 1938 election). Ever since those New Deal days he has been his party's most consistent nationwide campaigner, and has chaired five (a record) Republican national conventions. He was the Republicans' thread of continuity during their painful transition from the party of Coolidge (which first sent JOE to Congress) to the party of NIXON (which has now dumped him). As Speaker of the 80th and 83d Congresses, JOE did more than any single man to prove that long and bitter exile from power had not unfitted the Republicans to govern. His legislative strategy underlay the major accomplishments of Ike's first term; he kept his Republicans in orderly rapport with the White House while BILL KNOWLAND's Senators went off on ideological or fractional rampages. A practical mechanic of statecraft, JOE MARTIN has never been either ideologue or factionalist; he has no use for what he calls political dipey-doo. Though F.D.R. tried to make him a symbol of reaction ("Martin, Barton, and Fish"), he has never symbolized anything but personal honesty, plus fidelity to the party line—when he could find it.

The party line got blurred somewhere between 1953 and the 1958 election. It was not for JOE MARTIN, that friendly engine of harmony, to manufacture what the White House would not. As the play-by-play makes clear JOE himself was not the real target of the revolt that overthrew him last week. Not the House leader, but the party leadership bred the dissatisfaction.

Twice did Ike, in appreciation of JOE's great services, protect him from the assault of CHARLIE HALLECK's ambition. Yet HALLECK somehow made more and more trips between Hill and White House, and JOE fewer. Last week Ike stood aside, and the contest was like a painted scene of a snowy antlered kingdom, when the old buck is challenged and overthrown for no clearer reason than that he can be. No policy issue, no divergence of aims; just comparative age (HALLECK, 58; MARTIN, 74). Will the White House now have a livelier band of supporters and informants in the House? Let us hope so. But CHARLIE HALLECK's Republicanism will need at least as much guidance and backing as JOE MARTIN's got; and that wasn't enough to crown JOE MARTIN's long and able service to the Nation with the rewards he deserved. But he does have deep and universal affection.

The Birthday of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of January 1807, at Stratford on the Potomac, Westmoreland County, Va., a baby was born. His name was Robert E. Lee.

There were about 6 million people in the United States at that time—some 900,000 in Virginia at that time. That year people would be talking about Napoleon's threat to the peace of Europe. They would take sides about Aaron Burr's acquittal on a Federal charge of treason at Richmond. They would wonder at the success of Robert Fulton's steamboat *Clermont*, on its run from New York City to Albany. What was this world coming to?

The world was in turmoil when Robert E. Lee entered it. It was still in turmoil when he left. His character left an indelible imprint upon millions, during his lifetime; and upon many millions more since his death.

He has been known as an outstanding engineer. He has been known as a brilliant military tactician. He has been known as a wise educator. He has been known as a Christian gentleman.

I know him as a troubled man who searched his soul to find which of his divided loyalties he must follow to the end.

I see him the more clearly as he wrote to his son, Custis, shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War:

The framers of our Constitution (would) never have exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forbearance in its formation * * * if it was intended to be broken. * * * Still a Union that can only be maintained by swords and bayonets, and in which strife and civil war are to take the place of brotherly love and kindness, has no charm for me. I shall mourn for my country and for the welfare and progress of mankind.

I see him just as clearly as when, during that same period of crisis, he wrote to his friend, Markie Williams:

If a disruption takes place, I shall go back in sorrow to my people and share the misery of my native State, and save in her defense there will be one soldier less in the world than now. I wish for no other flag than the "Star-Spangled Banner" and no other air than "Hail Columbia."

It must be said that Robert E. Lee was a staunch believer in States rights, as so many Americans are to this day. There are no geographical nor philosophical limits to this creed which guards so well the sovereignty of our several States, even to this day.

The Crimes of the Armenian Quisling Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, many views have been raised against the visit of Mr. Mikoyan to this country. One of these is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and also a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. Americans who continually study the Soviet Union know Mr. Mikoyan very well; they know his crimes as

well as his purported foreign trade shrewdness.

Contrary to some reports in the press, the demonstrators and protestors against Mikoyan are not by any means just recent Hungarian immigrants and refugees to this country. This is a false notion. It should be obvious why some desire to propagate this notion. A good portion of the demonstrators is made up of Americans who have long been naturalized or were born here. Because of their intimate knowledge of the situation, these Americans have exercised their right to protest what they consider to have been a blunder in allowing Mr. Mikoyan to visit this country in the first place.

The statement and also the telegram sent by Dr. Dobriansky to President Eisenhower disclose some of the reasons why the American organization he represents has supported these demonstrations. Countless Americans, following their basic convictions, could hardly disagree with the stand taken against Mikoyan. Under leave, I request that the statement and telegram be printed in the RECORD:

THE CRIMES OF THE ARMENIAN QUISLING MIKOYAN

The telegram sent to the President by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the subject of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to this country has produced a most favorable response. The press and other media that published it gave the American people an opportunity to learn about the real Mikoyan, not the blown-up image of a harmless foreign trade expert.

On the basis of innumerable cards and letters received from fellow Americans throughout the country we are certain that the vast majority of the American people is possessed with a sense of disgust and revulsion toward the few who are fawning over the Kremlin visitor, Mr. Mikoyan. The foremost aims of Mikoyan are clear: (1) Lull the Nation into a sense of false security; (2) prepare the way for a summit meeting where the West is expected to acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the enslaved nations in Eastern Europe and Asia; and (3) ultimately, in relation to us, divide and conquer.

These tactics are not new in Russian imperialist history. The tactics are not the creation of so-called ideologic communism. They have been in use for over 500 years by the Russians and their quislings, and have succeeded in creating an unprecedented empire. The tragedy of the current Mikoyan spectacle is that all the foolery and loss of self respect shown by the few in their entertainment of a political criminal indicate an appalling ignorance on the part of these hosts to a criminal as to how Russia ultimately conquers nations and peoples.

We are most fortunate in this country to have our Congressmen Judds, our George Meany, our Cardinal Cushing. Their protests against Mikoyan and all his macabre achievements are not just in defense of basic moral and political principles. They are a defense also of our political sanity and maturity.

Some sections of the press have almost deliberately refused to disclose the crimes of the Armenian quisling. This situation indicates how easily some could be fooled by the smiles and humorous duplicity of our dedicated enemy. About 20 years ago, when the Nazi economic wizard, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, visited this country, our industrial and economic groups offered him only the social deep freeze; this despite no criminal acts on his part. Today, the very personifi-

cation of extreme cruelty, mass murder, and treason to his own nation (Armenia) is not only received but widely feted and shamelessly honored. The background of Mikoyan spells the very negation of the spiritual qualities of America and its traditions; yet some Americans who apparently lost all sight of the difference between right and wrong, courteously shower the honors of their attention upon him.

There is no doubt in our minds that this entire spectacle was well planned and indirectly financed by the Cyrus Eatons in this country. The businessmen and financiers who flocked to the circus almost seem to confirm the predictions of Marx, Veblen, and others that the weakest spiritual sinew of modern society is the pecuniary-minded business community. Following World War I the business interests of Western Europe were prepared to accommodate the Red wave from Eastern Europe. Are our business groups ready to do the same? By and large we think not.

The Mikoyan spectacle is only the opening and driving wedge of a broad plan. After his departure from these shores more and more voices should and must be raised in sober evaluation and protest against this first act of a continuous campaign. We urge that the points of the following telegram sent to the President be raised time and time again in order to offset the foolishness displayed by some of our people who think they see in Mikoyan, Menshikov, and Khrushchev any possibility for the end of the cold war:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your recent statement on good manners to be shown toward Mr. Mikoyan is somewhat mystifying. Surely this statement does not imply a desired cessation of peaceful demonstrations against Mikoyan and all that he symbolizes. We cannot believe that this was your intent in releasing your statement.

"The prime reason for our demonstrations is to make known to our fellow Americans precisely who Mikoyan is and what he has done. His genteel antics here deserve a realistic answer. In the light of his notorious record it is by no means an extreme characterization that Mikoyan is actually a political murderer on the loose—and of all places in our own America, the ultimate bastion of world freedom. If our people were to depend on the naive and dangerously misleading statements of such uninformed persons like Cyrus Eaton, Adlai Stevenson, Eric Johnston and other inadvertent tools of current Moscow propaganda, public opinion in this country would itself rapidly become a captive of Moscow.

"Among the many barbarities indulged in by this Armenian quisling, let us be mindful today of (1) his brutal annihilation of thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaidjani, Don and Kuban Cossacks in the period of 1917-21; (2) his callous involvement in the Russian manmade famine in Ukraine in the early thirties, shipping grains abroad while millions of Ukrainians starved to death; and (3) his bloody role in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots in this decade. It is, indeed, a travesty on our traditions to have even permitted the Armenian quisling to blemish our good earth.

"What amazes us further is that the so-called Russian desk in the State Department has informed columnists that this 'oldtime Communist never has made a violent anti-American speech' (Ted Lewis, Daily News, January 1, 1959). Yet only 2 months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, the Armenian quisling rallied against 'the stupidity and adventurism of the aggressive circles of the United States.' Quoting Lenin, he also said of the United States: 'She robs all, and she robs quite originally.'

"A code of good manners implies moral principles which in this case can best be reflected through our expressed indignation in these demonstrations. Conscience bids us

to conduct more of them. And we feel confident that most Americans share this confidence.

"Sincerely yours,
"LEV. E. DOBRIANSKY,
"Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and Professor of Soviet Economics, Georgetown University."

**Speech Delivered by Senator Gil J. Puyat
Before the Rotary Club of Manila on
Thursday, January 8, 1959, at the
Winter Garden, Manila Hotel, Manila,
Philippines**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following address delivered at the Rotary Club luncheon in Manila, Philippines, on January 8, 1959, by Senator Gil J. Puyat. The speech deals with conditions in the Philippines and in other countries recently visited by Senator Puyat. I am sure the facts pointed out will be of interest to every Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Senator Puyat is now serving his second term as a member of the Philippine Senate. He is chairman of the senate committee on finance. When he was elected to the Philippine Senate in 1951 he received the next to highest number of votes cast in the 1951 election for any candidate. In 1957, when he was re-elected, he was the top-notch— that is, he received the highest number of votes cast for any candidate.

Senator Puyat is one of the outstanding citizens of the Philippines as well as one of the leading and most successful businessmen in the islands:

I know that almost everybody here today faces the new year with this question: What is in store for us in 1959?

I have been asked to discuss what the economic trends for 1959 may be. In giving you my views, I must start by saying that I claim no prescience. I will not give you my views as a party man but as an official of the Government who fervently desires the best for the people. I will give you the picture as I see it without any furbishing and without any undertones.

Last September, on the invitation of the British Government, I spent 2 weeks in England during which I had the opportunity to talk with officials in the Government and to have a fairly comprehensive picture of the conditions of agriculture and industry as they are today in the British Isles. I was in England in 1947. I remember those days of austere rationing, of living on what I would call bare essentials. The Government and the people were beset with the problems that confronted a country that had just come out of a global war, its industrial equipment damaged and crippled, its economy threatened by the burdens of financing the most expensive war that mankind has yet seen. The people had gone through 4 years of hardships. With the strain occasioned by the

war, the question was how much more could the people take and how long would the people be willing to suffer more. I saw the answer to those questions in my last trip to England. In England today, there is almost full employment. Her exchange reserves are healthy, her foreign trade has improved considerably, her industrial equipment is turning out goods running beyond prewar levels of production. The British pound is a stable currency. Cities that were almost bombed out of the map had been rebuilt and are now models of modern and planned community development. Many businessmen in England have expressed the desire to have expanded trade relations with the Philippines and to do this are agreeable to sell capital goods to the Philippines on deferred payment plans. The announcement that the sterling pound has been made freely convertible for external purposes would certainly aid in increasing the volume of trade between the so-called hard currency areas and the sterling bloc countries. England is not a rich country. Its density of population is among the highest in the world. She imports a great deal of the raw materials that she needs for her industries. In spite of these basic weaknesses, England has been able to stage a recovery that is indeed remarkable.

I visited Western Germany. I was invited by Krupp of Essen while I was in New York and the representative of this firm flew from Bonn to Paris to extend to me the official invitation. If I was impressed with what I saw in England, I will say that what I saw in Western Germany was almost unbelievable. Here is a country split into two. Western Germany represents just about 50 percent of the land area of Germany before the last World War. The population of Western Germany is about 60 percent of the population of the entire country before World War II started. That portion of Germany that is now under Soviet domination used to be the source of food for the German people. To compound the problems, there is Berlin surrounded by a Communist dominated area, a day to day problem for the free world and a potential source of threat to world peace. The industrial machinery of Germany was damaged and destroyed to the extent of 80 percent. Many of her cities were beyond recognition. Her means of transportation were almost completely wrecked. Her currency had depreciated to the extent that in 1949 the country had to effect radical monetary reforms.

In Germany today, nobody talks of unemployment. The problem of the country is what to do with the dollar reserves that are piling up every month. The levels of production have exceeded the prewar levels. She is threatening to become both the industrial and financial leader in Europe. I had a conference with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and was praising the Ministry for its economic program to which I attributed this almost unbelievable progress. The Ministry, while accepting that it undertook the initiative of preparing the program told me not in a tone of false modesty but with a ring of sincerity that if the economic program clicked the credit must be given to the sacrifice made by the German people and the capacity of the people for hard, sustained, and dedicated work. I remember the words used and I will repeat them: "This recovery has been due to the brains and brawn of the German people." Although in saying this, they also readily admitted that the help of the allies specially in furnishing food supplies was a big factor in enabling Germany to devote her genius and her energies in rebuilding her industrial machinery. And finally, these officials added: "Senator, we were able to challenge the German people to work hard and to make sacrifices because the people in the government set the example. We were working 10, 12, 14 hours a day." And one of the officials added: "I was

a mayor in a small town and I remember that for almost a year my only food for lunch was a piece of bread and a piece of meat." This official further added that, "No government can ask the people to make sacrifices unless that government can by example and by actual accomplishments show that it is possessed of the integrity, the efficiency, and the vision to lead the people."

I was born in Switzerland and I saw the industrial machinery of this country working unceasingly, producing more than the country had ever produced, a country with no natural or mineral resources to speak of. Here is a country that imports practically all of the raw materials that she needs for her industries. Employment is at a peak to the extent that she has started importing technicians from other countries. I had the opportunity to talk with the officials of the Federal Reserve bank and I inquired into the mechanism and the operation of the reserves of the country. The answer was short and concise. "We keep two reserves—a dollar reserve for our dollar accounts and a gold reserve for our other currency requirements."

When I was in New York, I received an official invitation from the Government of Israel to visit that country. It meant making a change in my schedule but not only do I not regret having made the change, I feel that I was privileged to see a nation in the making. Israel is a small country. A great portion of it is rocky mountains and the south is a desert. It is surrounded by countries with which unfortunately its relations are not too friendly. In the past 10 years its population has grown from 600,000 people to its present population of 2 million. The desert areas have become productive agricultural lands and in the past 3 years millions of trees have been planted on the rocky mountains as part of a tremendous reforestation program. The army has a training program that not only makes of the people capable and competent soldiers but also equips the people with the vocational proficiency so that after a training of 2½ years in the army, a man is adequately prepared to earn a living. I was impressed by the dedication of the government officials. I could discern earnestness, a sense of mission. Get into the government service and you either suffer from ulcer or die of heart attack, is a saying amongst government officials in Israel today. Perhaps this is an exaggeration, but is indicative of the serious and dedicated attitude that government officials have when they join the government service.

A few days ago, the National Economic Council finished an updated 3-year economic program. It is the same program presented to the late President Magsaysay with certain revisions and datings, with some change in emphasis. Broadly, it has the same basic characteristics as the previous program. It recognizes that there must be a change from a purely agricultural economy to a balanced industrial-agricultural economy. It recognizes the basic weakness of the present order, high unemployment, prevalent underemployment, low levels of production, low per capita income, as a result of which the masses by and large enjoy low standards of living. Targets of production have been set up—calculated to gradually reduce the present unemployment and absorb the annual addition to our labor force. In drawing up these targets, the investment budget was considered and the sources of investment both private and public were analyzed. I hope this program is not treated in the same way that previous programs were intentionally or unintentionally overlooked. I remember what one of the economic planners in India told me when I was chairman of the National Economic Council—that in India no economic decisions are made unless they synchronize with the economic program adopted by the

country. I do hope that the executive and Congress will examine the program and come to policy decisions so that once and for all, there may not be the lingering doubt that there is no program to follow and that the present administration is characterized by ambiguity of policies, inaction, and inertia. Of the many economic problems that await solution, time allows me to discuss with you today only a few. I adopt this approach in the conviction that clear-cut decisions on these basic problems will determine the pattern of the economic trends for 1959.

Although the President has made repeated pronouncements that he is not in favor of devaluation, the discussion goes on unabated as to whether we should devalue or not. The discussion while and so long as it lingers has been and will be a deterrent to sound investment. Of late, investments have been channeled mostly into speculative enterprises where large gains may be reaped in a matter of weeks and in real estate. The reason is understandable. You would not want to invest in long-term projects if there is the danger that your investment may shrink considerably if devaluation should come. While the discussion lingers, we can expect little, if not nothing, in the form of foreign investment. You would not want to send capital over 10,000 miles to find that investment decrease in value within a few months. Personally, I am against devaluation. I have stated my position from the very start and I have stated my position repeatedly. Devaluation is not the solution to our present economic problems. We are not a highly industrialized country. What are our most important export items that devaluation proposes to increase? Our export of sugar to the United States and other markets is limited by our quotas in these markets. For sugar, therefore, there is the so-called inelastic market. The price for copra has never been as good as in the past few years. We do not even cover our quotas for hemp and cordage not because the prices are not attractive but because through a maladjustment in the machinery of distribution, the producers do not find it profitable to increase their production because the gains of the industry accrue principally and mainly to the middlemen. I know the lumber industry and I know that the industry by and large has been reaping handsome profits. We are agreed that we should proceed with the shift in the pattern of our economy and this will require an investment which will become more expensive if we should devalue. Price increases outstrip increases in wages and salaries and God forbid if a ganta of rice in this country should come to cost P10 to P15 should we devalue. If such a situation should develop, we can expect social repercussions.

It has been pointed out that the present ratio of the peso to the dollar is no longer its real value. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the dollar is quoted at between P3.50 to P3.80 in the black market. I ask this question: Has not even as stable a currency as the American dollar depreciated since the last World War? I, for one, refuse to believe that the black market quotation for the peso as its real value. This black market quotation is established through illicit operations and by flight of capital. The problem is compounded by the fact that our economy is not in the hands of nationals, but in the hands of foreigners some of whom have been indulging in extensive flight of capital operations. I have a hunch that if these dollars that have been stashed away could be channeled into our official reserves, our reserves would increase by easily \$100 million. What has happened is that instead of our dollar earnings going into the official reserves, they now are held by persons and corporations who have little faith nor care much about the future of this country. I will admit that certain industries have to

be helped, like the base metal industry. But for this purpose, specific legislation can be enacted. This we have done with the tobacco industry and the marginal producers of gold. We must be guided by that established maxim in popular government, the greatest good for the greatest number. Devaluation may help a few industries, many businessmen would profit from it, but what would be the effect on the masses?

Another policy decision that we must arrive at is whether to effect decontrol or proceed with our present system of almost absolute controls, the intensity of which has increased with every recent decision of the central bank. My observation in my last trip points to the fact that those countries that have lifted controls have rehabilitated faster than those countries that have persisted in perpetuating controls. Controls breed an artificial situation, controls create artificial scarcity. Whenever such situations emerge, the temptation to indulge in black marketing, in profiteering becomes alluring. I am in favor of gradual decontrol. For this purpose I have already filed a bill in the Senate providing for the necessary exchange for essential and semiessential consumer goods and the requirements of essential and semiessential industries. I am not worried about the nonessentials and luxuries. Provided we can take care of the essentials and semiessentials, the people, I am sure, will be satisfied. But then the question is asked, how can we effect decontrol when our reserves are low? This brings me to what I have been arguing for during the past several years.

The immediate suspension of the barter trade. The barter trade has been the biggest leak in our dollar earnings. We will never be able to have healthy reserves so long as there is that big hole in our pocket. I dare say we easily lose between \$50 to \$100 million every year through the barter trade. The recent experience in Spain should be an eye opener to us. The government has discovered that many persons and corporations have been keeping dollar accounts in Switzerland and as a result, the exchange reserves of the country have fallen to about \$57 million, whereas the aggregate amount hidden by these persons and corporations is estimated at \$288 million. Unless the barter trade is immediately suspended, we will not be able to build up our reserves. There are other means of bolstering these reserves. We should undertake a well studied campaign of obtaining capital goods on deferred payment basis. We could make greater use of Public Law 480. I would even be willing to subsidize our gold mining industry to build up the country's gold reserves. These steps are passive in character. We should at the same time take positive measures. We should lose no further time in establishing connections in countries we do not trade with now. We should take vigorous steps to expand our trade relations with the countries we now deal with. In the short space of ten years, Israel has been able to sign up bilateral agreements with at least 21 countries and with the skillful and adept use of the swing balance of payment provided for in these bilateral agreements, Israel, in effect, has increased her exchange reserves by the aggregate of the credits provided for in these trade agreements. All of the countries in Europe are currently engaged in establishing footholds in Africa. We have not explored the possibilities of trading with the Latin American countries. A continuing survey of the markets we now have and the establishment of footholds in new markets require a thorough dissection of the market potentials, the currency problems, tariff, and many other related problems. This should be a major program of our government. It is imperative that we start now a bold and dynamic program of market exploration, development and exploitation.

Such a move is almost imposed on us. When we undertook the revision of the Bell Trade Agreement in 1954, we stated in Washington that as we lose preferment in the American market, we should undertake a program to develop other markets for both our exports and for the sources of our imports. Four years have elapsed and I find almost nothing in the way of implementing this policy decision.

I will now take up with you briefly another major problem that faces us. The royal road to inflation is deficit spending. I have always stood for a balanced budget. For several years now, when the budget would come to the Senate Finance Committee for review, I have repeatedly called the attention of our executive branch to the overestimated revenues and the danger of indiscriminate bond issues. There is something radically wrong in a fiscal policy that bases its estimates of revenues on the assumption of the approval of new tax measures without first ascertaining whether such tax measures would meet with congressional approval.

When I first ran for Senate in 1951, I limited my program of government to three fundamentals. I said I would lend my every effort toward establishing in this country an honest government, an efficient government and a progressive government. Without honesty in the government, we cannot expect of the people their continuing support. Without efficiency, we cannot expect the people to pay their taxes nor to contribute their share to the economic development. There must be palpable evidence that every centavo collected in the form of taxes is returned to the people in terms of services, improved services and expanded services. And a government can never be, must never be static in its concepts. It must look forward, it must be progressive.

We should profit from the experiences of other countries, adopt those measures which would fit into the local conditions and discard those that find no local application. I am confident that a people that performed so heroically in the last world war can be as heroic in these times of peace, if there would be patriotic, competent and dedicated leadership.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower budget is a remarkable achievement.

First. We have a balanced budget, with outgo matched to income. That makes sense to everybody.

Second. No important Government activities—particularly national defense—have been cut back below current levels.

Third. The present income tax rates will bring in the revenues we need, without increasing the rates.

Fourth. We can go ahead with the buildup of defense, space exploration, and general welfare programs.

And fifth, we can hold off inflation.

When you realize that the Government is in the hole this year by about \$13 billion, you begin to see what a terrific job President Eisenhower and the Budget Bureau have done on the new budget.

I will be frank in saying that I did not think it could be done. As a Member of Congress, I see the terrific pressures for higher spending from all quarters. Defense costs have been going higher, and in a number of nondefense areas, such as farm price supports, the story is the same. But the President got his Cabinet officers together and told them they must hold expenses down and postpone everything that was not absolutely essential to the country right now.

So the President has given the Congress a budget that can be balanced.

If the Congress goes along with him, the budget will stay in balance, without increasing taxes and without hurting necessary public services.

Speaking for myself, I am going to give the President all the help I can on his budget. It is good business for all of us, and it will hasten the day when a prosperous economy will produce the income to finance the Government and to make possible a reduction in tax rates.

We owe the President a standing vote of confidence and thanks.

We Remember—We Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the following editorial which appeared in the January 8 issue of the Detroit News. I believe this candid message of greeting to Mr. Mikoyan upon his visit to Detroit will prove of interest to all Members of the House:

WE REMEMBER—WE HOPE

TO ANASTAS IVANOVICH MIKOYAN, FIRST DEPUTY PREMIER OF THE SOVIET UNION, Greetings:

Because you are a stranger, and because it is the long, proud tradition of this free Nation to offer hospitality to all strangers, we welcome you to Detroit, as other Americans have welcomed you to their cities. But because you come ostensibly to know us better, you should know first of all that the handshake of courtesy does not in the least dim our memory of your government's brutalities and particularly of your own visit to Budapest during the Hungarian uprising to support Kadar in the bloody business of crushing patriots.

We don't overlook the past, or your own responsibility for it during an extraordinary career of total devotion to self-interest at any cost. Every man, however, and every nation in a just world must be conceded to have a future as well as a past, a chance, not to be forgiven, for that is not man's business, but to go forward. While condemning unreservedly what you have done to those who wanted only to live their own lives, we resist the temptation to condemn in advance what you may do better hereafter.

You come on a mission of peace, prepared, it is said, to discuss increased trade and perhaps also diminished hostility between our countries. Most of us have long believed in maximum trade among nations, provided

only that the exchange of goods for mutual profit is the mutually accepted goal.

We note with misgiving that the Soviet Union has not always bought and sold in that spirit, that rather it regards trade as one of the more effective weapons for its obstinate war against the Western democracies. For instance, we remind you of the recent dumping on the London market of Soviet metals, which were not even surplus, in order to break international prices and so try out Soviet economic power.

The fact, of which you of course are aware, is that Soviet trade is carried on only by the Soviet state with the full power of the state behind each transaction. Our free businessmen are naturally reluctant to beard such a political colossus, and cultivate markets or sources of supply so at the mercy of a dictator's whim—especially when the dictator is openly sworn to destroy them as capitalist enemies.

On the other hand we are at least as anxious as you to promote peaceable contacts between our nations. We, too, are convinced that the more we can both do to advance our mutual prosperity, the more we promote our mutual security. A high standard of living is even more potent than understanding in turning people's thoughts from war.

"Budget mfr: There will be peace," you have said over and over since you have been here. These are appealing words, as you surely know. You may also know that our own refrain has been similar for years and yet somehow the world during those years has not enjoyed peace.

We suspect both from what you do and what you say that your peace is not ours, that what you want for other men is the repose of death or the harmony of prison and for yourself the ease of unchallengeable power. Peace for your government seems to consist in your having your own way; war is what happens when the other fellow objects.

We think you are profoundly mistaken in this view, not only because we personally decline to enter your servitude peacefully but because history proves that slavery is not the way to peace. You offer the world only that total surrender which even your own satellites, prodded by roving tanks of the Red army, have refused. Your already enslaved peoples provide not even you with peace but only with those splitting headaches congenital to tyranny.

Peace, in short, like so many aspirations of the human spirit is realizable only in freedom. Until your government sees that, it will go on multiplying the hates, frustrations and fears that make war inevitable.

The tragedy in this is that all your bullying is quite unnecessary to your stated main purpose: To promote the prosperity and security of the Soviet Union. "Let us compete," you say, "in having more milk and more meat and more clothing for people. And we hope you won't complain if we do catch up with you." We say, "Try us, Anastas Ivanovich; just try us."

State Versus Federal Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following speech made by Mr. Burnham Emerson:

STATE VERSUS FEDERAL WATER RIGHTS

(By Burnham Emerson, Colorado River Association, 1958 annual meeting, Las Vegas, Nev., Dec. 5, 1958)

During the past several years there has been, as all of you well know, an accelerated trend toward more and more control by the Federal Government, and less and less control by the several States, in a great many areas of governmental activity. This trend toward federalism, if I may use that term, takes many forms and manifests itself in many different ways, and I am sure you all realize that it is a very significant development of our times.

Much of this trend stems from the concept that practically all commerce is interstate commerce and thus falls within the orbit of the Federal Government. Some of the trend is based on the theory that practically every body of water on the surface of the earth is navigable and so falls within the Federal Government's jurisdiction over navigable waters. When these foundations for Federal jurisdiction fail, the federalists usually fall back on the broad, vague, and comfortable cushion of the general welfare clause in the Constitution.

I am not here, however, to analyze the basis or cause of this trend toward federalism nor to discuss its history. Rather, I want to talk about its manifestation in the field of water-resource development.

As persons interested in the conservation and use of our water resources, you are well aware of the trend in this field. You have seen the Federal Government repeatedly in recent years assert the authority to control, and even to own, waters which for a century or more had been regarded as within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States.

One example, a very dramatic one, was the famous tidelands episode of a decade ago, when the Department of Justice of the United States asserted, and the Supreme Court of the United States agreed—though later reversed by the Congress—that the Federal Government, rather than the States, had paramount rights in the 3-mile strip of water and the underlying soil along the coasts of our seaboard States (*U.S. v. California*, 1947, 332 U.S. 19).

Another and more recent example is the so-called Pelton Dam case (*Federal Power Commission v. Oregon*, 1955, 349 U.S. 435), wherein the Department of Justice asserted, and again the Supreme Court of the United States agreed, that a licensee of the Federal Power Commission could build and operate a power project on Federal lands within the State of Oregon without observing the requirements of Oregon law.

The clear implications of this important decision of the U.S. Supreme Court were of very great concern to everyone in the West who is familiar with water development problems. It appeared from this decision that the United States as a property owner was to be above the law and not required to observe the laws and regulations of the States with regard to the use of water within their borders. Furthermore, it appeared that not only the agencies of the Federal Government but also their licensees, such as the power company which obtained the license for the Pelton Dam from the Federal Power Commission, would also be exempt from State regulation. By this one decision it appeared that the Supreme Court of the United States had greatly expanded the authority of the Federal Power Commission and other Federal agencies and had greatly reduced the effectiveness and value of local regulation of water resource development by the several States.

The Pelton Dam decision is only 3 years old, having been announced in 1955, but the fears which it engendered have already been justified. In a very recent ruling by the U.S. District Court in the State of Nevada the

Pelton Dam doctrine was applied to exempt the U.S. Navy from complying with Nevada laws regulating the appropriation and use of underground waters. I refer to the well-known Hawthorne case (*State of Nevada v. United States*, No. 1247, U.S.D.C., District of Nevada), in which a decision was announced on August 27 of this year.

The importance of this ruling to the State of Nevada and to all other Western States cannot possibly be overemphasized. Like many of the Western States, the State of Nevada depends for its water resources to a very large extent upon the conservation and careful use of its underground water supplies. In order to utilize those underground waters to the best possible advantage the State of Nevada has established, as have many other States, laws and regulations controlling the drilling and operation of wells so that the underground water reservoirs shall be carefully managed and not improperly exploited. Yet this decision in the Hawthorne case would appear to immunize the United States as a property owner from the effect of these necessary regulations. It must be obvious to anyone that the regulations cannot possibly be effective unless all water users are subject to the same control. If the United States, for instance, is one of several property owners whose lands overlie a common underground water reservoir and all of the other property owners are subject to State regulations but the United States is not, then it is clear that the United States can, if it sees fit to do so, take all of the water from the underground basin for its own use. This, of course, would leave all of the other property owners without any water, and also without recourse.

Still another example of federalism in water law is the assertion of the Department of Justice in the Fallbrook case, now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, that the United States has a paramount interest in the waters of the Santa Margarita River above and beyond any interest which would be recognized under California law. One of the grounds given to support this contention was that most of the water of the stream originates in a U.S. forest reserve (*United States v. Fallbrook Public Utility District* (No. 1247-SD-C), a case which by coincidence bears the same clerk's number as the Hawthorne case). This last contention of the Department of Justice was rejected by the trial judge, Hon. James M. Carter, U.S. district judge at San Diego, last August. Doubtless the case will be appealed and if the contention of the Department of Justice should eventually become the law of the land, then I venture to say that practically all of the presently undeveloped waters of the Western States would become the property of the U.S. Government because most of those waters originate in mountain areas where the Federal Government owns most of the land. The result would be obvious—future water resource development in the Western States would be no longer regulated by the States themselves but by a collection of bureaucrats in Washington.

These and many other examples of the growth of Federal authority in the field of water resource development have recently been very well described and analyzed in an excellent address by Mr. Clarence A. Davis, former Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, at the 1958 annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Los Angeles. Mr. Davis entitled his address "Federal Encroachment on State Water Rights." Copies of the address have been prepared by the Irrigation Districts Association of California, which publishes the *Western Water News*, and can be obtained from the office of that association at 945 Pacific Building, San Francisco. I commend Mr. Davis' address to you

as an exceedingly interesting and informative discussion of this subject.

Recognizing the far-reaching consequences of the rule announced by the Supreme Court in the Pelton Dam case, a number of thoughtful statesmen, led by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, have made a determined attempt to obtain action by the Congress to reverse that decision. A bill was introduced for that purpose, S. 863. If adopted, that bill would require the United States and its agencies to comply with laws of the respective States governing the development and use of water resources.

Extensive hearings were held upon the bill by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in 1956. The most significant feature of the hearings was the very extreme position taken by the Department of Justice that the Federal Government owns practically all of the water rights in most of the Western States. These claims of ownership were based in large part on the theory that the Federal Government had acquired title to the water rights from Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and had never parted with title.

Following the hearings on the Barrett bill an attempt has been made to work out with the Department of Justice a compromise which would meet the primary objective of reversing the Pelton Dam decision. One of the leaders in this effort to straighten out this situation is Mr. Elmer Bennett, formerly Solicitor and now Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and he is to be commended for his forthright recognition of the importance of protecting the integrity of the water rights and water laws of the respective States. Mr. Bennett has worked diligently with the representatives of the Department of Justice to arrive at an acceptable solution of the problem.

So far as I am advised, the efforts to compromise the issue with the Department of Justice have not yet progressed to the point where success is assured. A tentative draft of a substitute bill has been released, and it has received a good deal of study and criticism on the part of interested citizens. The substitute bill certainly goes a long way toward correcting the Pelton Dam decision, but it contains some qualifying language which must be clarified before everyone can be sure that the bill will achieve the desired result.

I hope that the problem will continue to receive close attention and that in the forthcoming session of Congress it will be solved. Meanwhile, the Pelton Dam doctrine is still the law, and unless corrected by Congress it will certainly accelerate the trend toward federalism in the management of our water resources.

As I have said, one result of this accelerated trend toward federalism may well be a move toward the establishment of a system of Federal water right administration superimposed upon and perhaps largely replacing the present administration of water rights by the respective States. This is a development which I, for one, would view with great alarm. I trust that it shall never come to pass and I hope that it will never even be suggested. But if it should be suggested that the Federal Government ought to establish a bureau for the administration of water rights to which the United States lays claim, then I urge all of you to resist such a proposal with all of the force and strength at your command.

Let us examine very briefly some of the results which might follow from the establishment of a system of Federal water right administration.

First, it would mean abandonment of any hope of regulating the use of water by the United States and its many agencies. No one who has observed the management by the Federal Government of its own property

could imagine for a moment that the Federal Government would regulate itself while regulating others.

Second, The paramount interest of the Federal Government in our undeveloped water resources would be permanently and irrevocably established. Water right permits which might be issued by the Federal Government to private citizens or to cities or local districts would probably be made expressly subject at all times to all existing and future requirements of the Federal Government and its agencies. Such a permit system would impair the ability of local interests and local governments to finance water resource development projects through normal financing channels because the purchasers of the bonds issued to pay for the construction of the water conservation facilities would know that the water rights to be utilized by the facilities could be terminated by the Federal Government if a Federal agency should later develop a need for the use of the same water. The natural result of this condition would be that the Federal Government itself would have to finance the local agencies. Thus the Federal Government would control not only the water rights but also the purse strings. There would be little left for the local interests to do except to pay their Federal taxes.

Third, All water right administration by the Federal Government would, of course, be concentrated in Washington. This would mean that persons having need for water permits, or wishing to oppose the issuance of water permits to others, would have to travel back and forth to Washington, probably at frequent intervals, in order to present their petitions or protect their interests. Not only would this add greatly to the expense at every stage of the proceeding, but also it would add greatly to the amount of time required for the processing of water right applications. All of you who have done business with the United States know that it always moves very slowly, and sometimes not at all.

Fourth, Of necessity the Federal administration of water rights would be required to establish the same criteria and follow the same policies, rules, regulations and practices throughout the country. This necessarily means that the differences in law which have been built up over many decades by the several Western States would be suppressed. It also means that the differences in geographical characteristics, climatic patterns and water requirements of various States might be disregarded. Such an effort to establish a system which would be suitable for every place and every condition would in all probability produce a system which would suit no one except the bureaucrats who designed it.

Fifth, The establishment of a Federal system of water right administration would open the regulation of our water resources to all of the social and economic theories which so often find expression in the policies of the Federal Government. Water rights would be administered not on the basis of specific projects to meet specific needs but rather on some high-sounding combination of the philosophy of the general welfare clause, the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, the balancing of the public interests, and, of course, the lure—the pie in the sky—of Federal financing.

These are some of the conditions which might be forced upon us if the claims of the United States Department of Justice should eventually become the law of the land. I am not relying merely upon my imagination in describing these conditions, nor am I seeing ghosts. Most of these same conditions are actually present in the administration by the Federal Government of the waters which are developed by the

United States under the reclamation laws. Even if we should assume—which I for one do not—that these policies are good and proper and wise for the particular and limited field in which the reclamation laws operate, I am sure you will agree that expanding them into the administration of water rights generally would be unfortunate.

As an example, let me direct your attention for a few moments to the effect of the acreage limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and as I do so please let your own imagination tell you what would happen if these same principles were applied in the administration of practically all future water-resource development in the entire country.

As you know, the acreage-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws were incorporated in the original Reclamation Act of 1902 for the purpose of curbing monopoly and preventing speculation in the development of public lands in the Western States. The basic principle had its origin in the provisions of the homestead laws which limited the area of public land to be given to a single individual. This principle was readily adaptable to the reclamation laws which were intended to provide a means for the improvement of lands within the public domain so as to encourage and facilitate their settlement. I do not know of anyone who seriously quarrels with the application of this principle to public land development.

But when this same principle is applied, as it has been, to privately owned lands, great controversy arises.

This controversy has been the subject of numerous articles, several books, much oratory, many debates in Congress, and even some litigation. It goes without saying that the Federal Government may properly impose fair and reasonable conditions in return for its financial assistance in the development of water resources. The question in dispute is: Are the acreage limitation provisions reasonable and fair conditions to impose on the owners of privately held lands who receive such help?

The effect of the provisions is that in order to receive supplemental water a farmer must reduce his landholdings to what the demagogues graciously call the family size farm. This term is a misnomer, or at best a euphemism, for subsistence farm. By its own very words, that term "family size farm" implies that the farm should be of such size that it will barely support a family and no more. If the farm will support more than a single family it obviously contains more land than a family needs and so is too large to be a family-size farm. If the farm will provide a family with more than enough income for its own support, the farm is also by definition too big. Likewise, if the farm enables the owner to make a net profit to invest in other lands or to build up a savings account the farm is also by definition too large because it is providing the family with more than a self-sustaining income.

One common complaint about the acreage limitation is that in many areas 160 acres is not nearly enough to support a farmer—to say nothing of a family—even at a subsistence level. In answer to this complaint the advocates of the rigid 160-acre limitation have said that if the farmer who lives in such an area needs more land he should take unto himself a wife, and then he and his wife together can have 320 acres. If that is not sufficient, they say, then the farmer and his wife should have some children, each of whom could add another 160 acres to the family holdings. Thus, in reality, what these spokesmen have been advocating is not a family-size farm, but rather a farm-size family.

The result of these limitations is that as the price for receiving a supplemental water

supply for his land, the farmer who owns more than the prescribed unit must reduce his holdings to a bare subsistence level and must refrain from ever enlarging his farm above a subsistence level so long as he lives in the reclamation project. This continuous hand-to-mouth existence is imposed upon the farmer despite the fact that he pays his full share of the cost of construction of the irrigation facilities and his full share of all operating expenses.

As the excuse for imposing these conditions, the defenders of the acreage limitation provisions cite the fact that under reclamation law Federal funds are made available to the farmer upon an interest-free basis for a period of 40 years or more. The waiver of interest is said to be a form of subsidizing the farmer. In return for this subsidy, however, the Federal Government makes sure that the farmer shall never make enough money from farming to acquire more than the maximum amount of land which the Federal Government arbitrarily says one family may own. In other words, the Federal Government forbids the subsidized farmer from making a success of his business by enlarging his farm.

This attitude is directly contrary to the motivating ambition and the goal of every farmer in the country. Farmers traditionally have a strong desire to acquire more land with which to enlarge their operations, so as to provide farm lands for their children and their grandchildren and have adequate security for their own old age. Yet the Federal Government tells the farmer who receives water from a reclamation project that so long as he stays in the project he must suppress his ambition, abandon his goal, and content himself with remaining on a subsistence level.

Subsidies are not unknown or unusual in the farming activities of the Federal Government, but the subsidy represented by the interest-free financing under the reclamation laws is the only subsidy which carries with it a prohibition against successful operation of the subsidized business. In no other area of subsidized activities does the Federal Government prohibit success or penalize successful operators. All other subsidies are available to all who qualify, without discrimination on account of size, wealth, or resources, but the subsidy contained in the reclamation laws discriminates against the successful operator and guarantees that all beneficiaries of the subsidy shall never make anything more than a bare living on a family size farm.

Probably the oldest Federal subsidy is that of the Post Office Department, which operates year after year at a huge deficit made up from the general funds obtained by the Federal Treasury from the Federal taxpayers. The users of the postal service thus obtain the service at substantially less than its real cost and the Government pays the difference. This is a direct subsidy. Yet the subsidy is available to the largest mail-order house in the country on the same basis as to a one-man business or to a housewife. Everyone who purchases a postage stamp is a beneficiary of the subsidy. There is no discrimination in the distribution of the benefits of the postal subsidy.

Another early form of subsidy was the land grants to the railroads. There again the subsidy carried no conditions which discriminated between the large and the small operator. No penalty was imposed upon success. The land grants carried with them various conditions which the recipients were required to observe, but those conditions fell alike upon the short and the long railroads and there was no discrimination among them. Similar subsidies are used today in developing the country's airlines and steamship services. But these subsidies are also free from discriminatory restrictions.

There are very large governmental subsidies of various kinds in our farm price sup-

port programs, and while these are accompanied by planting restrictions, the limits are based upon historical performance and not upon any such arbitrary maximum as the family-size farm.

While not subsidies in the strict sense of the word, vast benefits are given to the people of the country in our flood-control projects and rivers and harbors improvement works. These benefits go to the rich and the poor alike. A Federal flood-control dam affords equal protection, without discrimination, to the huge industrial plant and the small cottage. The harbors and aids to navigation provided by the Federal Government are used upon exactly the same terms by the small tramp freighter and the huge ocean liner. There is no discrimination in the dispensation of these benefits. All citizens are treated alike regardless of size, or ability to pay.

Rather than discouraging expansion by imposing artificial limits, these subsidies and other benefits are calculated to aid expansion and encourage success.

But when we look at the acreage limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation law we find that success is virtually forbidden, so that the only beneficiaries of the subsidy are those farmers who are content to live at a subsistence level. They must abandon all hope of expanding their operations within the reclamation project and they must either move out of the project or be content to struggle along on a hand-to-mouth basis for the rest of their lives.

This is the rankest kind of discrimination against the farmer. It imposes conditions upon him which are not duplicated in any other field of governmental activity. For this reason, the proper name for these provisions of the reclamation laws should be the "acreage discrimination" provisions.

An earnest effort was made in the last session of the Congress to obtain an amendment of these provisions which would lessen the discrimination and make it possible for a farmer in a reclamation project to achieve real success by enlarging his farm over the subsistence size arbitrarily dictated by the present law. This amendment was presented by Senator Barrett of Wyoming in Senate bill No. 2541. If adopted it would have incorporated into the Reclamation Law the Engle formula—so named because it was originally proposed some years ago by Mr. CLAIR ENGLE, who was then a Congressman and is now our newly elected Senator from California. Under the Engle formula the owner of excess acreage in a reclamation project would be permitted to receive project water for his excess lands, without agreeing to sell the excess acreage, by obligating himself to pay interest upon his share of the repayment obligation to the United States, thus foregoing the benefit of the interest-free financing which the reclamation laws make available to owners of nonexcess lands. This plan requires the farmer to give up the subsidy as the price for rising above the subsistence level—so the formula is still discriminatory in its effect upon successful farmers, but at least it does remove the existing prohibition against success.

This bill to adopt the Engle formula came before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at hearings on April 30 and May 1, 1958, and it was debated extensively. However, the Senate subcommittee filed no report regarding the bill and took no action respecting it. The bill therefore died in committee upon the adjournment of the final session of the 85th Congress last August.

So the family-size farm is still with us. Even at the sacrifice of his share of the subsidy, the farmer in a reclamation project cannot escape this arbitrary limit upon his own success. He must remain at a subsistence level or get out of the project. This limitation is imposed upon him by ardent crusaders and well-meaning but poorly in-

formed do-gooders in the name of democracy and the American way of life. In my judgment, it is neither American nor democratic to hold a farmer down to subsistence farming. Rather it is paternalism and collectivism at their very worst.

Although the specific thrust of the limitation provisions is aimed at use of water, the immediate impact is upon title to land. By this means the Federal Government exerts control over land ownership patterns. To do so is to interfere directly with the State's own determination as to what land laws it shall apply to establish and stabilize its agricultural and industrial economy according to its own best judgment. Land laws are peculiarly and properly within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. In fact, hardly any subjects of legislation are as deeply rooted in our doctrine of States rights as are the laws by which land titles are determined, land uses are regulated, land tenures are controlled, and land taxes are collected. Yet, through application of these provisions of reclamation law the Federal Government is imposing its own rules regulating land ownership patterns in many large areas of irrigated agricultural development.

This artificial control of the destiny of the individual farmer is the type of control which emanates from the Federal Government when it is given a lever and a fulcrum with which to exert its power. In this instance the lever is the Federal Treasury and the fulcrum is the farmers' need for supplemental water supplies. If the Federal Government's power should be augmented by taking over the ownership of substantially all of the remaining water resources of the Western States, the result would be an utterly unmanageable force which could compress most of our western agricultural economy into whatever mold the Washington bureaucrats might fashion.

Let us hope that none of us shall ever see the day when this shall come to pass. It can be avoided, but as for all our cherished freedoms, eternal vigilance is the price.

Thank you for your very patient attention.

One World and "The Winter Solstice"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an international broadcast over ABC network on the program "Message of Israel," delivered on Sunday, December 21, by my very dear friend, Rabbi Martin M. Weitz of Beth Israel Congregation in Atlantic City:

The winter solstice—December 21—is the shortest day and the longest night in the calendar of man. It is the seedbed of his deepest fears and greatest hopes, because of the shadow-long night, because the sun was at its lowest ebb. Primitive religions helped Mother Nature and Father Time along and tried to resolve this dilemma by festivals of light in one form or another. The Saturnalia of the Romans centered about the winter solstice to impart strength to growing things latent in the winter-night. Greeks as well as Romans, Persians as well as Mithraists, shared different observances in a common observation of the sun's return to strength, directly after the winter solstice. The Jewish Festival of Lights and the Chris-

tian Day of Nativity also suggest this endless search for light in a world of darkness, the solving of crises in a balance of forces. Crises have ever been central to the calendar of all faiths. Crises, as birth, maturity, marriage, death, are basic for the rites of the individual, while group crises are sources for the great days that aim for world-ways—signposts at the crossroads of space and time in the life of man.

The winter solstice suggests a balance of forces that may harvest light out of darkness and yield strength beyond weakness, even as a philosopher-poet phrases it, "Yea, though I stand on a heap of wreckage, I may touch the stars" or, "I love the stars too deeply to be fearful of the night."

What are current zones where religion at its ablest and bravest may throw a bridge of the spirit across the "no man's land" of contemporary crisis, even as the winter solstice throws a torch of light across the year's deepest and longest night of darkness?

As darkness makes way for light in the winter solstice, so the no man's lands may become zones of safety, by a synthesis rather than antithesis of seeming opposites, by closing open gaps of conflict, as much as possible, and bridging them with cooperation, by surrendering "either or" to new priority of semantics in the landscape of language and for new values in human fellowship.

This balance may be sought and wrought first in striving for a synthesis of faith and health, of religion and psychiatry, so there be not a latent truce but a potent peace by them, a partnership to serve both better.

Judaism in general and progressive Judaism in particular may do much to undo the yoke of guilt, to reinterpret "sin" as "chet" ("miss the mark"), for modern man to free us from creeping clinging infantile inferiorities and inadequacies, to create a climate for a spiritual Shmitah, a religious therapeutic statute of limitations, a kind of sabbatical leave for sorrows, guilt, frustration, which we often try to drown only after they have learned us how to swim.

Varied are the interpretations in a bridging of religion and psychiatry. As Erich Fromm counsels us, "Man is not in danger of becoming a slave today as of a robot, for he has no joy while living in the midst of plenty. When man is bored he becomes vicious. When man counts so little, it is difficult for either religion or psychoanalysis to be effective." He specifies further, "Religion should aim to make a man fully human, to be able to unfold, to give love and devotion and in which psychoanalysis could play a role by helping man to overcome greed, folly, anger, fear and his illusions about nature, reality and himself."

The pathway across no man's land could be prepared with psychiatry as the bulldozer, to cleanse and remove the debris, while religion could be as a concrete mixer, with dependable fill-in of material for the precious traffic of life.

There is indeed worldwide need for much less anxiety and much more faith.

Luminous sentences from the Bible are equal to any modern prescription for mental health, as from book of Proverbs:

"If there be worry in the heart of man, let one talk it away; yea, a goodly word will even make it glad." The book of Psalms anticipates modern psychiatry when it intimates: "When I kept silence, my bones were away through my groaning all the day long. Then I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and my iniquity I have not hid. I said I will make confession concerning my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sins." Both catharsis and transfer are implied in these outbursts, with God as Supreme Intelligence (in lieu of a human analyst).

Beyond soul probers of a generation ago, we find doctors and ministers, as well as psychoanalysts and religionists of our own days, together sharing a groping and growing awareness of a relationship between faith and medicine as they strive to serve the ill. The Journal of American Medical Association for April 13, 1957, emphasizes that "Today, medicine and religion are drawing together more closely than ever before. No longer as in the past, do the doctor and the clergymen find themselves in competitive roles. Instead the men in white and the men in black are aware of a relationship between faith and health." The confessional of the chaplain and the couch of the analyst have helped the patient more than ever before. The New National Academy of Religion and Mental Health—600 members of the American Psychiatric Association, 600 psychoanalysts, as social workers and laymen, and 600 clergymen of all major faiths. This gigantic effort is paralleled by regional units, coordinating pastoral care and clinical experience.

As an Einstein beyond Copernicus, so a Fromm beyond a Freud has perceived new dimensions for the world within. The new interpreters concede the validity of ceremony for spiritual as well as emotional stability, the value of personal identity and integrity with rootage in the world, the life of faith in personal tragedy as synonymous with faith in life.

The great physician, Sir William Osler, once asserted, "Nothing in life is more wonderful than faith, the one great moving force we can neither weigh in the balance nor test in the crucible." The book of Proverbs synthesizes all this effort to balance faith and health in a simple prescription for life: "For as one thinketh in his heart, so is he. . . ."

Our second zone of safety—for more cooperation and less conflict is in a balance between individual and family.

Indeed we might paraphrase the prayerbook ala the Sabbath with, "Even as Israel has preserved the family, so the family has preserved Israel." In order to have the family survive and revive in the atomic age, religion in general and Judaism in particular may aid the family by stabilizing it on new terms even as on old values; by helping form institutes for marriage-counseling in our colleges, and even in our high schools; by dealing intelligently with such new phenomena as "going steady," "bird dogging," and other juvenile experiences; by advocating single standards of morality for men and women; by laboring for uniform divorce laws throughout the country, and in all other matters, so that the family be a preserving force not only for morality but for faith in itself in the atomic age. Marriage would not be merely a biologic mating, or a psychologic accommodation, or an economic partnership, but even more, a relationship through life as well as for life, sanctioned by the state, and sanctified by religion. Is it not strange that man could find no finer phraseology to beautify his most significant quest even for Deity than when he used family terminology, even for "fatherhood of God" and "brotherhood of man"?

A third zone where faith may bridge the gulf is in the emergent conflict of ruralism and urbanism. The vast network of suburbia (as overnight Levittowns), exurbia (as weekend estate villages), and interurbia (as blends of both along railroads or flightlines or turnpikes, a continuous settlement from, say, New York City to Washington, D.C.) is in itself a mobility of restlessness, a compulsive obsession for making money, a moving to and fro almost aimlessly for its own sake.

How may the new America have the standard of living—urbanism—balanced with a standard of life—ruralism? How may we spiritually integrate and physically

consolidate this mood for vast mobility, so that it be anchored, creative and responsive to its own needs here and overseas?

Here, too, a balance may be initiated by faith, to lessen the distance between Adam and atom, with vast slum clearance, atom-powered industry, garden-garlanded, school-ornamented, and culture-motivated communities, with a spiritual rather than secular base for our own permanent survival.

A final zone, for which faith may point a new way, is in the struggle of east and west. Religion may be as a lighthouse serving all points of the compass. We may live to see the ultimate reality in the cycle from war to peace, beyond blood-feuding by clans, wars by city-States and within States, dueling by individuals, crusades by religious-national empires, counteroffensives between world powers. * * * In the physical acceleration from atom to hydrogen to cobalt bomb, we may perceive the end of imperial unification, balance of power or similar techniques for control, and the beginning of world peace.

The more global, mechanistic, destructive, impersonal, war becomes, the less likely its final employment for victories. In the final analysis, there is naught but paralysis * * * for so-called victor or vanquished. The warless world may be ours—if we of faith, all over the world, will it, pray for it and work for it, free from military mentality from the past and for spiritual reality of the future, free from private animosity, major atrophy and general apathy—to employ military phraseology—for equations of war deeply laden within each of us.

"In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. * * * "If you confide not, ye abide not * * * " are echoes from the prophet of peace, Isaiah.

As an Albert Einstein at the end of days, and a Leo Baek, upon liberation from a concentration camp, we, too, may share their unspoken meditations:

"For those that have mud on their feet, let us remove that mud * * * for those that have blood on their hands, let us cleanse that blood * * * for those that have fears in their hearts, let us remove those fears * * * for those that have tears in their eye, let us dry those tears."

Thus we blend faith and health, fuse individual with family, balance the rural and the urban, and bridge—through force of spirit rather than spirit of force—even east and west * * * even as the winter solstice, because of the length of its outer night, makes man shine with a profound inner light. Amen.

He's Purged Thousands of Armenians, Helped Wreck Armenian Freedom; He's No More Armenian Than Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following two articles from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Hairenik Weekly regarding our recent visitor to the United States, Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan.

This publication, Mr. Speaker, is sponsored by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia of Boston,

Mass. In view of the apparent aura of respectability and even good will with which Mr. Mikoyan has attempted to surround himself during his recent visit in this country, I think the inclusion of these two articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is of particular note. Since Mr. Mikoyan is himself an Armenian by birth, it is particularly interesting to observe the opinions that are held of him and his visit by his fellow countrymen in the United States.

HE'S PURGED THOUSANDS OF ARMENIANS,
HELPED WRECK ARMENIAN FREEDOM; HE'S
NO MORE ARMENIAN THAN KHRUSHCHEV

(By James H. Tashjian)

The pathological devotion to anyone or anything emanating from or smacking of the Soviet Union on the part of certain Armenian circles is being matched these days by an equally pathological fascination on the part of the American press and "intellectual strata" (to use an excellent Marxist cliché) of the abominable figure of one Anastas Mikoyan who is these days, according to Moscow, the Deputy Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As a self-invited guest of our Republic, Mikoyan is courting through our land, from the mountains, to the prairies, to the oceans white with foam, giving nickel bits of candy to American kids in supermarkets, looking intently and wisely at packaged American donuts, asking motel owners sagely why they are in business, taking 3-mile strolls on crisp Washington mornings, making studiously quotable wisecracks—and receiving billions of dollars of free publicity for it all—free propaganda for communism.

The Hungarians had the right idea.

Instead of being met and followed around dutifully by batteries of newspapermen and photographers, Mikoyan should have been met by people, as he was met by the Hungarians, aghast that our free land can admit and entertain this Moloch, this man who disgracefully enough—and only coincidentally—bears the proud Armenian name of Mikoyan.

One wonders what exactly would have happened on these shores if, back in 1939 or so, Ribbentrop, or Goebbels, or Rosenberg had come here under the circumstances which have brought Mikoyan hither. And yet, as Congressman Judd said, Mikoyan, "a man with blood on his hands" is in the United States, he is being lionized, he is being feted—he has been admitted into the society of dignified mankind.

He ought rather to be relegated to the status of a pariah. He ought to be an outcast among freemen. He ought to be shunned like the biblical plague. The Hungarians had the right idea. They harassed him at every turn, for he is a man to be harassed. He should be given no rest for his crimes against mankind. He is Anastas Mikoyan, the symbol of dictatorship.

Amazing and astonishing things have taken place from the moment Mikoyan set foot in the United States.

Some of the baldest lies compounded by the Soviet propaganda mills have been eagerly adopted by the American press.

Let's look at some of these:

1. Mikoyan was a theological student. This is a lie. Anastas Mikoyan was never a theological student. He studied for a time as a lay student at the Gevorgian Seminary, at Etchmiadzin, but never had the intention of going on to the priesthood. The idea behind this lie of course is to leave the thought in religious or Christian minds that Mikoyan, because of his theological educational background (which he never had), certainly has a kernel of goodness within him. Said a minister to us the other day: "Well, the fellow studied for the priesthood. He must

have some good somewhere in him." Soviet propaganda hitting home.

2. Mikoyan is an old Bolshevik, a hero of the ramparts at Baku, where he was wounded. An interesting lie which bears a bit of treatment.

In 1915, Anastas Mikoyan was a member of General Andranik's contingents fighting against the Turks. It was about that time that he first showed signs of espousing communism. Haunted before his commanding general because he had been agitating rebellion among the Armenian troops, Mikoyan was roundly beaten up physically by General Andranik. He deserted the Armenian Army and went off and joined the Communist revolutionaries. He says he went to Baku, was given important responsibilities there, was wounded in the street fighting. This is a lie, merely an attempt to weave a legend around the fellow. Here's the truth.

In 1918, the Turkish Army was advancing steadily on the city of Tiflis, Georgia, and the Armenian Army facing it was hard pressed to resist. Meanwhile, the Armenian leaders of heavily Armenian-populated Baku, the great oil city on the Caspian, were making all attempts to keep the city in a state of quiet so that the Armenian forces before Tiflis would not have to detach contingents to fight in Baku. Armenians, Georgian, and Tartar leaders in Baku had effected a sort of uneasy truce with the large Turkish population of Baku. It was profitable to the Armenians, and to the Allies, to whom Baku's oil was important, that Baku be not made a battlefield.

There was another group in Baku which felt differently about things—the Communists. It was to the advantage of the revolution for Baku to become a battleground.

One day, the people of Baku awoke to reports of gunfire. In order to provoke the battle they so wished, the Communist bands, led by an Armenian outcast named Shahumian, had crept up on the Turkish wards and had fired on the people there. The Turks, itching for a fight anyway, had fired back. By the time the Armenian, Georgian, Tartar confederation acted to stop the fighting, it was too late. Baku was thrown into a violent holocaust.

Mikoyan says he entered Baku just before the fighting started and served at the barriers. Most Armenian leaders who knew the Communist leadership cabal say they never heard of the fellow, never saw him, never knew he existed. If he fought, he fought as an insignificant guerrilla in the streets. Few remember him, no one remembers his having been wounded; he never played a significant role in Baku. He is a fake, a forgery; he is not an old Bolshevik; he is a comparative newcomer, an opportunist who has pulled himself up through the ranks by his own bootstraps, acting the perfect dutiful Communist lackey of whatever man at the moment holds the U.S.S.R. reins.

He is a great practicing Armenian. Wrote one eager columnist: "Perhaps the power and stature of the man is shown above all in his loyalty to his native Armenia. He has never deserted it. He has always, in the teeth of heavens knows what grudging opposition seen to it that the Armenians have been, by Soviet standards, well looked after * * *"

How silly can we get? Anastas Mikoyan has not been an Armenian since he deserted the Armenian Army. When a man becomes a Communist, he loses his nationality. He adopts a new nationality and a new religion. Anastas Mikoyan is as much an Armenian as is Khrushchev today, or as was Beria or Stalin yesterday; that is, he is a Communist, and a Communist cannot be an Armenian; nor can he be Hungarian, American, French, Irish, or anything other than a Communist.

Rather than being the great practicing Armenian, Mikoyan has brought terror and hardship to his people. Here are but a few

examples of the "Armenianism" of this Moloch:

Mikoyan was the right-hand man of Lavrenti Beria when, in 1936, that murderer entered Armenia to organize the Armenian phase of the great U.S.S.R. purges which took the lives of thousands of intellectuals, leaders, and innocent people. As Beria's aide, Mikoyan devotedly executed his responsibilities—liquidating thousands of the people whom he is now supposed to adore.

It is now known that Mikoyan himself was personally involved in the assassination of Aghasi Khanchian, the Secretary of the Communist Party of Soviet Armenia, whom Beria slew in Tiflis for his temerity in demanding that the Soviet Government give Armenia a fair deal in the matter of territorial distribution and the right to retain for native use more of the products of Armenia (see *Hairenik Weekly*, Dec. 25, 1958).

It is also known today that Mikoyan helped actively to destroy the Independent Republic of Armenia, of 1918-20, by his behind-the-scenes maneuverings in Moscow during the crucial days of the Republic.

When the delegation of the democratic state was in Moscow on a formal mission to ask aid against Turkey, Mikoyan is known to have advised his Soviet comrades to reject Armenia's request. In fact, he is known to have advised the occupation of Armenia by a joint Soviet-Turkish force—which took place November 29, 1920, and resulted in the Sovietization of Armenia.

When Mikoyan visited Armenia some years ago, speaking in Russian, he advised the Armenian people too to make Russian their everyday tongue. He praised the great Russian people to the skies.

Now there is a point here that we ought to belabor a bit. Anastas Mikoyan, they are all telling us these days, is a really big man in the Soviet Union, and has been for some time. He is, we are also told, always mindful of conditions in Soviet Armenia, and is incessantly trying to aid the land and its people.

Again how silly can we get?

If Mikoyan is the man of influence he appears to be in the U.S.S.R., how is it then that Armenia has been considered by recent foreign visitors there the poorest country we have seen? Harry Schwartz, of the New York Times was aghast at the poverty of Armenia; Christian Pineau, the former Foreign Minister of France, was appalled at the destitution of the country; the American builders' commission came back and told the people of America that Armenia was a veritable slum under Soviet rule.

"Big shot" Mikoyan certainly couldn't have spent too much time trying to straighten things out down in his beloved Armenia—which he visits once every 3 or 4 years on a special propagandistic occasion—such as when he is up for reelection in one of those curious Soviet demonstrations of the persecution of the mechanics and principles of democracy in action.

Mikoyan is an admirer of the great Russian central cadre of the Soviet Communist movement, and let's make no bones about it. There are too many Mikoyan quotes on record in this respect to here adduce. He is simply a great Russian (Mikoyan disdains speaking Armenian any more, once told an American newspaperman in Moscow that he has forgotten the language, but who needs Armenian in Russia anyway?)

He wouldn't have lasted through these years of violence in the Soviet Union if he were anything but a lover of the great Russian battery of communism.

Which makes the little anecdote told by a glib American newspaperman even more remarkable for its naivete.

Mikoyan once asked some American press representatives in Moscow why they thought that each evening invariably he visited Joseph Stalin. They didn't know. Well, he

said, "Stalin and me meet and drink a toast. And do you know what toast we always drink? We lift our glasses up and shout 'To hell with these so-and-so Russians.'"

Nonsense. A perfectly amiable newspaper story, but hardly credible. One cannot imagine the Russophile, Joseph Stalin, proposing the above toast, even in private, when, on May 24, 1945, at the great Kremlin banquet for Red Army commanders, he arose and proposed a different toast:

"I should like to drink to the health of our Soviet people, and first of all, to the great Russian people. I drink first of all to the health of the Russian people because it is the most outstanding nation of all the nations forming a part of the Soviet Union * * * it has earned a general recognition in this war as a leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country. * * * Hail the great Russian people, the saviors of the Soviet state." (See *Pravda*, May 25, 1945.)

Those who were present at the banquet say that Mikoyan immediately seconded this eulogic toast, as the bones of 40,000 Armenian soldiers rotted away in the death arena of the Crimea.

As Americans of Armenian parentage, we especially ought to keep our wits about us in the matter of this Mikoyan person.

We ought to come to our senses as a matter of fact. It simply is not enough for a person to be an Armenian for us to accept him into the fold, and even go easy on him.

It is awful, incredible, awesome, and frightening, for instance, when any Armenian publication breaks out with the front page news welcoming "Mr. Anastas Mikoyan, the great Armenian official, to the United States"; or when a false Soviet Armenian Foreign Minister, an MVD agent named Balabek Martirosian, one of the Soviet secret police who loused up the lives of our people in the Lori district of Soviet Armenia, comes to the United States on a mission, rather than proposing receptions and banquets for such a man, we ought to shun him like the plague, at least shun him if we can't get up the necessary courage to expose the rascal for what he really is.

We wonder, said a columnist of one of our pro-Soviet organs, whom Mikoyan would visit if he were to visit Watertown. We have no doubt whom Mikoyan would visit.

But meanwhile, let the American and the Armenian press stop imputing in this man and his story imagined virtues. Anastas Mikoyan simply does not warrant a single kind thought. The quicker he leaves America the sooner the air will clean, and the safer we all will be.

EDITOR OF ASBAZEP NEWSPAPER RECALLS HAVING MET GUEST ANASTAS MIKOYAN

(By John M. Bernier)

If Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan includes Fresno on the itinerary of his trip to the United States it is doubtful that he will drop in on Andre Amourian to talk over old times.

Amourian, the editor of *Asbarez*, an Armenian language newspaper published in Fresno and Mikoyan attended a university in Etchimizdin, Armenia, in 1917.

However, since their student days when they argued politics in the coffee shops near the Armenian Academy the men have been political foes. And Amourian suspects that ending up in a Soviet prison in 1943 may have been the work of Mikoyan.

Mikoyan is scheduled to arrive in the United States tomorrow for a 2 weeks visit. It has been reported he may include California in his tour.

Most persons who knew Mikoyan at the academy, Amourian said, expected that someday he would become a Communist leader. At the academy Mikoyan was one of the leaders among the Communist students and Amourian headed the Dashnak, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation. The federa-

tion's aim is the establishment of a free Armenian Republic.

"Mikoyan arrived at the academy about February 1917," the Fresno editor recalled. "He was with a group of other Communist students who had been studying at another school in the Province of Georgia. He moved into the same dormitory where I was living."

"The thing I remember particularly about him was that he was such a good speaker. He spent more of his time in classrooms and outside arguing in favor of Marxism. Fortunately we had some good Dashnak speakers who could keep up with him."

"Mikoyan had a hot temper and he had difficulty controlling it when he discussed politics. This quick temper may have been one of the reasons he ended up in the Communist movement."

"Previously he had been a Dashnak and served as a volunteer in 1915 in the army of the Armenian national hero General Antranik. He got in an argument with the general and the general struck him. Two years later he appeared at the academy a dedicated Communist."

Amourian describes Mikoyan as full of energy and one who never tired of debating politics.

When the Russian Revolution broke out in November 1917, he recalls, Mikoyan and the other Communist students went to join the fight in the Baku oil fields.

At this time he was about 21 years old.

This was the last direct contact Amourian had with the Russian leader. The newspaperman's work for the Dashnak movement took him to Iran and in 1943 the Red Army occupied part of that country. Following on the heels of the first Russian units were the agents of the Soviet secret police.

Amourian said he was thrown into a Russian prison by the secret police. At the time, he declared, he was accused of plotting Stalin's assassination. Two years later Amourian was released through the intercession of the United States and Iranian Governments.

He says he does not know for certain, but he believes Mikoyan may have been responsible for his arrest by the secret police.

Mikoyan, like Amourian, is of Armenian descent but the Fresno newspaperman says the Soviet leader is rarely known to speak Armenian.

Amourian said that according to a story which has circulated among Armenians throughout the world, the last time Mikoyan spoke in his native tongue was years ago when he had too many vodkas at a banquet in the Rumanian Embassy in Moscow.

Mikoyan was born in Sanahin, a small town in Soviet Armenia, but according to Amourian, he has no particular feeling for the Armenian people and usually will not admit he is Armenian.

Amourian was sent to Fresno from Iran in 1953 as the editor of *Asbarez* and a fieldworker for the Federation.

His memoirs now are being translated into English from Armenian and will be published in about a year. The book will tell of Amourian's lifelong efforts to help to create a free Armenian republic.

Amourian and his wife now live on their ranch near Madera.

Castro's Blood Bath for Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, with our usual inspired acumen, we seem to

have slightly misjudged Castro and his mission. He hardly seems to be the knight in shining armor, fighting for the ideals of pure freedom, depicted in our press and by many of our revered columnists.

The following article by a very fair and well informed writer on foreign affairs, Mr. Constantine Brown, raises the curtain and gives us an accurate and slightly terrifying picture of reality.

As these startling errors of judgment of curs keep recurring, one begins to believe the words of the late Senator Huey Long when he said, "You can sell any ideology to Americans by calling it Democracy."

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 14, 1959]

CASTRO'S BLOOD BATH FOR CUBA—MORSE CITED AS FIRST SENATOR TO PROTEST MASS EXECUTION OF BATISTA OFFICIALS

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, has the distinction of being the first Senator to raise his voice publicly against the blood bath which has been going on in the new democratic Cuba, where government officials under the regime of ousted President Batista have been murdered in batches.

It is also a strange reflection on modern political ethics that our Government not only rushed to recognize the Castro regime but has not raised its powerful voice against the recent wholesale massacres.

Modern diplomacy apparently requires that governments even formed by murderers be taken to our bosom. It is a quite different frame of mind from that at the turn of the century. When the palace guard in Belgrade murdered King Alexander Obrenovitch and his wife, Draga Machin, all the Western Governments withdrew their diplomatic representatives from the Serbian capital. And when the Okhrana (the secret police of Czarist Russia) organized a pogrom in the Ukraine, also at the turn of the century, we withdrew our Minister from St. Petersburg for about 7 months.

In more recent times we refused to recognize the bloody Communist regime in Russia for 16 years and President Roosevelt recalled our Ambassador to Nazi Germany, Hugh Wilson, because of Hitler's ruthless persecution of the Jews, and left only a chargé d'affaires in Berlin until December 1941, when Germany declared war on us.

It may be that in those days when the administration were not scared of complications we were more justly called the leader of the free world than we are today. We stood for principles and did not merely talk of how nice they are.

No sooner had a Communist-inspired military junta murdered and mutilated the bodies of King Faisal of Iraq and his advisers than we rushed to recognize the regime of murderers. It was explained in Washington that it was necessary to obtain the friendship of the new regime in order to forestall its going completely to either Nasser's United Arab Republic or the Kremlin. According to the latest reports from Baghdad, our rushing did not do much good for ourselves and our remaining friends in the Middle East.

Similarly, we rushed to recognize the new Cuban regime created by Fidel Castro. Off the record explanations in Washington are that we did so because the Cuban rebels replaced the dastardly dictatorship of Batista.

Fidel Castro used to have a well-established reputation as a strong Communist sympathizer who organized the 1948 Bogota demonstrations against Gen. George C. Marshall. His brother Raoul was described as an outright Communist who had studied in

Moscow the MVD techniques of guerrilla warfare against the forces of the capitalist dictators. This appeared to be the information available to the highest official quarters in Washington before Castro started his rebellion and before it seemed that he might succeed. Now all of a sudden he has been declared by the State Department to be lily white. There was nothing really tangible to go by, it was said, to show that Fidel had a hand in the anti-American uprisings in Bogota in 1948 or that Raoul had done anything more than have a good time in the Soviet Union.

The recent wholesale execution of Batista agents, of many members of the regular armed forces of the previous regime, of many other individuals whose greatest guilt was that in order to make a living they had become members of the regular police force, and others against whom the rabble which joined the rebels had scores to settle follows clearly the Russian Communist pattern.

The Communist Party which has been banned in Cuba has not only been permitted to reappear on the political scene but in the 12-man group appointed by Castro's yes man, Provisional President Urrutia, to supervise labor conditions and new legislation, five members are Communists (either Cuban or imported from Venezuela).

While the policy that we must learn to live with Communist governments which are in the eyes of our policymakers uncommitted to international communism is being argued, there is one thing that cannot be debated: That the American Government must never remain indifferent when wholesale massacres and executions without trials (except kangaroo courts) are taking place in a country whose regime we have rushed to recognize.

Richard Cardinal Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include a noteworthy article from the Jewish Advocate of January 8, 1959, entitled "Man of the Year," and editorials of January 10, 1959, from the Boston Herald and Boston Record-American. The Jewish Advocate has conferred its Man-of-the-Year award upon Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston. Boston is proud that a Jewish newspaper has thus saluted a great Catholic prelate. Citizens of Boston and New England will say "well done." Richard Cardinal Cushing is a distinguished son of Boston, born and raised in that city. His long career as Archbishop of Boston was noteworthy not only for outstanding service to his church, but also for service to the community.

[From the Jewish Advocate, Jan. 8, 1959]

MAN OF THE YEAR

In appreciation of his contribution to interfaith understanding, civic progress, and human betterment, the Jewish Advocate bestows its second annual Man of the Year Award upon Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston.

First recipient was the illustrious Bostonian, Ralph Lowell.

In making its designation this year, the board of editors of the Advocate was re-

minded of the magnificent tribute to noble manhood presented to the world by William Wordsworth in his famous poem, "Character of the Happy Warrior." The poet interprets life as a battle—not necessarily a military expedition to expand territory or increase the power of an aggressive nation; not as an assault against the lives or liberties of innocent people, but as an endless and decisive struggle against every type of evil from which the human family suffers. The happy warrior is the heroic soul who meets and masters intolerance, crudeness, deceit, vanity, and violence.

Although writing more than 150 years ago, Wordsworth, with prophetic vision, might well have been thinking of Richard Cardinal Cushing, who is truly a superbly generous spirit. His human impulses make his mind responsive, his heart sympathetic, and his hand helpful to the appeals and sorrows of others.

Cardinal Cushing was born 63 years ago in South Boston, reared and educated in this city, and spent his entire priestly life within a few miles of his birthplace. But there is no place in the United States—and few places abroad—where his zeal, charity, and genuine love of people do not inspire a similar love for him.

In a sense, Archbishop Cushing is many men.

As a churchman, he represents the fullness of the Catholic priesthood. His social thinking has given him place among the most vigorous prelates of the world.

As an orator, he is renowned for his preaching literally everywhere in this country and in Europe.

As an administrator, he ranks with the leaders in business and the captains of industry; his jurisdiction includes a million and a half Catholics and hundreds of hospitals, schools, churches, and homes of every description, each of which receives his personal attention regularly.

In academic circles, he holds the doctor of laws, of humanities, of canon and civil law, of philosophy, of letters, of theology and divinity. Nations honor him as count, knight, commander, and honorary citizen. He is proud of titular memberships in drum and bugle corps, in the Street Railwaymen's Union and in the Boy Scouts.

But his greatest role is played as a man of God. It is from this well that he draws his energy and incredible zeal. He is the administrator of the great Boston See, but his influence and leadership have not been restricted by arbitrary boundaries. Reason, human values, and religious faith have permeated his life and led him to crusade for the rights of people, little people, many of whom have been outside his own church.

His untiring labors for humanity and its welfare have added immeasurably to our community's riches in schools, hospitals, special homes and similar institutions. His personal drive and ceaseless devotion to brotherhood and general goodwill are worthy of imitation everywhere.

His personal appearance and address at a goodwill dinner of the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom was a milestone in community relations. He is an ardent supporter of the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

His forthright statement that there is nothing in Catholic doctrine that should adversely affect the attitude of the Christian towards Jews was an inspirational pronouncement. Speaking at the 75th anniversary convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations when it met in Boston, he declared:

"There are many ignorant or malicious things sometimes said about our beliefs concerning Christ and their effect on the attitudes of Christians toward Jews. I ask you not to believe those things; they are lies and they are said to divide us. No man can have my faith concerning Christ, his life

and death, without loving him and loving the people who produced him, the Jews. No man could have my faith concerning Christ, without desiring to be more like He was and therefore seeking always to serve, to help, to befriend all men without exception—white, black, gentle, Jew. Always remember that a Catholic bishop took time from a busy day to come and tell you that. I did send a representative to assure you of my official friendship. I would not send a scholar to prove that our doctrines do not make us your enemies. I come myself to pledge my personal affection and officially to declare there is nothing in my faith to make us enemies of you. It is all the other way. I can and do pledge to you the friendship of my people."

In addressing the Massachusetts branch of the Jewish Labor Committee, Cardinal Cushing offered a formula for peaceful living calling for "the harnessing of forces of the spirit, power of the holy writ, the electrons of the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments. After reviewing the crucial social and economic problems of our times, he pointed to the Ten Commandments "which are designed to meet our most modern needs," asserting "there would be no religious problems if the rulers of nations would observe the first three commandments. The problems of economic and personal relations among individuals are cared for by commandments 5, 7, 8, and 10. The 4th, 6th, and 9th care for the home unit."

The conferring of the cardinalate on the archbishop of Boston last month was an exalted honor for the diocese of Boston and for its devoted people, but was no less an honor for its illustrious spiritual shepherd. Cardinal Cushing is not a great man because he has been elevated to the sacred college; he is a member of the sacred college because he is a great man.

By the same traits—greatness of heart, mind, and soul—by which Abraham Lincoln raised himself from log cabin to White House, so has Richard Cardinal Cushing risen from poor boy to prince of his church. He is held in affection not only by his religious kinsmen, but by all who have a grateful acquaintance with the fruits of his work.

If the cardinal's noble thoughts against racial antipathy and creedal strife could be put into the hearts of every man and child, then verily would we arrive at the long overdue recognition that we are all children of one loving Father to enjoy the pleasantness of brethren living together in peace.

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 10, 1959]

We are proud of our community today, very proud. We are proud because a great Jewish newspaper has saluted a great Catholic prelate as the man of the year.

The Jewish Advocate has served the cause of tolerance nobly in thus honoring that indomitable fighter of intolerance, Richard Cardinal Cushing. And seldom has this ardent champion of human love and understanding been so aptly described as in the Advocate's tribute:

"Cardinal Cushing is not a great man because he has been elevated to the Sacred College; he is a member of the Sacred College because he is a great man.

"By the same traits—greatness of heart, mind, and soul—by which Abraham Lincoln raised himself from log cabin to White House, so has Richard Cardinal Cushing risen from poor boy to Prince of his Church.

"He is held in affection not only by his religious kinsmen, but by all who have a grateful acquaintance with the fruits of his work.

"If the Cardinal's noble thoughts against racial antipathy and creedal strife could be put into the hearts of every man and child, then verily would we arrive at the long overdue recognition that we are all children of

One Loving Father to enjoy the pleasantness of brethren living together in peace."

[From the Daily Record, Jan. 10, 1959]

It was a nice gesture and a richly deserved one, for the Jewish Advocate, an important Boston publication, to name Richard Cardinal Cushing as the recipient of the Advocate's Man of the Year Award.

In making this designation, the board of editors of the Advocate was reminded of the magnificent tribute to noble manhood presented to the world by William Wordsworth in his famous poem, "Character of the Happy Warrior."

The poet interpreted life as a battle—not necessarily a military expedition to expand territory or to increase the power of an aggressive nation; not as an assault against the lives and liberties of innocent people, but as an endless and decisive struggle against every type of evil from which the human family suffers.

The Happy Warrior is the heroic soul who meets and masters intolerance, crudeness, deceit, vanity, and violence.

In all the land there is no finer personification of this type of leader than Cardinal Cushing, whose zeal, charity, and genuine love of people have certainly made America a better place for persons of varying races, creeds, and faiths.

The Fourth "R"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Peter B. Bart recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. It was described by a constituent of mine, who has children in the public school system, as most disturbing.

While the article deals specifically with a situation in New York City schools, there is no doubt that the same situation prevails throughout most of the country.

We are penalizing the thrifty and the hard working, and while the children who cannot afford proper food and transportation must be given it, there seems no good reason for putting them above their fellow students who are self-supporting.

The article follows:

THE FOURTH "R": A SCHOOL ENCOURAGES PUPILS TO GET ON RELIEF EARLY AND STAY ON

(By Peter B. Bart)

NEW YORK.—"Our school has a more varied curriculum than you may imagine," says the small, graying teacher sipping coffee in the cramped little room her school provides for coffee breaks. "We teach the three 'R's' all right, but our most effective training is in the fourth 'R'—relief chiseling.

This may sound like a rash statement, but the teacher advanced it in deadly earnest. Her view, which she shares with many of her colleagues: That the New York City public schools inadvertently train their pupils in the art of living off the relief rolls. "By the time they finish elementary school, many children already have gotten the idea that the city somehow owes them a living. Indeed, the schools seem to reinforce this attitude," explains the teacher.

How so? Basically, the problem lies in the ways in which the schools channel different forms of public assistance to the children. If a child asks for free lunches, for example, he automatically gets them—no questions asked; in fact, he gets a better meal served under better conditions than children of self-supporting parents.

"No one questions the overall idea of helping children whose parents cannot properly provide for them," observes another teacher. "What irks us is that, in trying to remove the stigma of relief, the schools actually have made it seem desirable and attractive—something to aspire to."

BUSES, MILK, SOUP

Visit this teacher's school on a typical schoolday and you sense what she means. First thing in the morning, for example, a special school bus picks up a large group of children living in a city low-rent housing project (many of whose families are on relief) and totes them the half mile to school. Other children who do not live in the project and whose parents are not on relief must walk to school, even though they, too, may live a good distance away.

In midmorning teachers call a break and distribute milk to the children. Pupils requesting free milk may get it without their classmates knowing—no questions asked. Others pay for their own milk.

At noontime, a majority of the children crowd into the dimly lit auditorium where they eat sandwiches brought from home—the school has no cafeteria big enough to accommodate all of them. But those children who request free lunches receive hot soup plus as many sandwiches as they desire plus ice cream or cookies for dessert. This meal is served in a comfortably furnished, sunny cafeteria at city expense.

Nor is this all. Any child asking for free medical aid, free dental care or free eyeglasses is referred by his teachers to the school nurse who in turn refers him to nearby clinics where he may get the needed services at no cost. And children requesting free clothes may choose their garments from a storeroom provided for this purpose.

In each instance, teachers are instructed to keep secret the names of children receiving these various types of public assistance. Milk money, for example, is collected in a carefully devised manner so as not to embarrass children getting free milk. "But," observes one teacher, "there's really little chance of embarrassing anyone. You never see any embarrassment when the free-lunch children go to their cafeteria. If anything, other children are a little envious."

Of course, no teacher begrudges a free meal to a needy youngster whose parents truly cannot feed him properly. But many teachers at this particular school do believe that these gratuities can be overdone.

FREE MEALS, \$20,000 HOME

Moreover, they resent the stern admonitions from their supervisors not to investigate requests for free meals and the like. "School officials tell us firmly we should not question the children about any of these matters," says a teacher. "Yet no one in authority does any questioning either. I know of one boy in my class whose parents own a \$20,000 house near school, but who asks for and receives free milk and free meals. If I ever talked to him or his parents my meddling would be considered with disfavor by my supervisors."

Concedes the principal of this school: "I know lots of children get free meals and, free clothes who don't really need them. But I'm not supposed to check up on them. If the parents sign a note saying, for example, that they have two children and that the family weekly income is under \$67, or that they have 10 children and their income is under \$150 a week, we just have to take their word for it. No one even knows whether the 10 children are really theirs."

SOME ARE EXCEPTIONS

To be sure, not all schools conform precisely to the setup of the school in question. A few of the schools, for example, have cafeterias in which all the children may eat their lunches in comfort.

But most generally lean over backward to keep from bruising the sensibilities of children receiving public assistance. And, says our teacher friend: "The schools completely succeed in this mission. At the same time, however, they get children accustomed to being on the public dole—and to liking it. I wonder how many of the children leave elementary school with the idea that eventually they may try out for the really big game—adult relief checks."

New York's total public assistance grants, it's noted, already have increased by 40 percent over the last 10 years to \$167.1 million despite the fact that the city's population has remained fairly stable. If these teachers are correct in their analysis, that 40-percent increase should be even greater over the next 10 years, thanks to the schools' training in the fourth "r."

Communist-Line Advances in United States, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS L. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Richard Cardinal Cushing:

[From the Tablet, Jan. 17, 1959]

COMMUNIST-LINE ADVANCES IN UNITED STATES, 1958

The year 1958 will be recorded in the annals of atheistic communism as a year of great progress within the United States.

There are many in the United States and, among them, a number of powerful voices, who contend that the Communist Party is practically dead in this country. We are told not to worry about that question anymore, but merely to prepare ourselves against military assault from outside. Those who argue in this fashion—there are some among them who even go so far as to argue that we should agree to every Soviet demand—point out that within America the Reds have suffered losses.

FALSE MEASURE OF STRENGTH

They no longer stage their huge Madison Square Garden meetings, where formerly at least 25,000 Reds and their friends and supporters assembled on various occasions. They have had a loss in membership partly because of Government prosecutions and partly because of the revisionist split in their ranks. They no longer conduct the Daily Worker, which was an important telegraph agency of the conspiracy to its members and sympathizers. They must now be content with the weekly edition of the Worker.

All of these contentions fail to note what the Communist Party really is, how it maintains itself, and what is the purpose of its operation. These judgments do not include a true measurement of Communist strength, which is well stated by Stalin (citing Lenin) that the party is strengthened by purging itself of opportunist elements.

They do not embrace the true understanding of the operations of the party, which were so well expressed again by Stalin when he said that up to the time when any par-

ticular country can be overthrown by violence the party must advance the Communist line. It must do this, mark you, by making "transmission belts" of as many non-Communist agencies as possible, using them to advance the Red line as though it were something non-Communist.

The true estimate of the strength of the Communist Party is to be gaged from its impact on American opinion—on how much it has succeeded in weakening our opposition to Soviet aggression. What we must ask ourselves constantly in this respect is: How far and in what features has the Communist line made progress in the views and judgments of our Nation? When we answer that question honestly we will see that we have no cause for satisfaction. By that yardstick the Communist Party of the United States is much stronger than is generally realized.

REDS ADMIT GROWING INFLUENCE

We have testimony to this effect from the chief organ of the Kremlin to its followers throughout the world, the December issue of the "World Marxist Review". It pays a warm tribute to the work of the party here, its struggle against revisionists, its regrouping of its ranks, and the extension of iron disciplines among its members and to its growing influence in American life.

It concludes by stating that the American Communists "are making a major contribution to the ideological struggle of the world forces of progress, democracy, and socialism, against the forces of obscurantism, reaction, and imperialism." Remember these are the words of the chief voice of the Kremlin in the international field.

Moscow views the Communist Party of the United States in this favorable light because that party has remained loyal to Moscow and has got rid of its so-called revisionist element. It has from the Communist viewpoint strengthened itself by getting rid of opportunist elements, so that it can dedicate itself fundamentally to the final aim of overthrowing this Government by violence, and, in the meantime, fully and faithfully forwarding the Communist line as Moscow initiates it.

In the meantime, the revisionists, represented by a former editor of the Daily Worker, still cling to their hope of establishing socialism in America and by indicating that the party is weak, actually help it to deceive a considerable section of the American people.

When this Communist Party of the United States looks back over the year 1958, it can record that the following important features of the current Communist line laid down by Nikita Khrushchev in 1958 at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—and taken up by the Communists here—have been successfully advanced in the United States:

1. That under the name of "civil liberties" practically all our internal security safeguards under the law have been abolished by decisions which the Communists have halled. That means that the campaign initiated by the Communist Party in 1950 against any curbing of its conspiratorial activities—and given new stimulus by Stalin's call of October 1952—has been almost 100 percent successful in paralyzing the United States so far as internal security goes.

2. That the fifth amendment has been used effectively to conceal the extent of the conspiracy in the United States by shielding witnesses in Government cases or before Congressional committees from testifying to the truth as to their associations in the Communist conspiracy.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

3. That all the laws of the States against sedition and subversion have been nullified. This was decided by the Supreme Court in the case of Pennsylvania versus a notorious

Communist agent. It was then definitely indicated that all of the anti-sedition laws of the States are unenforceable.

4. That the right to travel for the Communists freely back and forth to Moscow and to other places, to lay plans for diminishing the reputation of the United States abroad and for establishing lines of communication with the capital of world communism, has now been firmly and fully established. This complete removal of the bars on the right to travel for the Communist conspirator has led Roderick L. O'Connor, Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to warn the Congress and the Nation of what is taking place against the interests of the United States.

5. That this paralysis of our internal security, which leads to carelessness on the part of the American people concerning what is really transpiring to the peril of this Nation, is accompanied by a new smear attack on J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and against that Bureau itself. It is also supplemented by a new campaign for the emasculation of congressional committees against subversion.

The southern California committee of the American Civil Liberties Union is proudly pointed to by the Worker as succeeding in obtaining 100,000 signatures for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This indicates how effective has been the cry of the Communists and their sympathizers that civil liberties are violated when such committees or the FBI endeavors to protect the United States from subversion. As a matter of fact, it is only the question of the Communists and those cooperating with them which is involved in the work of these committees or of the FBI. It is a complete distortion of what is taking place to indicate that the liberties of anyone else is at stake in their work.

6. That the great campaign of the Communists for the breaking down of American vigilance by means of cultural exchanges, so emphasized by Khrushchev in his famous report of February 1956, to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has now reached a high point of development. This acquiescence to the Communist line demanding full cultural exchanges has gone to the extent of importing Soviet films into this country and thereby breaking down more resistance to Red propaganda from abroad.

THE MIKOYAN VISIT

7. That the concomitant campaign by Soviet Russia and its agents for East-West trade has now reached the point where many of the trade barriers toward building up Soviet strength have been broken down for the free world. This whole development has been crowned by the coming to this country of Anastas I. Mikoyan, Deputy Soviet Premier, for the purpose of persuading the United States to build up Soviet defense, thus making it more imperative that we, in turn, build up a higher wall and higher taxes for our own defense.

What is particularly ironic about the Mikoyan visit is that he has been touted as the originator of the fraudulent down-grading of Stalin, whereas in reality he was the chief creator of the Stalin cult. In 1939 he published a tribute to Stalin, calling that tyrant infallible and applauding his crimes.

In denouncing Stalin as a bloody tyrant before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, Mikoyan preceded Khrushchev. This is the same Mikoyan who wrote the article "Stalin: The Lenin of Our Day," glorifying "Stalin: The Infallible" on his 60th birthday in December 1939. Here are a few quotes from that article:

"Our country and toiling humanity all over the world honor their leader, father and friend—Comrade Stalin."

"He is the leader of oppressed humanity the world over."

"He created the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the role and significance of the state in socialist society and under communism."

"He eradicated the remnants of capitalism. He is the personification of profound love for mankind. He is a man of iron logic. He is ready to smash every obstacle for the sake of emancipating mankind. He is the personification of fearlessness, of indomitable will for struggle and conviction that communism will triumph."

The foregoing in a dozen pages of sickening flattery was written in December 1939, 4 months after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the beginning of World War II and 3 months after the rape of Poland by Stalin and Hitler.

Mikoyan, who survived under Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev, had his share in the bloody crimes of each. These included the massacre of his own free Armenian Republic, the Ukrainian massacres of 1932-33, and the Hungarian massacre of 1956.

Mikoyan's visit is unofficial. He has been free from a lot of protocol, and it is doubtful if he could have received more attention from the press were the call an affair of state.

HIS PROPAGANDA LINE

His excuse for coming here was that he wanted to confer with the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mikhail Menshikov. But he has talked with many Americans, almost all of them highly placed and some of them top officials.

His itinerary has taken him across the country. The press has reported that he has told influential Americans that there should be more contacts at all levels between the Russian Communists and Americans; that Moscow and Washington should not wait to agree on an agenda but should get together and talk; that it was not the Soviet regime but his fellow intellectuals that browbeat Boris Pasternak for writing "Dr. Zhivago," which won the Nobel prize; that the West should not use such words as "liberation" and "satellites" in referring to Soviet Russia's neighbors; that the Russian people would not think of overthrowing their present regime; that Stalin did centralize power too much but that the present Red leaders have developed a decentralized dictatorship of the proletariat; that there are not political prisoners in Soviet Russia; that Moscow wants Berlin to be a free city with its own police, and so forth.

All of this is the Communist propaganda line. It is all aimed at getting us to forget the true nature of communism, the Russian crimes and to deal realistically with the Reds, to accept the status quo and start from there.

Could one of our very top officials go to Russia on the pretext that he wanted to confer with our Ambassador in Moscow, then wangle talks with the top Red leaders and get his views leaked into the Communist press; make propaganda appearances from one end of the Soviet Union to the other; appear on television; hold press conferences; be the guest at dinners and lunches; mingle freely with people at all levels; get his best political arguments into Red publications and on the air? He could not.

8: That a number of American business leaders and certain American business circles are now singing the praises of Soviet Russia, thereby drowning out the cries for help and sympathy of the Hungarian people. In effect, we turned away from the Hungarian revolt and permitted it to be crushed by the Red army.

9: That funds from the United States are still going to bolster the Communist regimes of Gomulka in Poland and Tito in Yugoslavia, thus keeping alive the hopes of the Communist Party here that the United States will subsidize "all the Socialist coun-

tries," as the Communists here urged as early as 1946.

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

10: That, while the determination of the American people has so far halted the recognition of Red China, there is a trend—reported by such an important business paper as the Wall Street Journal—toward such a step. This trend is evident among happenings, especially by letting down restrictions on a number of items involved in trade of our alleged allies with the Mao Tse-tung regime.

This progress of the Communist line in our country now advanced by Mikoyan's visit (and the items I mentioned are only the most outstanding of that line) should immediately cause us to pause and appreciate the havoc that friends of the Communist Party and non-Communist "transmission belts" have wrought on our views and attitudes during the past year. The result is all the more astounding, when we consider that experience has constantly taught us that when we take a firm stand, one that is strong and unambiguous, against the aggressions of the Soviet powers, we are victorious.

Tributes to the extent of Communist activity on behalf of its own line are found in the many voices within America, represented by editorials in the press and by letters to our newspapers, echoing the Communist "warnings" about the sad fate of the United States if we do not surrender in the Far East.

No wonder that the Red organ, the Worker, for January 4, 1959, rejoiced in what has happened in 1958 for the Communist cause. Since the Communists always pretend to speak for "the people," this is represented by the leading editorial entitled "A Year of the People."

The Red organ applauds, with almost lyrical tone, the continued existence of the Soviet dictatorship in Soviet Russia and in Red China, and in general declares: "People—the people of the Socialist countries of Europe, working together—were busy advancing their economic goal."

Then, expressing its delight at the successes of the Communist line, the Worker gives this distorted view of specific world affairs:

"People—the hundreds of millions still in the rapidly shrinking capitalist world—joined with the hundreds of millions in the expanding Socialist world and the hundreds of millions in the new nations in 1958 to hold back the enemies of the people, our own Wall Street imperialists, from unleashing the dogs of war against the newly independent nations of the Middle East, over wrongfully held Matsu and Quemoy, through adventurous maneuverings over the West Berlin situation."

You will observe how arrogant the Communists are in their assessment of what happened in Hungary, how the revolt of the people is represented as "the bloody plot of the western imperialist-inspired Nagys." You will also note the contempt for the United States expressed in the calm assurance that Red Hungary, crushed by Soviet bombs and bullets, is now moving "once more along the Socialist path to the future."

You will also note how the Communists twist history for their own purposes, misrepresenting the bombing of Quemoy and Matsu and the Soviet demands on West Berlin as "our own Wall Street imperialists . . . unleashing the dogs of war."

I think that Pope Pius XI in his classical encyclical letter on communism asked the question: How is it possible that communism, long since rejected scientifically, proved erroneous by experience, and demonstrated as atheistic, merciless, a curse upon mankind, how is it that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world? The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism.

FEW UNDERSTAND COMMUNISM

Within 40 years about one-third of the population of this earth have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. It is unfortunately still true that few people, especially in our own country, understand what communism is, what are its techniques, its methods, its line.

The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but ignorance of their tactics, strategy, and objectives.

We have lost much to the Communist line in the past year. I pray that we shall be a little more vigilant, a little more pro-American and pro-God throughout the New Year.

Does Uncle Sam Always Defend the Status Quo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 13, 1959, entitled "Does Uncle Sam Always Defend the Status Quo?" which I think clearly illustrates a great weakness in our foreign policy:

It would be wise for Congress to look a good deal deeper into the relations of our Government with the fallen Cuban dictator, Fulgencio Batista. The New York Times has called them affectionate. Earl E. T. Smith has now resigned as our Ambassador in Havana, amid charges that his Embassy did not keep Washington fully informed of Castro's rise, that it showed a distinct partiality for Batista, and that it was inefficient in the evacuation of American citizens from Cuban trouble spots.

This paper is not prepared to judge the merit of these charges. We can only note that our own reporter on the spot, Alan Levy, felt that the handling of American nationals by our Embassy staff was entirely adequate. We also recall that in August 1957, Ambassador Smith was in trouble for actions that were considered pro-Castro. These included a visit to Santiago, then the center of rebel strength, and a protest over brutal treatment of some women demonstrators by Batista police. He was rapped over the knuckles then by some Members of Congress, though Secretary Dulles defended him as a person of flesh and blood and heart.

A FAMILIAR SITUATION

The subject would bear further investigation. Cuba during the uprising is akin to situations American diplomats must face in many parts of the world. Smith went to Habana as a political appointee, a party contributor with no diplomatic experience. Any American is likely to find it difficult to live in a country where political passions are running at white heat, without showing the slightest warmth himself to either side in the argument.

Of course, the envoy of a foreign power is not supposed to take sides. This is especially true of envoys of the United States, which has lent or given money to so many other nations, and which is always suspected of having a selfish interest in their internal affairs.

The fact is that American representatives have tended most often to take the side of the government in power. The United States was born of a revolution, but many American officials now adopt the attitude of the Daughters of the American Revolution toward political revolts anywhere—that they are troublesome, untidy, and dangerous to our business interests.

This might easily be the bias of a business tycoon appointed to an ambassadorship because of a handsome party gift. But it is also likely to occur among the career-service men in the State Department, whose conservatism often runs far deeper than the striped pants people think they wear.

THE PROBLEM IS SERIOUS

It has been charged that American aid since World War II has sustained in office many corrupt and reactionary regimes, and has frustrated the hopes of many reform groups. It is necessary for our representatives abroad to deal with the officials of the country to which they are accredited and to direct our financial aid through Government channels. Any other method would produce pure chaos. But this necessity has increased the image of America throughout the world as the defender of the status quo, rather than the friend of healthy change and aggressive freedom. This is a problem for the Foreign Affairs Committees of Congress to ponder with deep seriousness.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my newsletter for January 17, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Organization of the House membership topped the week's proceedings. All Members are assigned to permanent committees which by subject consider pending legislation. The majority party (Democrat, 283 Members) and minority party (Republican, 153 Members) membership ratios are decided by the House leaders so that the majority party clearly controls each committee numerically. The committees (alphabetically) are: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, House Administration, Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Civil Service, Public Works, Rules, Space, Un-American Activities, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

The Ways and Means Committee (15 Democrat, 10 Republican limit) has jurisdiction over the fields of taxation, trade and tariffs, and social security, and is considered a choice committee. On the Democrat side this committee also names the Democrats to the other committees. I am honored indeed to be nominated to this important committee, although I shall miss the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with its interesting transportation problems, and where I had progressed to the eighth seat.

The Chance Vought Regulus II contract termination prompted by pre-Christmas in-

quiry of the Secretary of Defense whether a void was created in our defense posture. The answer from Vice Admiral Pirie gave two general explanations: (1) "Regulus II missions will be reassigned to carrier heavy attack aircraft" (Isn't this a backward step?); and (2) "the accelerated Polaris is scheduled to become operational in quantities at approximately the same time Regulus II was originally scheduled." Suspicion that there may indeed be a gap or void of many months up to several years not having been answered, I have asked other questions of Admiral Pirie and the Secretary of Defense. Surprisingly enough, no mention was made of economizing in the defense budget as a reason for contract termination.

As I see the Congressman's it is twofold (now that contract termination has focused attention to defense efforts within the Fifth District of Texas). First, as a Federal representative, it is important that I take by part (representing my constituents) in helping to provide the best defense for the money spent. Second, it is my duty, as I see it, to help inform my constituents so they may better understand the defense problems, and this requires Defense Department explanation, particularly in view of worker layoffs and the spending of taxpayers' money on weapons. A temperate but conscientious effort to understand is necessary, not complacency or blind acceptance of the military's decisions, no matter how able the military men making the decisions. As an economy-minded Member of Congress with voting record to match (assuming that economizing played a part in Regulus II termination) I do not intend that we sacrifice our defense needs unnecessarily while we blandly spend more on social programs. I shall not fail to accept my responsibility to the Defense Department and to my constituents. In that spirit I intend to press this inquiry.

An additional judgeship for the northern judicial district is sorely needed and I presented a bill to accomplish this, as an emergency and exceptional case. The three judges of the northern district, Judge Whitfield Davidson, Judge Joe Estes, and Judge Joe Dooley, averaged 612 new civil cases docketed in fiscal 1958 as compared to the nationwide average of 273. Further, Judge Dooley's recent accident, a broken hip, will remove him 5 or 6 months. Truly, a desperate situation. It is my hope that Congress will consider this nonpolitically, as an exceptional case, rather than get into a wrangle and delaying action over who will appoint the 45 judges needed across the land—a Republican or Democrat President.

Operation abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee spearheaded by JAMES ROOSEVELT and other avowed liberals may have been stalled by the valiant and factual work of Chairman WALTERS and Committee Members SCHERER, JACKSON, and DOYLE. It seems that a gigantic effort has been planned to discredit this committee of Congress and J. Edgar Hoover. You would think the Communist conspiracy a patriotic American movement rather than a dedicated effort to overthrow our Government and enslave our people. This also bring to mind the gala reception for Mikoyan, a leader in this worldwide conspiracy whose chief target is the United States. Why should anything beyond the barest diplomatic protocol arrangements be accorded him?

A balanced budget, the spending of no more by the Federal Government than we take in, shall be my continued interest as it has for the last 4 years. For the sake of everyone, the dollar must not be cheapened. The President promises to point the way in his budget message. Let's all get behind this effort.

JANUARY 17, 1959.

Is United States Still Aroused?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit Free Press of Tuesday, October 14, 1958, which I regard as a grave warning to the people of the United States: IS UNITED STATES STILL AROUSED?—RED SCIENCE SCARE SEEMS TO HAVE COOLED

(By Victor Cohn)

(Victor Cohn has returned from 5 weeks in Russia as the first American reporter to make an extensive tour of Russian centers of physical science, followed by 2 weeks at last month's Geneva Atomic Energy Conference. This is the third in his series of articles on Russian science.)

Americans were happily broiling hamburgers on the grill when I left for the Soviet Union, and the discjockeys were giving the old great big twirl to "The One-Eyed, One-Horned Flying Purple People Eater."

When I returned from a vast nation of dull television programs and laboratories, Americans had steaks on the grill. Americans, after 2 months, were ignoring politicians, getting ready for the world series, looking over the old clunk and the new-model fins.

I suppose I was no different. I had dinner at Charlie's, went to a football game, and tried out a hula hoop.

We Americans were aroused, aroused more than our leaders, a year ago, when the first sputnik went up.

Are we aroused today?

A scientist said: "We have not done enough—not to meet the Soviet kind of challenge."

"How have we done? I'd say medium," responded another highly placed American scientific leader a few weeks ago.

These are common opinions today among American scientists, though many are harsher. Only a few are kinder.

One year ago—when the first sputnik went up—we all said, "We must meet the challenge of Soviet science." Washington after sputnik promised a new crusade for science and education. We have done less.

"We have made a beginning on education, but still not enough," believed Dr. Edward Teller, H-bomb theorist. "I'm still dissatisfied."

"Unless we step up the pace, the race will be lost," pronounced the National Science Foundation August 29. Sighed a biologist: "The sputnik effect is dying out."

Remember the reaction to sputnik? A year ago we had to wake up.

The President November 13, 1957, proposed a program to aid output of students and teachers. Within the administration the major goal was set: \$750-a-year Federal scholarship help for one-tenth of the 200,000 young people each year who should go to college but do not.

ALL BRIGHT KIDS SHOULD GO TO COLLEGE

The program would start helping about 20,000 a year, and increase until 80,000 were being aided.

There also were to be:

1. Tests for all eighth and ninth graders;
2. Grants to States to hire more science and math teachers and improve facilities;
3. Grants to colleges to improve their outdated plants.

The measure, as passed late this August, became a 4-year, \$223-million-a-year program, eliminating scholarships and substituting loans.

State testing programs will be strengthened, though not as much as planned. There will be funds to help buy equipment for public school science-math-language teaching. Little was provided to help train and nothing to expand teaching staffs. Nothing is done for college plants.

The bill already has had some praise as a good start, though not so much from scientists. Many colleges still don't know where they'll get enough money to expand for new students.

BASIC SCIENCE NEEDS SUPPORT

Basic research is the stockpiling of facts. Development is applying facts to H-bombs or hair oil. Total U.S. spending on all kinds of research and development now runs between 5.4 and 10 billion dollars a year.

Between 240 and 450 million goes to basic science; may one-tenth of 1 percent of our national income.

Government research and development spending at last count was 3.1 billion; mostly for weapons.

Basic research—including agriculture, medicine, everything—got 279 million. Of this, physical sciences in 1957-58 got 143 million.

Our national expenditure on chewing gum every year is 280 million.

The National Science Foundation is American scientists' real hope for the agency to support basic research. It was established in 1950 (after scientists pleaded for it starting in 1945).

Vannevar Bush, wartime science chief, thought its budget should reach 125 million a year in 5 years. Its 1957-58 budget (for all purposes, training, labs, research) was 40 million.

It is getting a big boost, to 138 million (it asked for 160). Forty of this will go to basic research, a drop in the Washington bucket still, but enough to support about half of what very conservative Director Alan Waterman calls the worthwhile proposals.

Defense Department research and development barely recovered in 1958 from the severe summer 1957 economy cut (when some 80 percent of Air Force projects alone were canceled or held).

Many projects never were helped again—new, post-sputnik money went to missiles. As of mid-1958, actual defense basic research sponsorship was down 25 percent from 1952, because of inflation's effect on the dollar.

"If America is to maintain scientific preeminence and economic stability, research funds must grow 5 or 10 times in the next few years," say scientist Lloyd Berkner.

"We need about 500 million a year"—said an NSF official in Washington—"and then we could really sponsor research reactors, atom-particle accelerators, electronic computers, the big things that cost dollars."

And these the Russians are building.

LET'S LISTEN TO THE SCIENTISTS

We have taken steps to have science listened to sometimes. James R. Killian has become the President's personal science adviser.

Killian also heads the President's Science Advisory Committee, and it has become an active body. Before sputnik, it met with the President twice a year.

No step was taken, however, to give science more than this personal Presidential advisory role.

So we can still expect proposals for a Cabinet department for science and technology, or at least some permanent office or commission at Cabinet level—just as agriculture, commerce, and labor have voices at Cabinet level.

Congress did give a stronger voice in the Pentagon as part of the President's reorgan-

ization, with a director of defense research and engineering, with some authority.

We established an Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Pentagon, to push missile work, and—nearly a year after sputnik—a National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We increased missile spending, but we did not begin to take the really radical steps here and elsewhere—requiring billions—that the Galtner and Rockefeller reports said we must take "to survive."

Defense Secretary Neil McElroy said September 2, the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in overall military power "in being, in the here and now."

But we know the Russians have more jet aircraft, more submarines, more troops and a head start on missiles.

Retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin, who was the Army's talented research and development chief, believes: "We are in second place militarily and in second place in the exploration of space."

We have moved ahead on some other things. But a survey shows at least a half-billion dollars needed, perhaps over 5 years, to bring United States research facilities to where they should be. There are no such plans yet in the works.

In 5 weeks in Russia, I wish I could say I had seen some evidence of serious miscalculation.

When I returned from the Soviet Union, the deejays, as one, were spinning "Tears on My Pillow." On TV, "Maverick" was out-pulling Steve Allen or Ed Sullivan.

The kids were back at school, and a mild national debate was still on: "Should they have to take hard courses?"

The political campaigns were in high gear all over the country, but science and education were not among the issues.

Installation of Rt. Rev. Bishop Lichtenberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States installed its 21st presiding bishop. The first presiding bishop was installed 1 year after the beginning of our National Government in 1789. The church, which is now the fifth largest Protestant denomination in the United States, has grown up with this country.

It was my privilege to attend these installation ceremonies as the lay representative of our diocese. I attended at the invitation of the Right Reverend Richard A. Kirchhoffer, who has served our diocese with patience, intelligence and good humor for 20 years. On February 28 Bishop Kirchhoffer will retire, and I was especially pleased to be able to assist him in a ceremony that surely comes as a fitting climax to a wonderful career of spiritual leadership. Bishop Kirchhoffer married us, confirmed our children and helped bury our dead. His retirement will come with a measure of personal sadness to every member of his diocese. But the continuing life of the church will go ahead in our diocese under the leadership of a vigor-

ous, intelligent new bishop, the Right Reverend John P. Craine.

In the person of the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, the Protestant Episcopal Church will grow with this great Nation and continue its record of spiritual service. Because of its history and potential, I think it only fitting that Bishop Lichtenberger's first sermon in his new office be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a message of hope, optimism and dedication to the religious ideals which have helped make this Nation great. Bishop Lichtenberger said:

An occasion like this in the life of the church is a moment of thanksgiving and hope. It is a time for remembrance and expectation. This double response to God's mercy and demand is always centered for us in the present moment, in the opportunities and tasks that immediately confront us, in our situation as it is now. This is what we say repeatedly in the general thanksgiving, "Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we, Thine unworthy servants, do give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindness to us, and to all men . . . And, we beseech Thee, give us that due sense of all Thy mercies . . . that we show forth Thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives, by giving up ourselves to Thy service." A due sense of God's mercies; the offering of our selves to His service, this is the pattern and the substance of the Christian life.

So first of all we give thanks to God that He has brought us here today. We think of God's goodness to us in our own lives, of His gift of the church and what it has meant to us to be members of Christ's body. We give thanks for our own church, for all who have served and loved her and who have made this day possible for us. In particular now we give thanks to God for the ministry of Henry Knox Sherrill as our presiding bishop these past 12 years, for his vision, his courage, his utter devotion to the work he was given to do.

This time of transition, of the induction of a new presiding bishop into his office, is not of great significance in itself. Or to put it more precisely, the focus of attention now is not the person of the presiding bishop, whoever he may happen to be, but the continuing life of the church. I do want to say, however, now that I have been given this responsibility, how grateful I am for the encouragement and support of so many friends. This encouragement and support and the strength that comes from your prayers will sustain me.

But, as I have said, it is the continuing life of the church that gives this service of installation its significance and its meaning. And we see clearly, particularly at a time of transition such as this, that whatever God calls His church to do, however impossible of accomplishment the tasks before us may seem to be, we are to face this call neither with confidence in our own strength or with fear because of our own weakness, but rather remembering what great things God has done for us already, we believe that He has better things for us in store.

In St. John's Gospel, in the 15th chapter there are some words of our Lord which say this concisely. "You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide." These words are spoken to each one of us, and to us all together in the church. We have been chosen, we have been appointed, we are to bear fruit, and our fruit is to last.

But do you see the point, the whole point here and everywhere in the New Testament? That the initiative rests with God and not with us? Whatever we do is all response. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but

that He loved us." It is true that responsibility is laid upon us in the church. We have been chosen, and appointed, and we are to bear fruit. But it is God who has chosen us, it is God who has appointed us, it is the fruit of God's Spirit that will be produced in us. And this is the deepest root of our thankfulness. For where would we be and how would we feel, if having been chosen and appointed, we were left to our own devices?

So our hope and expectation as we look at what we must do now and in the days ahead, come out of the very nature of our gratitude to God. St. Augustine has expressed it. "It is not that we keep His commandments and that then He loves us, but that He loves us and then we keep His commandments." Without His love God's commandments are impossible; with His love they are still beyond us, but our striving is no longer losing. In the assurance and confidence of God's love there is, as T. S. Eliot has said, for us "only the trying. The rest is not our business." This is to live in faith and leave the issue to God's wisdom.

Well what then of the trying, what of the effort required of us that we may bear fruit? I speak now of the responsibilities that are before us as a Church at work in this country and in lands overseas. The opportunities are so great and all that we have now to meet these opportunities seems so inadequate. How can we do what needs to be done? This is the question we usually ask, but surely it is the wrong question. A bishop in an overseas missionary diocese tells how he visited a village for the baptism of the first group of converts. The new Christians were ragged, illiterate, slow to respond. "One of those waves of unbelief comes over me," he said. "What shall we ever make of them? Then at once I am ashamed. Who are those keen eager young men moving quietly among them? They are from the same village. A year ago they were as unpromising as these. The question what can we make of them is the question of an unbeliever; the proper question is what can the Holy Spirit make of them." And that is the proper question for us as we face our responsibilities. Not, how can we possibly do what needs to be done? But what can the Holy Spirit do through us when we are open and humble enough for his action? The answer is: He can make us witnesses to Christ, he can bring forth fruit in us, fruit that will abide.

This is our deepest need, to believe this and to live by this. All our programs, all our plans without this are what Carlyle called quaint galvanic sprawlings, and many people quickly see them for what they are: mere schemes and devices. I do not want to be misunderstood. Plans and programs and united effort are good and necessary. In our parishes and dioceses, in National Council and General Convention we must be familiar with both our resources and the opportunities before the Church and then work to develop our resources and make them available. This is not the time or the place to speak of this in any detail, but this is a necessary part of our effort; this is to clear the way so that we do not through ignorance and unreadiness hinder the work of the Holy Spirit. Yet whatever we do, we know that the fruit which we are to bear is primarily God's work, it is ours only as he works through us. So if we let the invigorating wind of the Spirit refresh and empower us, then we will think, we will decide, we will act. It is for this that we have been chosen, appointed.

There are two words which have been in my mind constantly these past few months as I have been thinking about the task of the church in our day. All that we were concerned with at the Lambeth Conference

centered also I think in these two words; they are essential to the very nature of the church.

The first word is mission. The church has a mission, it is the mission, it is sent to serve God in the world. This is the only work it has: To be the channel through which God makes himself known, to be the obedient servant of God. But what does it mean for the church to obey God now in this present world, this angry world, this world so afraid, heading apparently toward self-destruction? The answer can be found only in the midst of the actual circumstances in which we live. The answer can be found only by a repentant church, a church always aware that it stands under God's judgment, that it is a means not an end, a church always living in expectation of a renewed life. But we must know how to read the signs of renewal. For example, all over the church we are building many new churches and parish houses and establishing new missions. Is this a sign that we are bearing fruit that abides? It may be. But this kind of activity in itself is not renewal. We cannot be content with this and say, here is sufficient proof of our obedience. A good many years ago during an earlier building boom one of the great denominations of our country was building a new church a day. Then when Robert Ingersoll said in a public lecture that "the churches were dying out all over the land," a telegram was sent to him by a leader of that church saying, "We'll make it two a day." If a serious critic of the church says that the church has little relevance to the daily life of its members the answer cannot be: Then double the number of communicants. How true it is that there is only one place at which a genuine renewal of the life of the church can take place, namely, at the point at which its mission of transforming the world is being fulfilled. The only real renewal is a healing and saving manifestation of the power of love in open and courageous encounter with the world.

This is the mission on which the church is sent and it carries us into every part of the world and into the whole of life. This means that the church comes to man not in his extremity at the point where all else fails. The church stands not on the outskirts but in the center of the town. We do not live in a world of worship and piety apart from the world we encounter in office or factory, at home or on the street. The gospel speaks to the totality of life; all what we do individually or together, stands under the judgment of God and all our ways are to be conformed to his will. We can establish many new missions, we can baptize and confirm large numbers of people, we can have standing room only at our services, but unless we know that we are in the church in order that we may praise and serve God in the world and that it is this effort which constitutes obedience, then what we are doing is woefully inadequate. This is to lock ourselves in, this is to make the church irrelevant. The encounter of the church with the whole man and with the whole of life brings perplexities and uncertainty and suffering, but this is also the way of joy for to obey God is to enter into an exciting adventure. So we work for the transformation of the world knowing quite well we can never accomplish it. But we make our decisions—that is live our faith—in the conviction that the world into which God has entered with His redeeming power will in His own time be transformed, and the kingdom of this world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

The mission of the church: The other word is unity. Whatever may be our convictions about the right approaches to unity, all of us surely pray that the church may be

visibly one. There is one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. The church is one in Christ Jesus. Over 20 years ago in Edinburgh at the second conference on faith and order this essential unity was affirmed. "We are one," those Christians said, "in faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate word of God. This unity does not consist in the agreement of our minds or in the consent of our wills, it is founded in Jesus Christ Himself." This is the unity God has given us. But we have broken that unity and how greatly our witness is weakened because we are divided. How hard it is for a divided church to bear witness of the one Lord to a divided world.

Here again our part is to clear the way so that God may lead us into that unity which belongs to the church of Christ. I believe we are finding our way, by God's grace, into a deeper unity within our own communion. We are coming to understand more clearly what it means to belong to a church which is both catholic and reformed. This is not an uneasy compromise which will have to be resolved eventually one way or another. It may appear so with those who call themselves Catholics or Evangelicals, each contending for his own tradition and often contending against each other. There is a far better way. It is not necessary that some be Catholics and some Evangelicals; each of us can know and manifest in his own life that comprehensiveness which we so greatly cherish. The two parts of our heritage are not incompatible and opposed elements, but are essential aspects of God's truth. They are, as F. D. Maurice said, "signs of the Kingdom of Christ." This is a rich inheritance we have. Can we not accept it all and grow in our understanding of it? Pray, then, that God may lead us into a renewed and deepened unity among ourselves and be a worker for unity among your own brethren.

And then beyond our own church, beyond the Anglican communion, we long for the unity of all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. The unity we desire is the fulfillment of the unity we have. This is the unity given to us by Christ in His act of self-giving: "And I if I be lifted up will draw all men unto Me." Unity is not something which is to be fashioned and put together by us. The Church of Christ in its essential nature is one, as Christ Himself is one. Yet here as in our own lives the requirement is laid upon us to become what we are. We are one body in Christ, but we must constantly pray to be delivered from fear and inertia and despair; and work that we may so enter into that unity that it becomes visible and operative in this world. Surely this is not a concern and activity for those who happen to be interested in church unity; this is inseparable from the mission of the church.

So as God's thankful people we dedicate ourselves anew to the mission of the church and to the search for unity. We have before us an opportunity unique in the history of the church. If God is the Lord of history, as we believe, then we cannot think that this time is some terrible mistake. This day, as every day, is the Day of the Lord. And so we rejoice that God has brought us to this time, for it is His time and therefore a good time and we pray that we may be penitent and humble and open so that God may use us for His purpose. When we are fearful then, or hesitant or dismayed, when the tasks seem far beyond our strength; or when we are confident and assured, let us take heart and remember that it is God who has chosen us, God who has appointed us, God who will bring forth fruit in us. And to Him be the glory and the praise for ever and ever.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include copy of my weekly newsletter "Keenotes" which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

One of the highlights of the opening days of a new session of Congress is the President's state of the Union message. There has grown up in recent years a tradition that the President deliver this address in person before a joint session of the Senate and the House. Millions of people throughout the Nation share this experience through the magic of television.

For the most part, the state of the Union message is couched in general terms. The President tries, at the beginning of a new period in his administration, to sum up just where he thinks the country is going, how we are doing as a Nation in meeting the problems which beset us at home and abroad. He indicates, in general terms, what he wants Congress to do during the months ahead.

It is always a thrilling experience to be a part of this annual ceremony. It is history in the making. This year was no exception. The President appeared before the assembled legislators, Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, and foreign diplomats in the House Chamber. I was pleased to note that he appeared to be in the best of health. He delivered the 45-minute speech in a vigorous manner. To the eyes of a layman, he appeared to have bounced back from illnesses that plagued him earlier in his administration.

Because so much of the address was couched in general terms, it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusions about the Presidential message. As everyone knows by now, the President centered his emphasis on a balanced budget. He spoke of the need to tailor all of our programs, including defense, to the objective of a balanced budget. I got the impression that his insistence that budgetary requirements transcend even defense needs received a distinctly cool reception, even from some of the Republicans. This battle between the budget and defense is shaping up as one of the major fights of the session. Democratic leaders in both Houses will insist that our defenses not be neglected to achieve a bookkeeping balance between revenue and expenditures.

The battle will be joined when the President presents his budget. He already has announced it will be in the neighborhood of \$77 billion and will be in balance. However, many people are skeptically awaiting full details. For instance, can we balance a \$77 billion budget without an increase of about one-third in tax revenues? And will business increase that much? Or can the President count on additional revenue from a further increase in postal rates and the gasoline tax?

Many Members will insist that urgently needed programs not be delayed or abandoned as a sacrifice to a balanced budget. For example, the West Virginia delegation is united in the belief that a depressed areas bill should be passed. How economical is it to stave off this program and allow thousands of men to continue on the unemployed

rolls? Wouldn't it make better sense to invest money to create jobs to restore these men to the tax rolls and give them an income that would create additional jobs?

The President indicated he would ask additional money for foreign aid and credits to finance economic development abroad. Many Members will balk at expanding this foreign activity while cutting back on identical programs at home.

The state of the Union message is a valuable part of our system of government. The President, as head of the executive department, has the responsibility for initiating a program of action. The old saying, "The President proposes and Congress disposes," is certainly true. But Congress has a responsibility, too. It must examine the President's proposals, abandon them and change them to fit existing conditions.

Details of the President's program will unfold in a series of special messages during the coming weeks. No doubt there will be many differences of opinion between the President and Congress. But these differences will be worked out or compromised. Emphasis may be shifted from one program to another and Congress may decide to go further than the President wants. It is the genius of the American system that these differences are never allowed to paralyze Government.

Mikoyan Did Not Answer Any Important Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared several days ago in the Washington Star. Mr. Mikoyan has given the expected exhibition of nimble sidestepping of specific questions like those asked by Mr. Lawrence, while oozing general assurances of trade, trust, and truce, if only we will forget the past and ignore the present. Americans must not sell out for worthless words our position of steadfast support for the captive peoples who, without our support, are helpless.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR MIKOYAN—QUERIES ON MOSCOW REPRESSIONS AND BRUTALITY URGED FOR RED

(By David Lawrence)

As the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Government, Anastas Mikoyan is entitled to a courteous reception by the officials of the U.S. Government. The American people, however, are under no obligation to embrace a man whose hands are dripping with the blood, not only of his fellow countrymen but of the people of Hungary and the other captive nations in Eastern Europe.

Indeed, this is the opportunity of a lifetime to do something for the millions of persons imprisoned even now in slave-labor camps in Russia and for the millions who are denied freedom behind the Iron Curtain. For, as Mr. Mikoyan travels around America, questions can be asked him publicly concerning the conditions inside the Soviet Union for which he, as a part of the Kremlin apparatus, is responsible.

When, for instance, will censorship be removed so that the Iron Curtain can be lifted

for the more than 300 million people who today are being forbidden to learn the truth of what's going on in the world around them or outside their countries?

When will the millions of innocent men and women under Kremlin control who have been thrust into jail, without a hearing or a trial, be given a chance to regain their liberty?

When will the elderly persons in the Soviet Union who have children in the United States and other countries be permitted to leave their native land so they may visit their families abroad?

When will the people of the Soviet Union be given a chance to vote in a free election—an election in which more than the Government's own party is allowed to put up candidates?

When will the right of self-government be given once more to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany?

When will freedom of expression be permitted for the writers of the Soviet Union, and when will an author like Boris Pasternak be allowed to accept an award given him by a nonpolitical organization abroad such as the Nobel prize for literature?

When will the Kremlin withdraw its troops from the smaller countries contiguous to it and let their peoples enjoy complete sovereignty?

Above all, when will the Soviet Government begin to honor its pledges and its promises as written in treaties, agreements, and documents of an international nature in the 13 years since the close of World War II?

For there can be no assurance of peace if one of the powerful governments, with a vast military machine at its disposal, can at any time violate its written word and plunge the world into war.

There can be no trust, moreover, as long as the basic principles of freedom and a free society are ignored by the tyrants and autocrats in the Kremlin.

Anastas Mikoyan is a symbol of dictatorship. This very week Americans generally—especially those on the "liberal" side—have been enthusiastically acclaiming Fidel Castro and expressing satisfaction that Batista, the dictator, has been overthrown in Cuba. Americans ought not to adopt one rule for dictators in this hemisphere and another for the dictators in Europe. Only a few days ago Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, said in a report to the White House on Latin American affairs:

"I believe the suggestion of Vice President Nixon is sound and would be applauded by Latin America itself—that we have an 'abrazo' (embrace) for democratic leaders, and a formal handshake for dictators."

This expresses accurately the manner in which the United States should react to the visit of Anastas Mikoyan. He is not deserving of the social embraces which some shortsighted Americans are giving him. He could mistake this for approval of Communist methods and customs. In fact, the main reason the Deputy Premier has come here, and the main reason Premier Khrushchev sent him to urge a summit conference, is that this is one way to set in motion a dramatic distortion of America's position. It is a way of gaining prestige at home for the dictatorship.

More than anything else in the world, American approval of Communist behavior is important to the Kremlin in squelching any possible uprising inside the Soviet Union. To welcome Mr. Mikoyan in America with open arms, and without voicing any protest, is to furnish headlines in the Soviet-controlled press telling the Soviet people that the people of this country no longer disapprove of or at least are unwilling to combat the Communist philosophy.

America's moral force is the most powerful weapon in the world—it can move mil-

lions of people behind the Iron Curtain. So, on the kind of reception given the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union as he tours this country depends the hope of the oppressed and the enslaved in whose hearts and minds the craving for freedom and liberty will never die.

Statements Before the Fourth Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

INTERVENTION OF DELEGATE GEORGE W. WESTERMAN BEFORE THE FOURTH COMMITTEE ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES, NOVEMBER 29, 1958

Mr. Chairman, the numerous historic debates conducted in the chamber of the fourth committee have furnished ample proof that since the establishment of the United Nations, chapter XI of the charter undoubtedly has brought many extraordinary benefits to the progressive development of the political, social, and economic institutions of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

The population of the non-self-governing territories vary widely in race, tradition, and culture. They have, however, one thing in common; most inhabitants of many territories are of an ethnic origin and have a cultural heritage different from those of the metropolitan countries.

In the economic affairs of these territories a notable trend toward diversification is to be noted. There is also marked concern for the planning and execution of development schemes, as well as for the employment of technical advice and assistance not only in economics, but also in the social and educational fields.

Generally, improvement in the overall picture should be considered against the background of increased population pressure. In this evolutionary process we observe that increased capital investment is being made and that large-scale projects for industrialization are being undertaken. At the same time steps are being taken to stimulate agricultural production. All these measures are being adopted towards developing a balanced economy and providing a better living for these peoples.

On the other hand mention must be made of how steady is the progress in town and country planning as an effective means of solving housing problems. With this view in mind Government banks are being established to provide long-term, low interest loans for persons wishing to construct their homes.

We also observed that most public housing is undertaken directly by territorial governments or central agencies, rather than by municipal bodies. Also that some schemes had to be devised on an emergency basis to relieve urgent needs. However, broad programs aimed at creating integrated neighbors with all necessary amenities were noted to be receiving increasing attention.

Other significant advances have occurred in the development of all forms of mass media, and we all welcome the policy of encouraging a free and responsible press. It is recognized, of course, that the full utilization of mass media is still impeded

by a number of problems in the non-self-governing territories, particularly in areas of high illiteracy.

In general, health conditions are said to be steadily improving, and recent advances in medicine and public health have contributed substantially to the reduction in morbidity and mortality rates.

We fully subscribe to the view that a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation is required to combat racial bias and to promote common advancement in territories where different ethnic groups live side by side. Also that advancement of any society depends on the contribution of all its members. When groups of people in a given society are not regarded as equal, progress is difficult. We applaud the recommendation that the abolition of discrimination on racial grounds should form an integral part of social policy and public administration.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that, with the expansion of community development and programs, the extension of training facilities and the provision of new administrative arrangements, a further spread and intensification of the community development movement had been recorded in many areas.

Mr. Chairman, there is sufficient proof now available from a perusal of the report of the committee on information from non-self-governing territories that the economic, social, and educational conditions are constantly improving. This is made manifest from the fact that in the case of a number of territories information on them is no longer submitted. Others have moved directly into full membership with the United Nations. These countries are well known to the members of this august body. The nearer territories reach the state of self-government the more concerned should be the United Nations about them.

Furthermore, one of the fundamental aims of chapter XI, in addition to that provided in article 73(b), is that contained in article 73(d), which is, I quote: "to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth."

A few weeks ago this committee discussed the future of French Togoland. On that occasion we were happy to join the many distinguished delegates who were pleased to commend the administering power for the advancement of the Trust Territory of Togoland. We listened with a spirit of solidarity to the words of the delegate of Ghana when he urged upon France: "That no stone should be left unturned, in these last days of their final control over the external relations of Togoland, to enable the territory to get all the assistance possible to make a vigorous and successful start on its new course of statehood." Several of our distinguished representatives expressed the hope that technical assistance would be forthcoming not only from the administering power itself, but also from the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance.

Mr. Chairman, in the course of my remarks before this committee at its session of October 17, 1957, reference was made to the non-self-governing territories in the neighboring Caribbean area—the proposed West Indian Federation. On that occasion my delegation congratulated the United Kingdom for having assisted both financially and materially in bringing the territories to that stage of constitutional advance. Since then, this Federation has become a fact. In March of the current year the West Indies, comprising 10 island territories, elected their Federal representatives, and a Federal government was inaugurated by Princess Margaret in April at Trinidad, the capital site.

We understand that provision is made in the West Indies constitution for its review within 5 years, leading to Dominion status, or independence within the British Commonwealth.

The delegation of Panama draws attention to this situation, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to us that here is a case somewhat like the present position of French Togoland or the Gold Coast before it became Ghana. Thus, as in the case of the Gold Coast and French Togoland the West Indies are on their way toward independence, hence our interest in their relation to the United Nations. We are sure other delegates here would join us in urging the United Kingdom to do all in its power during these closing stages of its control to bring the West Indies into closer relations with international bodies. It is only in such a manner that it might be possible to facilitate the provision of technical assistance, and to give the West Indies increasing opportunity to prepare themselves so that they will be ready to participate fully in the work of the United Nations as an independent member when the time comes.

Speaking on the occasion of the inauguration of the West Indies Federation, the Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, said; I quote:

"The attainment of Federation is, I think, a remarkable constructive achievement in which many have played their part. We now look to the future rather than the past. We believe that through federation the people of the West Indies can most speedily and effectively fulfill their national aspirations; and that they can look for a standing and an authority in the Commonwealth and in the world that would be denied to them as isolated units. We believe, too, that federation provides the means by which the economy of the region can be strengthened and the standard of living of its people be raised. We shall need, at every stage of the road, the help and encouragement of the British Government, and we know that our progress will be watched with close interest and practical sympathy throughout the Commonwealth and outside and in particular by the people of the Dominion of Canada and the United States."

A month or so ago it was our pleasure to listen to Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams here in New York when he spoke of the goals of the new nation. This West Indian scholar and statesman emphasized the need for technical assistance. "Give us the tools," he urged, "and we will do the job," he assured. It was pleasing to note from his statement the measure of assistance Canada had already made available to the West Indies, and of the invitation from the United States to his Government to come to Washington later this year for discussions on possible means of assistance.

Agreements already are in effect between the International Cooperation Administration of the United States and the individual members of the Federation. These agreements include health, housing, technical administration, communication, public administration, as well as agriculture and natural resources. Accordingly, it is now in the hands of the United Kingdom to offer the opportunity to the Federation for extending such agreements on a wider level. This can be done most effectively by encouraging the Federation to seek technical assistance so necessary for this underdeveloped area where the problems include an explosive population situation.

We are not unaware that in this changing constitutional relationship between the West Indies and the United Kingdom, the latter has already assumed an appreciable part of the financial obligations involved in the West Indies Federation. Since the problems of emerging territories have become a special concern of the United Nations, my delegation feels that in all propriety the provisions

of the Charter can equally extend to the West Indies.

While it is true that there is a difference of approach in our dealings with trust territories and the non-self-governing territories, it does seem, however, that the spirit of the Charter implies that in either type of territories the interest of the inhabitants are paramount. Therefore when approaching political independence they should be given every assistance so that they may be prepared to assume their rightful part in the community of nations.

The demonstrations of helpfulness on the part of Canada and the United States in coming to the aid of this emerging Caribbean nation, as mentioned earlier, augurs well for good neighbor relations as envisaged in article 74 of chapter XI, and to which we referred in our statement before this committee last year. In this spirit of manifest goodwill we are sure that the United Kingdom will not view with disfavor a more direct approach to the United Nations and its specialized agencies in this matter of technical assistance for the West Indies.

In invoking the principle of good neighborliness we are equally certain that the people of Latin America whose representatives on the fourth committee have championed so intently the cause of self-determination, will welcome whatever reasonable proposal is put forward that will guarantee the most effective contribution to West Indies regional development. As remarked by my esteemed colleague from Guatemala in his intervention of November 17, 1958, "a typical feature of the present era is international cooperation and the interdependence of countries . . . to which the United Nations has been attaching increasing importance."

Mr. Chairman, might we not aim at recapturing for this territory which has become a poor and deficit area, much of the substance that made it as historically productive as it once was? Furthermore, the West Indies is destined ultimately to have a full share in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. By fostering the socio-economic advancement of these 3 million inhabitants of the Federation, we are by that fact itself promoting the solidarity of this hemisphere and energizing the bonds of world peace and international security which the United Nations is committed to maintain.

During the course of our debates the members of this committee have never failed to demonstrate a deep concern in respect of the welfare of the inhabitants of the non-self-governing territories. This laudable attitude then has prompted the foregoing observations. Our motivation in this regard has been only that of presenting before this committee a few ideas that might contribute to improving as far as possible the efforts of this Caribbean territory toward its full independence, in harmony with the aims and objectives of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation, which shares the wide esteem in which Sir Andrew Cohen is held in this committee, has been observing the profound interest with which the Government of the United Kingdom, through its distinguished representative, has followed our deliberations. These factors represent a happy augury that formulas of positive benefits will be found to favor the West Indies Federation in its final relations with the United Kingdom.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY SIR ANDREW COHEN
TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 2,
1958

Although I have spoken at great length already in this debate, I feel that in fairness to a number of members who have raised matters relating to territories under United Kingdom administration, I should take up a little more of the time of the committee in order to make a brief statement on one or two points.

First of all, Sir, I would like to refer to the remarks—the most helpful and constructive remarks—made by the distinguished representative of Panama with regard to technical assistance for the territories comprising the West Indian federation and other territories in the Caribbean area under United Kingdom administration. I very much appreciated the spirit in which the distinguished representative of Panama put forward his remarks.

My delegation and indeed my Government is well aware of the great interest, the great sympathetic interest taken by the present Government of Panama in the well-being and future progress of the territories in the West Indian federation. We are much encouraged by this and also by the general interest, friendly interest, taken by all the countries of the Western Hemisphere in the progress of this new federation.

My delegation, sir, fully sympathizes with the views expressed by my distinguished friend from Panama. We realize the great importance of outside aid in economic and social development to this new federation. We welcome the assistance which has already been received from various organs of the United Nations and we have been delighted to see these countries receiving this assistance.

I would like very briefly to mention that there have been a large number of schemes valued at nearly £140,000 of technical assistance of a whole variety of sorts for the countries in the Caribbean. I will not weary the committee at this stage with details of these schemes, but they cover a wide range, and I would like to emphasize their great importance.

I would also like to remind the committee that very large scale assistance had during this whole period been received by the countries in the Caribbean from the United Kingdom Government itself. For example, in the period from April 1946 to 1958 the total grants and loans approved under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the territories now in the federation was approximately £28 million, and during the year ended March 31, 1958, schemes of development and research costing about £4 million were approved under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act.

I think it would be agreed by everyone round this table, or, at any rate, by most people, that in considering applications for technical assistance from the United Nations obviously the extent to which United Kingdom assistance is available in the fields concerned, this clearly should be taken into account. But I would like to say this. We can, in my view, expect a steady increase in the technical assistance schemes from this whole area come before the United Nations. The United Kingdom Government will welcome this.

We are extremely grateful to my distinguished friend from Panama for having raised this matter here and to the other speakers who have spoken with sympathy on this subject. We are encouraged by the sympathy and interest, and I will say here that I will bring the views which have been expressed by the representative of Panama and others to the attention of the United Kingdom Government, and I am sure that my Government will take the views into very serious consideration.

STATEMENT MADE BY DELEGATE GEORGE W.
WESTERMAN TO THE FOURTH COMMITTEE,
DECEMBER 3, 1958

I regret that yesterday when the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom intervened in the debate I was absent from this chamber. However, he has graciously presented me with a copy of his speech for which I am most grateful.

It is with much pleasure we note that in his intervention he made reference to both

my delegation and the Government of Panama in complimentary terms for having taken the interest shown on behalf of the Caribbean territories.

My delegation feels greatly honored that the modest recommendations which we made last Friday, will be duly forwarded to the Government of the United Kingdom for its very serious consideration.

In view of his declarations, we express the hope that positive results soon will ensue in favor of these territories and their inhabitants.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH MADE BY MR. H. N.
MCQUARRIE, DECEMBER 5, 1958

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of our debate on the report of the committee on information from non-self-governing territories, the distinguished representative of Panama made some very kind references to my country's offers of assistance to the West Indies, the new federation of islands in the Caribbean. My country shares the affection for the people of the West Indies expressed by my distinguished colleague from Panama. Canada has strong ties of trade and history with the islands of what have been known as the British West Indies. Canada has recently entered into a special aid program for the new federation and study is under way of how young people of the West Indies may be best assisted to acquire advanced training which may contribute to the prosperity and cultural growth of their islands. Of the more than 1,600 students from non-self-governing territories now studying in Canada, some 1,000 are from the English speaking islands of the Caribbean. Many of these students, I am happy to say, are being assisted by private Canadian sources. Canada looks forward to playing a still larger role in providing educational facilities for West Indian students.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body the following entry to the I Speak for Democracy Contest prepared by Miss Anita Lanphier, a junior in the Dodge City Senior High School, in Dodge City, Kans. Anita is a well-known debater and has been a trophy winner on a number of occasions:

I am a student. My mind is a product of the greatest industry this Nation has ever conceived. Within my mind are the ideas which founded this country and the same ideas which have made it rise, an indestructible phoenix, from the ashes of war and depression.

I, and my companions, are the infinite, though unperfected, results of 300 years of living. We seek to improve—but, above all, to continue those principles which have made us free to walk in the sight of God as equal by right of our being.

We have grown old in the struggle to give life to this great new dream. Yet, even now, we discover that the future is forever chained to the past. The winter remembers much of what the spring should have done. Yet, if the spring should guard herself well, the winter would never be. So we must review the events which led us to this pinnacle

with as little reckoning as mourning for the barrenness of autumn.

This young country was nurtured into being and opened her wondering eyes on the great dark winter of revolution. She rose up, and slew the mighty Goliath of British control. It was a battle for her very being. She stood far above the great dark clouds of oblivion and chose her pebbles well. Even as Goliath's laughter spread like a roll of thunder, she rose up and slew him with an idea and cut off his head with a dream.

She stood tall on the mountains of freedom, and she bore the child called democracy.

Then, suddenly, the warm protective cloak of peace was taken from her shoulders and she was torn with the biting cold of civil war.

The aging, defiant South reared her head above the Union, supported by proud gentlemen who cherished her and her way of life above all else. She was a lady and they donned their toy-soldier uniforms and marched away to defend her honor. To them, war was this, nothing more, an affair of honor. They did not fear or doubt, until they, as Thomas, felt the gaping ugly wounds.

The South fell, crushed and burning. Suddenly, as age comes upon an old woman, she lay broken and about to die. And the ages to come echoed in unison, "They have not died in vain."

Once again, she rose with a new name, "The Union," a new greatness within herself. She had grown in stature and in wisdom. She has much to remember and much more to learn. She stands proud and holds her head high among the stars for she, too, guides the lives of those who chart their paths by her unerring light in the skies. As long as men think and see—she is there. As long as men yearn to know—she is with them. As long as men cherish freedom above all else—she lives. For, like the spring, she is eternally reborn. She is as inevitable and unchanging as the seasons. She is your godmother and your playmate, she is the mammy who nurtured you in her honey-blossomed bosom. She is a lump in your throat and a flag flying high. She is the words of a song. She is a spirit—infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. She is democracy.

Anita won second place in the State contest and we in the Fifth District of Kansas are very proud of her.

Where Do We Stand on Missiles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by WDSU Broadcasting Corp., New Orleans, La.:

WHERE DO WE STAND ON MISSILES?

Where does the United States stand in relation to Russia in the development of military missiles?

Three statements have come out of Washington on this subject in the past 2 days. They all come from people who should know what they are talking about. But they are hardly in agreement with each other.

First, the House Space Committee made a report that Russia is 12 to 18 months ahead of us in its space program, and it will take us 5 years to close the gap. This committee, incidentally, includes both Democrats and Republicans.

Second, Vice President Nixon made a statement, apparently intended as an answer to the committee. He pictured the United States as ahead of Russia in some aspects of the space race, and catching up in others. In regard to purely military missiles, Nixon said, we're ahead, although he admitted the Russians have more powerful rocket engines.

Now, a third statement has come from Senator STUART SYMINGTON, a former Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman. SYMINGTON says he does not know a single impartial expert who agrees with Nixon. He challenges Nixon to give a percentage comparison between the number of intercontinental missiles this country expects to have at the end of this year and the estimated number the Russians will have.

We don't know what the truth of the matter is. It would be comfortable to believe that Vice President Nixon is right. But we're inclined to believe that Nixon is engaging in the kind of soothing coverup that has been practiced in the field of national defense for several years.

Joseph Alsop has said, referring to U.S. intelligence estimates, that we will not have a single operational intercontinental missile even at the end of 1959; the Russians are expected to have 100. We know who fired the first satellite to orbit the earth, plus the first one to orbit the sun. Nixon himself admits the Russians are ahead in rocket power.

Where do we stand on missiles compared with Russia?

It's not a question anyone should play politics with.

It's a question that involves national survival, and the known facts do not furnish grounds for complacency. They suggest the urgency of providing the American people with a straight, clear answer.

Let's Throw Away the Crutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a great many words have been voiced and written concerning the President's state of the Union address last week. My own views were expressed in my weekly newsletter. The Moore County News is published biweekly in Dumas, Tex., and contributes greatly to this flourishing, progressive, civic-minded community. The News, whose editor is my good friend, D. E. Alford, expresses editorially an approach to the state of the Union message which I heretofore have not seen, and which is most provocative. Under unanimous consent I insert herein the editorial from the January 11 edition of the Moore County News, as follows:

LET'S THROW AWAY THE CRUTCH

In his State of the Nation address Friday, President Eisenhower leveled a point-blank blast of cold, hard facts at the American people and its Government.

He talked of dollars, missiles, and war.

The words of our President reflected the frenzied era in which we live . . . a time of excitement through scientific advancement, yet overshadowed by a cloud of fears, anxieties and frustrations coming from people of a disturbed Nation.

A threat as old as man himself, that of violence and conflict with that which would challenge his survival, was ever present in the calm words of our President.

Sixty percent of our national budget is being poured into our national security program.

Moore County got a glimpse of this huge dollar theory with the establishment of two large Nike missile launching sites in our area. As we rest in Dumas and Moore County, snug within the supposed protective circle of that small, almost minute segment of air protection, we well can ask what does our freedom cost?

The President told us in dollars what price we pay for keeping the pace of our times.

New jet fighters of today, replacing the old aircraft of World War II, are costing nearly 50 times what those old war heaps cost; atomic submarines are costing as much as \$150 million apiece; a bare minimum of \$35 million is spent every time a mighty Atlas blasts into the sky.

And, we were told in honest reflection by our President, we have new bombers which actually cost their weight in gold, tons and tons of it, for a single weapon of defense, which, tomorrow, may be as outdated as the old prop fighters of World War II.

Freedom costs money, more money than many of us can even start to imagine, yet we are the only source of support for this age which we have helped to create for ourselves.

During the same speech, President Eisenhower said progress is security, defense and in scientific research must be our first objective, and that we must keep abreast of the world whatever the costs.

The key factor in this unknown formula of survival, we were told, is a strong, healthy economy to feed the giant brainchild that is our Government and our defense network with reduced waste in the process.

At times such as these, when Federal controls continue to reach out and spoon feed the American people, it would appear to us that the waste of which our President speaks is not in terms of dollars but in terms of wasted human energies, softened by having our jobs done for us.

The waste in dollars, no matter how high the billions pile up, is little indeed to that lying dormant within our people. Yet our selfish demands for unneeded help from Government aids and handouts will continue until a government of people, and not dollars, crumbles through its complete inability to nourish a nation of parasites instead of people.

Moore County can do its share in standing firm against the menace of our times, despite dollars. We can unleash our own abilities for the jobs to be done, without help.

We can start by using the Government as a cane instead of a crutch.

Democratic Party Advisory Council Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of statement on policy issued by the Democratic Party Advisory Council as it appeared in the print of the New York Times for Tuesday, December 9, 1958:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON POLICY ISSUED BY THE
DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S ADVISORY COUNCIL—
THE DEMOCRATIC TASK DURING THE NEXT
2 DAYS

The Democratic victory in the Congressional elections this autumn provided our party with great opportunities and responsibilities.

All Democrats are concerned about the tasks which face our party in the next 2 years. We think and talk about them across the Nation, consistent with our duties as America's only national political party. We know, moreover, that the measures required of Government acquire their true effectiveness only as they rest upon the kind of public understanding and support that comes from full and free discussion.

In accordance with its practice of stating, from time to time, its view, on important issues, the Democratic Advisory Council here enumerates the elements of a program it hopes will be adopted during the next 2 years.

We do not have full prosperity at home, and desperate want still stalks most of mankind. Peace is the goal of all peoples, and yet that goal is still receding rather than drawing near. We in the United States have the technology and the institutions to make the greatest single contribution toward plenty and peace. We lack only the decisions to call forth our full power. The purpose of this statement is to help evoke these decisions, and to rally further to their support the full powers of the American people.

A wide range of actions and measures is urgently needed. The world moves rapidly in the last half of the 20th century and the need for bold and comprehensive action is urgent. Republican reaction lethargy and indecision of the past 6 years have allowed this Nation to fall woefully behind in meeting the demands of the times. Thus, we are called upon not only to keep up with the many demands of growth and change, but also to overcome the backlog of unmet needs that the Republican Administration has allowed to pile up. Our list of what is needed must perforce be an extensive one.

Under our Constitution, we will have a Republican administration for 2 more years. The Congress must of necessity cooperate with this administration. The effort must be to lead the administration into doing the best of which it is capable.

CALLED UNPRECEDENTED

The election for the third successive time of a congressional majority which is of the opposite political party from the President is without precedent in our history. It imposes an unprecedented responsibility upon the Democratic majority. It is in the nature of things difficult for congressional majorities to provide the leadership which is supposed to come from the Executive. But the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives and the Senate has performed this difficult task with great ability and effectiveness during these past 4 years. We are confident that the Democratic majority will fully meet this responsibility during the next 2 years. To this end, we will support and help it in every way we can.

While we may expect the administration to continue to try to block some needed measures, the increased Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress provide better means to overcome such opposition. While it will undoubtedly be impossible for the Congress to overcome administration objections to do all that should be done, it should now be possible to enact desirable legislation that the administration has previously defeated and to put through a larger portion of a clear and comprehensive Democratic program.

We are glad that Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON

have indicated their intention to take the initiative in formulating and obtaining consideration of such a comprehensive Democratic program. We recognize their pre-eminent qualifications in the legislative field. The Democratic party and the Nation are fortunate to have such extraordinarily able legislative leaders at a time when so much is required of the Congress.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

It must be a primary aim of our foreign policy to work at all places and in all ways to create world conditions and climates of opinion which will make it possible to prevent the destruction of our country and all civilization in a hydrogen war.

The Republican administration is on dead center on this, the most vital of the problems which confront us. The administration seems to have lost the determination to succeed in the prevention of war—and this in the day of hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles. The Democratic Party must and always will be committed to the conviction that peace is possible, and to the actions that are necessary to its achievement.

During these 2 remaining years of the Eisenhower administration, the Democratic opposition should insist that the Republican administration act to have a foreign policy which will make it clear to the world that the United States and its allies and friends want peace and are willing to do what is necessary to get; to develop policies which will establish a common understanding with the peoples of Asia and Africa to work with us to prevent war; to work from positions of strength at home and with our allies of Europe and of South and Central America and the rest of the world to try to persuade the Russians and Chinese Communists to agree to the peaceful settlement of disputes between them and us; to use the United Nations wherever practicable for the development of our policies; and to move with determination to seek world agreement on the regulation and control of the weapons of modern war. Mankind must get control of the weapons of modern war. The most immediate step in this direction should be for the United States to propose to the United Nations a reliable stage-by-stage plan, to be enforced by the United Nations, for substantially total disarmament down to the levels needed for local policing.

COOPERATION ON FOREIGN POLICY

Never was confidence and cooperation between this country and the free world more essential to the security of the United States than now. Never have crises broken around us so fast and so violently and caught our Government so unprepared as in the Middle East during July, in Quemoy during September, over Berlin in November.

No one questions the constitutional authority of the President to command the Armed Forces of the United States and to conduct negotiations with foreign nations. No one doubts his right to choose his own advisers. But there is much more to formulating and carrying out foreign policy than ordering troop movements and negotiating with foreign nations. There is the vast responsibility of determining our national purposes and of providing the capacity and means for attaining them. Here the legislative branch has its own constitutional task both in devising policy and in wisely exercising the power to grant legal authority for its execution, along with the necessary manpower, material resources, and funds.

If there were proper relations between the parties and within the Government, the legislative branch—and, indeed, the country—should confidently depend upon the President, acting through the State Department and its missions abroad, for information, analysis, and appraisal and leadership in foreign matters. Unfortunately, the confidence of the country, the Congress, and of our

allies in the present conduct of our foreign policy has been lost.

This lack of trust has consequences which must be faced frankly and, in the national interest, stated frankly. As for the day-to-day conduct of the unforeseen crises with their threats of war, into which the administration so blindly stumbles, there is not much that our party can do. But we can and should make clear four points which might have some salutary effects:

First, that we are wholly determined that our country shall carry out solemn commitments to which it is a party. But we disapprove the tendency of the present administration to expand these commitments beyond their original intent by administrative interpretation.

Second, that we are wholly determined that so far as we can do so, we shall see that our country is prepared and able to carry out its commitments.

Third, we intend to criticize men and their actions responsible for the blunders, drift, and neglect which permit the recurrence of these crises; and we do not intend to be intimidated by the charge that to do so is to give aid to the enemy.

Fourth, the Constitution gives the President broad discretionary power to use the Armed Forces. We view with misgivings the requests by this administration for vague and imprecise extensions of this authority.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The hour is now too late to tolerate the equivocations, the suppressions of truth, the positive misrepresentations of those who tell us that what we have been doing, what we are asking of ourselves, what we are devoting to our defenses is even keeping us abreast of the tide. It is not. The time given us is very short. The security of the country can no longer afford the inaction of officials, however highly placed, who stubbornly refuse to obey the law which gives them direction of funds to be used in defense. It is the duty of our party to continue even more vigorously to legislate the expansion of our defensive capabilities and see that the law is obeyed.

More than this: We need a new attitude in our military planning and in our military budget. We need the decision and determination that this country shall have a level of deterrent military power, now and in the future, such as to leave no doubts in the minds of the Russians and the Communist Chinese that they must not start a war or allow one to start.

We must build, too, our air transport facilities for a minimum of three or four modernized divisions, to be quickly transported to where they may be needed.

Our need for these forces is more compelling than the question of their costs. Our decision should be based on national security rather than arbitrary budget figures. But at the same time we must stop vacillating about service rivalries and the organization of the Department of Defense. We must reorganize our military establishment into a single department, thereby eliminating the waste in money, manpower, and results which are inevitable under the present obsolete organization.

ECONOMIC STRENGTHENING OF THE FREE
WORLD

The ultimate objective of the free world is not military strength but human well-being. The advance of this well-being, under the shelter of this military strength, offers the best single hope that the costs and dangers of the shelter itself may gradually and safely be removed. The contest of competing systems to uplift peoples can be the long-range salvation of the world; the contest merely to excel in arms is the current tragedy of the world.

The Marshall plan and point 4 won the support of the American people because we

are dedicated to human advance. The economic and political benefits of these efforts came just because the recipients saw in them a reflection of their own aspirations and of the true face of America.

In more recent years, we have neither reshaped these efforts to changing circumstances, nor maintained them at levels consistent with needs overseas and our resources at home.

This process of reshaping should now be undertaken with redoubled vigor. It involves a complex of technical assistance, private credits facilitated by public action, and public programs. These related efforts should be coordinated at home and with friendly nations, showing that our power and determination to diffuse the security of plenty is no less bold and realistic than our efforts to diffuse the security of arms. The cost of plenty is less than the cost of arms; the benefits incalculably greater. The appalling world spectacle of vast unused productive powers in the United States while others cannot make their human ends meet, needs to be succeeded by the inspiration of an America willing to use a just proportion of our marvelous technology to reinforce political freedom by reducing freedom from want.

BACKS MORE TECHNICAL AID

Specifically, we believe that the Democratic Party should give strong support first, to expansion of technical assistance under the point 4 program; second, to the authorization of at least \$1 billion for each of the next 5 years for the development loan fund; and third, to the expansion and extension of the program under Public Law 480 for using our agricultural surpluses to help needy people overseas.

Our party, as in the case of the Marshall plan and point 4, can and should draw up—what the administration has not provided—a definitive program, stating concretely the objectives for a specific phase of development in undeveloped areas and the extent, duration, and cost of our country's participation, which program should be carried out to the greatest extent practicable with our allies and through the United Nations. Only in this way can a practicable program and continuity of action be achieved.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AT HOME

We must have a rapidly growing economy to support the inevitably mounting costs of an adequate national defense, to supply the economic sinews of an effective foreign policy, to meet the domestic needs of a growing population, and to make reasonable progress in the living standards of our people. During the last 6 years of the Truman administration our gross national product, measured in constant dollars, increased at an average annual rate of more than 4½ percent. During the 6 years of this Republican administration, the average annual increase has been only 1.3 percent. This is intolerable.

The population of these United States has increased by 15 million people since Mr. Eisenhower became President. The annual increase in our population is 3 million persons. The growth in output of goods and services must match this for us even to stand still. But standing still is not progress; in fact, it is failure. The Russians are not standing still. The increase in their national product during the most recent years has been estimated at an annual rate of 7 to 10 percent. They are catching up with us and have plans to pass us by. No one should fail to take their plans seriously. Their implications for our peace and security are ominous indeed. A 5 percent annual growth rate, barely above what we averaged some years ago, is moderate in terms of our new technology. We could do even better.

Government expenditures, keyed to our vital needs and resource capabilities, are in themselves a key factor in maximum eco-

nomic growth. Conversely, maximum economic growth is essential to support the necessary level of vital Government expenditures. The amount and purpose of Government spending must be determined by wisely balancing needs and capability. It is elementary that a growing nation needs larger public as well as larger private expenditures, just as it costs more to support a family of five than it does a family of three. It is equally obvious, even more for a nation than for a family, that it is better to increase production and income so that needs can be met, rather than to sacrifice essentials because production, employment, and national income are far too low.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

The Republicans have given us unemployment and recurrent stagnation with persistent inflation. This, in fact, is their unique contribution.

The main key to effective inflation control is sustained full employment and full production, combined with truly competitive pricing. Actions to insure an expanding economy, in which full private and public consumption calls forth the high rate of productivity of which we are technologically capable, would facilitate the fight against inflation. Artificially restrained production has inflationary effects.

The Congress should give serious consideration to the following matters: First, the impact of the monetary and high interest rate policies of the administration which repress production and cramp economic growth; second, the lack of public machinery to air the facts of pending inflationary steps in the private economy and of debt policies that have raised the cost of financing the increasing public debt to an alltime high; and third, the more vigorous enforcement of antimonopoly laws, with a continued stress on investigations into the administered private policies of American industry. There should be constant review of tariff policies which unduly protect noncompetitive domestic industry.

A thorough going review is urgently required of the fiscal and monetary policies of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board that have contributed to a gross imbalance of the national budget; to a serious recession with continuing rising prices, and to serious problems now arising in the refinancing of a sizable portion of the Federal debt at unreasonably high interest costs to the taxpayer. It should be the object of such an investigation to determine who the beneficiaries of these policies have been, and what harm has been done to the future of the Nation's economic strength.

The problem of continuing and rising consumer costs demands congressional inquiry into such pricing policies as the farmer-consumer price spread that has resulted in rising retail food costs with a decreasing portion going to the farmers of the food dollar.

The following portions of this statement outline the specific crucial areas in which we should bring our performance into line with our needs and capabilities. The question will at once be raised as to how we can meet the costs of these economic and human advances. The answer is that we cannot meet them with an economy growing at the rate of 1.3 percent a year. But if we restore and maintain a satisfactory rate of economic growth, the increases in production which are the ultimate sources of all wealth will more than cover the costs of the programs detailed below. In fact, public budgets designed to service these needed programs would in a fully expanding economy represent no larger, and most likely a smaller, part of our total national production than the inadequate public programs of recent years have represented in a retarded economy.

EDUCATION

The administration's attempts to stop the Federal Government from assisting States by vocational education programs should be opposed. These programs are particularly important in the rural areas in which there are dramatic changes in emphasis and ways of life and where, as a consequence, the young people must be provided with help and training to meet the challenge of these transitions in our rural economy.

A Federal scholarship program to meet the truly great challenge facing the United States during the next 10 years, as the number of students eligible for colleges and universities more than doubles, should be promptly established.

We favor a program of Federal assistance to the States for school construction.

There must be a continuation of the Federal impacted areas program which has been opposed by this administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Democratic Party reaffirms its traditional belief in the dignity of each individual human being and that every citizen must be guaranteed his full rights and opportunities under the Constitution.

Appropriate congressional action appears to be necessary to make the deliberations and investigations of the Civil Rights Commission meaningful.

There should be a thorough review of the enforcement by the Attorney General of rights of Americans under existing civil rights laws, including the newly enacted Federal laws to protect voting rights.

The Attorney General of the United States should be authorized to start civil injunction suits against those who deprive persons of their rights to equal protection of the laws, on account of race, color, religion, or natural origin.

There is an obligation to meet the challenge of closed schools and potentially uneducated children as a result of the defiance of the law of the land by a few State and local officials. The present crisis over the refusals of local officials to comply with the orders and decrees of Federal courts has not been met by firm and constructive leadership from the President or his subordinates. It is to be hoped that such legislative action will be taken as will aid, assist, and encourage, the earliest possible reopening of schools now closed, and will prevent the closing of other schools.

Federal legislation is needed to outlaw the use of the mails for the distribution of literature designed to inflame racial and religious prejudices for the purpose of inciting violence such as that which has led to the recent wave of bombings and violence.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

The Senate will face a challenge that can only be met in its opening days.

The challenge is to change Senate rule XXII which now requires a two-thirds vote of the total Members to shut off debate and which provides for no limitation whatsoever of debate on proposals for changes in any rule of the Senate including rule XXII.

The Democratic Advisory Council, as it did on January 4, 1957, once again takes its stand on the relevant 1956 Democratic platform plank. The language of that plank—the Republican platform is altogether silent—unequivocally calls for improved congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails, and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.

We reaffirm this position and state these propositions:

First: We believe that every new Senate, like every new House, has the constitutional and democratic right to make its own rules of procedure.

Second: In any new rule for the limitation of debate, the need for full and searching

discussion in which all Senators may speak and in which public opinion can make its own influence felt, must be duly respected. But the new rule must also be such that after a respectable interval of time, the Senate shall be able to give relevance to the debate by bringing the matters under discussion to a terminal vote where the decision of the majority of the total membership shall close the debate. There can be no compromise with this ultimate, democratic right of the majority to say "Yes" or "No" on legislative issues.

We also favor a liberalization and democratization of the rules of the House of Representatives. The present House rules have operated to delay or block the consideration and passage of important and desirable legislative measures. We believe that in the House as well as in the Senate, the majority of the membership should have an adequate opportunity to vote on legislation.

IMMIGRATION

A general revision of existing immigration and citizenship laws is long overdue. Such revision, for the purpose of humanizing and liberalizing these laws, is of vital importance.

In addition, prompt consideration should be given to the problem of resettling groups of refugees and escapees which are now scattered throughout the world. The United States should give a home to its fair share of these persons.

HEALTH

The need is urgent for an enlarged program of hospital construction, and for loans to local comprehensive health insurance co-operatives. This will provide the basis for the development and enactment of a comprehensive and integrated program for the insurance, protection and improvement of the health of all of our people.

There must be a steady effort to increase the funds and resources available for a broad program of medical research and rehabilitation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The following increased benefits and hospital care program should be adopted as the next several steps in insuring a secure life for our people:

Increase social security tax payments by one-half of 1 percent, split 50-50 by employers and employees, to finance hospital and nursing insurance for aged persons and other social security beneficiaries, including:

Hospitals care for 50 to 60 days per year. A limited amount of nursing service.

Increase monthly social security benefits 10 percent, as a next step, and another 10 percent in the next 3 or 4 years, to bring benefits up to an average of \$100 per month.

Improve widow's benefits.

Extend the age for children to receive benefits from 18 to 21 to enable children to stay in school.

Remove the requirement that disability benefits begin only at age 50. A disabled person is disabled whether he is 25, 40 or 50 years old.

Increase the maximum earnings to which the social security tax applies from its present level of \$4,800 to \$6,000 within the next 2 years, and to \$7,200 by 1962 or 1963, to keep the wage base in line with changing economic conditions.

Maximum benefits to families with several children should be raised.

Study should also be directed to the appropriate retirement age in view of general economic as well as personal considerations.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—CHILD WELFARE

The Congress should now enact at least the increased public assistance payments to the States which were blocked by the administration in the last session of Congress, and broaden and improve the program to take care of anyone in actual need.

We must strive for an improved program for maternal child health and welfare.

LABOR

We favor:

An increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour.

Broadening the coverage of the minimum wage program to include at least 10 million additional workers.

The enactment of minimum Federal standards for the unemployment compensation program with respect to the amount and duration of benefits and the provision of continuing Federal assistance to increase and extend benefits until such standards become effective.

The enactment of the Kennedy-Ives Labor Management and Reporting Act.

The repeal of the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act authorizing State so-called right-to-work legislation.

Neither right-to-work laws nor differing standards of unemployment compensation should be allowed to react to the disadvantage of those States with more advanced labor laws or higher levels of unemployment compensation.

SMALL BUSINESS

Effective action should be taken to ease the credit squeeze on small business.

Continuing work is needed to insure that a fair share of the Nation's defense contracts is allotted to the smaller business firms in all parts of the Nation.

New sources of long-term credit and equity capital should be opened up for small businesses, and Congress should focus its attention on the manner in which the Small Business Administration, through its regulations and rulings, has served to weaken the implementation of the Small Business Investment Act and to subvert its purpose.

AGRICULTURE

We must have an effective, consistent, and broad-based program for the protection and development of rural America. Farmers and their families, businessmen, and dwellers in the smaller towns, inhabitants of rural communities, all have an urgent stake in such a program. So do all our people, because the long farm depression has hurt us all. The administration through the action of Secretary Benson is now at the end of a long effort to undercut the corn program through the abandonment of acreage controls. The next step, as the result of the predictable increase in production, will be to ask for the total abandonment of corn price supports. Programs of long standing for cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and other crops are now in serious danger. This impairment of the farm programs must be arrested and reversed and measures must be adopted to assure fair farm income, to develop human and natural resources, and to protect rural communities.

These measures should include:

An expansion of domestic consumption of agricultural commodities through programs to assure an adequate diet to the undernourished portion of the population.

The increased export and foreign consumption of agricultural surpluses through the establishment of an international food agency.

The development of a program to preserve family-type agriculture from overwhelming encroachment by corporate-type farming.

An improved and workable program to use such combination of price guarantees on basic agricultural commodities and other measures as will move farm families toward parity of income with other groups.

CONSERVATION

The broadly gaged Democratic programs for the conservation and utilization of our soil, timber, mineral, and water resources have proven themselves over the years as meaningful programs for today.

The Congress must constantly be vigilant to see that the full utilization of existing laws and programs is pursued by the administration, so that these natural treasures are nurtured and expanded for the benefit and pleasure of future generations.

HYDROELECTRIC AND ATOMIC RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Goals for the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress in the greatly neglected area of full utilization of our tremendous power resources should include:

Enactment of a TVA self-financing bill. Clarification of the "public purpose" of the atomic energy program of the Federal Government with particular attention to the broadened application of atomic power to serve mankind.

Rapid development of large-scale atomic power reactor demonstration by the AEC and increased emphasis on the use of atomic power for transportation and propulsion.

A sizable increase in funds for new power project starts in the many projects already authorized, including funds directing research be instituted for unauthorized and potentially feasible projects.

A Columbia River development program that would be self-financing.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION COOPERATIVES

The Rural Electrification Administration should be reorganized along the lines of the Humphrey-Price bill, so that the Secretary of Agriculture will be unable to subvert the REA programs. In this way, rural America will continue to benefit from expanding REA services. The administration's efforts to bring its high interest rate policies to bear on the REA program must be vigorously opposed.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES—PUBLIC WORKS

The problems of adequate metropolitan transportation, public recreation facilities, schools, and local public services of all kinds are as meaningful an area for Federal Government activity as are the great reclamation and power projects of the West.

The deficits in the public works programs in all parts of the Nation are mounting all too rapidly for a Nation of our growing and expanding population.

It is vital that the 86th Congress look at public works development as a whole. To assist our citizens in the cities and towns, it should enact a community facilities program along the lines of the one that was defeated in the last Congress. It should also enact a new and broad program for reclaiming of the land and wasted resources in all regions of our Nation.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

This bill, vetoed by the President, at a heavy loss to his party, is urgently needed. We are unwilling to see our fellow citizens forced to idleness in communities that have been hit hard by economic misfortunes not of their own making. Under the terms of this legislation, a minimum of \$500 million should be made available to finance new industries in the distressed communities and to provide needed public services, and to retrain workers.

HOUSING—URBAN RENEWAL

Republican obstruction kept the last Congress from passing a housing bill. Accordingly, housing legislation is immediately necessary. Apart from extending mortgage guarantees and renewing other needed legislation, it should provide for a much-expanded public housing program and a significantly larger and vigorously administered program of urban renewal. Programs for middle income and cooperative housing should be liberalized. Explicit provision should be made to insure moderate interest rates.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

There is a pressing need for Federal aid to modernize and expand existing airport facilities.

ties across the Nation, and meet the demands of the air transportation age.

TAXATION

The Congress should constantly review the total revenue-producing laws of the Federal Government. This review should not be limited to consideration of how much revenues given tax rates can yield in an economy which is not fully productive nor fully expanding. It should include consideration of taxation as a means toward full production and economic growth.

It is not conducive to a healthy growing economy to have the tax burden for the Government's programs inequitably distributed.

The Republican inspired tax programs of 1954 placed undue burdens on certain income groups of our society when viewed against the tax advantages given other groups. These inequities, together with an increasing complex of loopholes for special interests, must be readjusted. Much of the added income needed to bring our national budget into balance can be found by such adjustments of the tax burden, and by closing these loopholes.

CLEAN ELECTION LAWS

Federal election laws should be modernized along the lines proposed by the Hennings-Green bill, in order to assure more meaningful reporting of campaign expenditures, a tightening of the corrupt practices laws, and an extension of Federal regulation of elections for Federal office to include primary elections for any Federal office.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Now that Alaska has been given statehood, the claims of Hawaii to come into the Union as a State can no longer be set aside.

The representatives of Hawaii agreed to wait until the Alaska problem was resolved, and are entitled to get final action promptly.

ALASKA

We are gratified that statehood for Alaska was initiated by and largely accomplished through the efforts of the Democratic Party. We hope that the Democratic Party will give continuing attention to the special problems and pressing needs of our new State and its people.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to local home rule, and to elect the officials to administer their local affairs. They are also entitled to vote in Presidential elections and to have voting representation in the Congress of the United States. Legislation to achieve these objectives should be passed promptly.

OUTER SPACE

The United States should rapidly extend its exploration of outer space. We should press our efforts to place this new dimension under the international control of the United Nations.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Following are the members of the Democratic advisory council:

Jacob M. Arvey, national committeeman from Illinois.

Paul M. Butler, of Indiana, national chairman.

Mrs. Katherine M. Cullinan, national committeewoman from Rhode Island.

Mrs. Benjamin Bryan Everett, national committeewoman from North Carolina.

Camille F. Gravel, Jr., national committeeman from Louisiana.

Leo C. Graybill, national committeeman from Montana.

Governor Harriman, of New York.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Mrs. Ione Hunt, national committeewoman from Minnesota.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Arthur B. Koontz, national committeeman from West Virginia.

Governor-elect David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania.

Former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado.

Mrs. Margaret Price, national committeewoman from Michigan.

Calvin W. Rawlings, national committeeman from Utah.

Mrs. Thelma Parkinson Sharp, national committeewoman from New Jersey.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Mrs. Leonard Thomas, national committeewoman from Alabama.

Mrs. Marguerite Peyton Thompson, national committeewoman from Colorado.

Former President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri.

Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, of St. Louis, Mo.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan.

Paul Ziffren, national committeeman from California.

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, is listed as consultant to the group, and it has an administrative committee composed of Thomas K. Finletter, of New York; Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland; and Mr. Butler. Charles S. Murphy is counsel, and Charles Tyroler 2d is executive director.

The FBI or the Nation—Facts To Combat Communism and Those Who Aid Its Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending House resolution to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, and certain other activities of a small militant group which continues to attack the FBI, I am placing in the RECORD the October 31, 1958, issue of Counterattack. It sets forth accurately and concisely facts to combat communism and those who aid its cause. I think it would be well for every loyal American to read this particular publication:

THE FBI OR THE NATION

In September 1957 the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) headed by Harvey O'Connor and Corliss Lamont, two staunch supporters of the Soviets, began its campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). Almost immediately this campaign was broadened to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Pamphlets were sent out warning "friends" they didn't need to aid the FBI and they should tell the ECLC of any attempts by the FBI to intimidate or threaten them.

¹ Emergency Civil Liberties Committee: To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the * * * Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. When the Communist Party itself is under fire these fronts offer a bulwark of protection.

In the light of the past record, a careful student could have estimated just how long it would take before the anti-FBI campaign of the ECLC erupted into "The Nation," a magazine that once upon a time was influential as a fairminded liberal organ but in recent years has become a steady follower of assorted pro-Soviet and pro-Communist causes.

For some years the name of Harvey O'Connor has been on The Nation's list of editors as a staff contributor. Mr. O'Connor, it will be remembered, is the man identified in 1939 as a Communist Party member employed by the Communist-controlled labor press service, Federated Press. Before the McCarthy Senate Investigating Committee in 1953, O'Connor refused to answer if he was a party member. Recently he refused to obey an HUAC subpoena. (See Counterattack, October 3, 1958, p. 156.)

The present owners of The Nation are George G. Kerstein, publisher, and Carey McWilliams, editor.

McWilliams record in support of Communist activities goes back over 20 years and is cited on the last page.²

Mr. Kerstein is the moneymen whose ex-wife, Elinor Perry Kerstein, is secretary of the ECLC.

The Nation itself has been a subject of interest to the Government. R. Lawrence Siegel, general counsel of the magazine, and another lawyer from his office, Miss Hadassah R. Shapiro, were both convicted in Federal court on January 18, 1958, of conspiring to obstruct justice and of perjury. They were involved with the case of Harvey Matusow, the recanting perjurious ex-Communist who went to the Nation with his story. Attorney Siegel was convicted of having destroyed records of his conversations with Matusow and of having lied to the grand jury investigating the case. Both are appealing. Martin Solow, former assistant to the publisher, is still under indictment.

Former U.S. Attorney Thomas Bolan, in testimony in the Siegel-Shapiro case, said: "Carey McWilliams * * * had arranged certain meetings with Matusow, with members of the Communist Party * * *"

The issue dated October 18, 1958, was a special issue, sold for 50 cents, twice the regular price, and was devoted exclusively, except for a few advertisements (as you shall see later), to a blast at the FBI.

Who was assigned by the Nation to do the FBI? A man who attacked the FBI in the Nation on other occasions, one Fred J. Cook, a rewriter for Roy W. Howard's New York World-Telegram and Sun, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

WHO IS COOK?

Cook came to the World-Telegram from the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press and was known

² Carey McWilliams, chairman, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; sponsor, Civil Rights Congress; endorser, Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee; member of council, American Peace Crusade; member, national council, American Peace Mobilization; signer of Call, American Writers Congress; speaker, Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America; sponsor, American Slav Congress; signer of statement, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; subscriber, People's World, west coast Communist organ; sent greetings, International Labor Defense; sponsor, Committee for a Democratic Far-Eastern Policy; contributor, New Masses; speaker, National Lawyers Guild; endorser, public rally, International Workers Order; associate editor, Lawyers Guild Review; vice chairman, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; speaker, Washington Book Shop; sponsor, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; signer, open letter to American Liberals, Soviet Russia Today.

on his job as a nonpolitical newspaperman. His main forte was crime. A police reporter calling in the details of a story of an important murder could be expected to give these details to Fred Cook. Cook was often seen in the evenings at the World-Telegram office writing stories of murders and robberies for the various crime magazines, his desk stacked with folders of clippings from the Telegram's morgue (library). His first contact with the Nation was on March 10, 1956, when he sold them an article, "Capital Punishment: Does It Prevent Crime?" His view was that it didn't. His next contact with the Nation was an article on September 23, 1956, on the case of the acid-blinded labor columnist, Victor Riesel, and Cook concluded there seemed to be no motive for the crime.

In April 1957 Cook had an article on the case of William W. Remington in the magazine *Saga*: True Adventures for Men. The subtitle of this piece was "An Overdose of Curiosity." It stated that Remington was led to "experiment" with communism and it finally cost him his life. (Remington was killed in prison by another inmate, after being convicted of perjury.)

Cook's article on Remington is supposed to have inspired the Nation to choose him to write a new version of the Alger Hiss case. This appeared in September 21, 1957, and took up 38 of the 45 pages in that issue. Later it was sold as a book. Like the Remington article, the Hiss piece presumed to be a dispassionate appraisal, but in both the net result was to leave the reader with the idea that an injustice was done to the convicted perjurers.

It was in the Hiss article that Cook made no attempt to prevent his readers from thinking the worst of the FBI. At one point, he wrote that Whittaker Chambers came up with some testimony only after the FBI had produced certain evidence, indicating that the agency had aided in distorting the facts in the pending trial. Later Cook quotes a "pungent paragraph . . ." by Hiss' attorney Chester T. Lane, a part of which read "We search for records—the FBI has them. We ask questions—the FBI will not let people talk to us . . ." Cook then comments approvingly:

"This is probably as close as any attorney has ever come in court to accusing the FBI of Gestapo-like methods, of creating the atmosphere of a police state which is the very antithesis of democracy."

The final gist of the Cook judgment on Alger Hiss is that only if seven points are believed that were raised by Hiss' lawyers and rejected by the jury and the appeals courts, can one believe Hiss guilty. If Hiss is really innocent, says Cook:

"Could Whittaker Chambers alone and unaided have deceived the FBI and the U.S. Attorney General's Office? Or must he have had, perhaps on several levels, official collaborators in the perfection of his story and the completion of his deeds?"

Is this an implication that the FBI and/or the Department of Justice conspired with Chambers?

This is the background of the one assigned to do an objective survey of the FBI in the Nation.

THE NATION AT WORK

The Cook version of Hiss case called Hiss: New Perspectives on the Strangest Case of Our Time appealed to the Nation's editors. They couldn't wait for him to do something new. So with almost no changes, the Nation proceeded to run the warmed-over Remington story from *Saga* magazine. It was not rewritten except for a phrase here and there. Nor were the intellectual readers of the Nation told that they were getting a rerun of a true adventure story from *Saga*.

The changes are worth noting. Cook wrote in *Saga*:

"By 1943, however, the double-crosses of international diplomacy had created new

tensions at home and abroad. Russia had made it evident that she had not relaxed her goal of a Communist-dominated world and had betrayed us in Korea."

In the Nation article the sentence about Russia (underlined) was cut out. The *Saga* story told about Elizabeth Bentley, the Soviet courier who testified about her contact who was still in government and it read:

"That contact, unnamed at first, was William W. Remington." The Nation changed this to read: "That alleged contact."

Cook in *Saga* told of Remington's claim to have paid \$30 in dues through Miss Bentley to the Joint Antifascist Refugee Committee. He added:

"This was later exposed as a Communist front but he said he did not know that then."

In the Nation, this sentence became: "This was before the organization had been labeled a Communist front."

Quite a difference in meaning.

The *Saga* version said that in 1948 Bentley and Remington testified before "the Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee." The Nation corrected this to read "Internal Security Subcommittee." But both versions were incorrect. The testimony was before the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. The Internal Security Subcommittee was not constituted until 1951.

Both editions end with an implication that the FBI had tapped the phone of Remington's attorney and thus was able to prevent two witnesses from testifying.

Cook next wrote for the Nation about Boris Morros calling his article "Hero of a Myth." Morros was identified as a longtime undercover agent for the FBI when he appeared to give testimony in the case of Jack and Myra Sobie, who pleaded guilty to espionage. They were members of the same Soviet spy apparatus, only Morros was working for the FBI. Cook claimed he found many contradictions in the stories Morros told the press.

Before the Nation ran the Cook attack on the FBI it made some changes. Its issue of September 6, 1958, had the list of staff contributors that had run for some years. Included in this list was Harvey O'Connor, Andrew Roth (indicted but never tried in the Amerasia case), and H. H. Wilson (professor at Princeton University, also an ECLC member), among others.

The following issue of the magazine dropped these names without any explanation to its readers.

The October 4 issue carried an article attacking the monetary policy of the Eisenhower administration. The author of this piece is Wilfred Lumer, described by the Nation as the author of "Small Business at the Crossroads," and the "Hard Money Crusade" with Bertram Cross, as coauthor, published by the Public Affairs Institute.

The 1958 report "Investigation of Soviet Espionage" issued by the HUAC lists the testimony of Wilfred Lumer, who was then employed by the Public Affairs Institute which he said was supported by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The committee noted that Lumer had been identified under oath as a Communist Party member and involved the fifth amendment when asked whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his appearance before the committee, and whether he had discussed his work on legislative reports with any person known to him to be a Communist.

The Nation of October 18 devoted exclusively to the FBI, ran to 56 pages and an introduction by the editors stated that "The last objective study (of the FBI) was undertaken in 1950." This was a book called the Federal Bureau of Investigation by Max Lowenthal, said the editors.

Just how objective Max Lowenthal's book was, is indicated by a news story in the New York Times the day it was published, November 30, 1950. The story was headed "Lowenthal Book Assails the FBI." The writer then devoted more than a column to detailing the Lowenthal assault on the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. Book reviewers recognized that the Lowenthal book was just the opposite of objective. It was a violent attack.

To get its own objective appraisal of the FBI the Nation stated it "decided to call in Fred J. Cook, one of the country's top reporters and investigators in the field of crime."

THE BUILDUP

By writing for the Nation, Cook has been steadily promoted. The capital punishment article listed Cook as an author and crime reporter on the World-Telegram and Sun. His Riesel story mentioned him as a "police reporter on a New York metropolitan newspaper." For the Hiss piece he became "one of the Nation's top crime reporters." For the Remington rerun in the Nation he was cited as "the veteran New York crime reporter." For the Boris Morros story he was only a crime reporter again.

Actually Cook is a good rewrite man who can write a lively article from a few old clippings. He is not a veteran since he came to New York in 1945, nor is he a nationally known reporter. Two others on the World-Telegram won Pulitzer prizes while Cook was doing his daily grind. Fred Woltman won his prize for exposing the Communists. We wonder if the present Fred Cook—in the Nation at least—would approve. The other, Edward J. Mowery, won a Pulitzer prize for legitimate crime investigating and reporting. Two men were released from prison on the basis of investigation done by Mowery and stories published in the World-Telegram and Sun.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER?

It may be worth noting that there are just two columns of advertising in the FBI issue of the Nation. One is a full column ad paid for out of the tax-free funds of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic. The other column consists of eight 1- and 2-inch ads, one of which is from the Communist Party's publishing house, New Century Publishers, advertising the latest issue of the party's theoretical organ, Political Affairs.

What has Mr. Cook, the crime writer, to say about the FBI? Appearing in "The Nation" as he does, one may be sure there will be little that is good. Whole sections are lifted in essence from Lowenthal's 559 page book of 1950. At least four columns are lifted directly, in quotes from a snide series that appeared in the New Yorker magazine in 1937. Wherever anyone has written about the FBI and has had unpleasant comment to make, Mr. Cook has seemingly found them.

If "The Nation" looked for a nonpolitical person like Mr. Cook to do its "job" on the FBI, naturally Mr. Cook looked around too. By and large he has lifted from wherever he could, and the result is that what "The Nation" has published is a slightly updated version of the Max Lowenthal book, plus the nastiest phrases by anyone else available to Mr. Cook.

In gathering together every criticism of the FBI, Cook tries to create the impression that little, if anything, in the history of the FBI or of Mr. Hoover was of the high level that Americans have found them to be. He even manages to doubt the efficiency of the FBI's huge fingerprint file because the Scotland Yard method is different and therefore better. In the end however, he admits that the FBI file is one of its few good points.

After many pages of blasting the FBI, Cook manages to find room to concede that its record during World War II was "very good indeed." Having made one concession,

he then tries to break down the record and claim it failed in point after point. He accuses the FBI of failing to cooperate with local police and ignores other parts of his story which note the ties of many local police to crooks and mobsters.

His attack on his home publication, the World-Telegram without mentioning it by name is interesting too. He writes about the Amerasia (stolen documents) case and states that it "established (the) eagerness of some of the great media that form public opinion to make the Truman administration and the Democrats the scapegoats for any failure of security. It was an attitude that was to be capitalized upon eventually" as in the Bentley case.

No papers more completely covered these two cases than the Scripps-Howard papers. It is more than likely that Cook himself may have written some of the headline-making features for the World-Telegram.

And if J. Edgar Hoover should be attacked by "The Nation's" reporter, then why not Dwight Eisenhower too? Cook obliges. He quotes a minor statement by Mr. Hoover speaking well of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and then adds "Eisenhower tripped on his halo by embracing McCarthy in Wisconsin."

After 54 pages of slurs, and innuendoes, Cook is still not satisfied? What he has written against the FBI isn't enough. He says:

"If America is ever again to see issues clearly and to react with the powers of the mind instead of emotionally, Hoover's role and the role of the FBI, at some day and some hour, will have to be assessed."

Then Cook adds a bit later: "Little wonder that we have reached a stage where no issue—not Lebanon, not Quemoy—can be debated vigorously or reasoned on its merits."

Apparently Mr. Cook the top reporter in the field of crime, is now an expert on the subject of international politics as well.

Counterattack considers this latest job by Fred J. Cook a fine example of the old adage about getting someone else to pull your chestnuts out of the fire. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its stalwarts are out to get the FBI and Mr. Cook is their current catspaw. There will be others. But as an American President said of another debunking attempt: "The monument is still there."

A FINAL WORD

The ECLC is still carrying on its drive against the FBI. As the outstanding governmental opponent of subversion and espionage, the FBI stands in the way of all who would subvert the American way of life. Promising that the October issue of its publication Rights, will be a special issue, the current number of Rights has the following notation.

"The October issue of Rights will be devoted to the subject of 'The FBI and Your Freedom.' Contributors will include Aubrey Williams, president of the Southern Conference Education Fund; attorneys Benjamin Ginzburg, Joseph Forer, Charles C. Lockwood, and Ben Margolis; and Sam Pollock, president of Local 427, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO. Mr. Ginzburg was formerly on the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights."

The New York Post which has probably published more editorial attacks on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI than any other paper in the country (except possibly the Daily Worker) has a whole staff assigned to gathering material for a series on J. Edgar Hoover according to Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion. In a word of warning to patriotic citizens, Commander Moore noted that "there are some individuals in this country and certain publications determined to discredit the FBI and its Director * * *." He adds:

"It is difficult to attribute any purpose to these attacks other than a desire to destroy this Federal law enforcement agency and its leaders as an effective deterrent to undetected, unopposed Communist subversion in this country."

To this, New York Post Editor James Wechsler writes, his paper is preparing a factual study of Mr. Hoover. He objects to this warning against the Post's independent study and believes Mr. Hoover should not be immune to objective reporting.

This is the first time in 10 years that Wechsler has considered it important to be objective about J. Edgar Hoover. Counterattack believes that on the basis of the past record of the New York Post, Wechsler's idea of objective will be the same as that of the Nation.

The Nation has since published commendations of its FBI article from David L. Weissman, Roger N. Baldwin, and Rev. Stephen A. Fritchman. Weissman is a vice president of the New York chapter of the National Lawyers Guild listed by the HUAC as legal arm of the Communist Party. Reverend Fritchman is so well known as a backer of Communist fronts that nothing more need be said. Roger N. Baldwin, former head of the American Civil Liberties Union can boast that he was attacking the FBI back in 1920 when it was just the Bureau of Investigation.

Faithfully yours,

COUNTERATTACK.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Republic of Latvia—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a group of Latvian-American citizens met on November 16, 1958, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia.

Although Latvia has lost her independence and the people have become inmates of the vast prison that is Soviet Russia, they still yearn as do all other captive peoples for return to the days of freedom, self-government and dignity that the Latvian people once knew.

The resolution adopted by these patriotic Americans of Latvian descent is as follows:

Resolution adopted by Latvians of Detroit, Mich., assembled at the Veterans Memorial Building on 16th day of November, 1958, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of independence of the Republic of Latvia

Whereas, in June 1940, the Soviet Union destroyed once free Latvia and other Baltic States, enslaved their defenseless populations, condemned hundreds of thousands of them to death in Siberia; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has repeatedly denounced the subjugation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and continues to recognize these states and their diplomatic representatives; and

Whereas the Latvian people have their only source of true, objective information radio broadcasts from the Voice of America and other programs from the free world; and

Whereas the continued existence of these broadcasts in the Latvian language provides

the Latvians with proof the United States is still aware of the intense feelings the Latvian people have toward their freedom from Soviet chains; and

Whereas any reduction in the Voice of America Latvian language programs will be doing a disservice to the persecuted and long suffering Latvian people, who look to America as their only hope, and to the United States as well, which needs as many friends in all parts of the world as it can muster; and

Whereas, since the United States has made commitments to all anti-Communist countries throughout the world, it is essential that the present policies in Asia especially not be changed with regard to Red China as an example of America's good faith toward the peoples of the world who are struggling against communism; and

Whereas the United States as the last hope of oppressed mankind—the nearly 1 billion people of the world now ruled by Communists—has been able to maintain superiority in the field of nuclear weapons, despite the exaggerated claims made by the Russians and their apologists and other dupes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Government of the United States to continue to safeguard the legal existence of Latvia and to take appropriate and timely action in order to enable the Latvian people to resume the exercise of their free and independent statehood under the government of the people's own choice; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Information Agency broadcasts in Latvian be increased to a number of programs to a level commensurate with the importance of the Latvian people located as they are on the sensitive Baltic coast; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States continue to withhold diplomatic recognition of Red China and prevent its admission to the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States enter into no agreements with the Soviet Union that would have the effect of reducing its power in the atomic- and hydrogen-weapons field or otherwise restricting its freedom of action in this vital defense area; and be it finally

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Senators and Congressmen from Michigan, Governor of the State of Michigan, and Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 16th day of November A.D. 1958.

Space Development Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the fine and carefully worded editorial, entitled "Space Development Race Has But One Objective," which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 14, 1959:

SPACE DEVELOPMENT RACE HAS BUT ONE OBJECTIVE

As each new success or failure comes in the launching of satellites by the United States and Russia, neither the American people nor those who guide the Nation's military courses

in Washington should ever forget that the first objective in all this must be the development of weapons of war.

Ideally this Nation and its people look forward to the days of new peacetime wonders through progress in science that now is going on. Perhaps some portion of the people in Russia look forward in the same way. But right now the one objective of Russia in all space development is to create Russian military supremacy over all of the rest of the world. The one objective of the United States must be to reach science success that will prevent the Russians from achieving their objective.

It is nice enough to talk of peace and treaties and agreements and disarmament and limiting or ending atomic tests. But this fact must never be lost sight of: The existence of this Nation and of the rest of the free world as peaceful peoples rests on the ability of the United States to be able to meet and offset any attack by the Soviet and to conquer and subdue that nation completely in quick retaliation. "Shooting the moon" and accidentally getting to the sun is wonderful from the standpoint of prestige and as indicative of certain progress in certain fields of science. But the Soviet views its own accomplishments only in whatever value they may have toward creating worldwide military superiority and the United States must have the same objective.

In trying to evaluate American space progress alongside of Russian space progress, it must be kept in mind that the two nations move along different paths, even though the paths may be somewhat parallel. The United States seems to be far more deeply concerned—or at least more successful—in development of highly delicate electronic instruments for use in satellites and in other ways than Russia.

So far as public knowledge is concerned, considerable of Russia's satellite and rocket achievement has been on the side of the spectacular and of a type to bring worldwide prestige, where the United States seems to have more definite scientific objectives in its launchings. For example, it is noticeable that in almost every instance each of the recent launchings by the United States had some particular scientific objective—sought through new electronic instruments—that was not a part of any of the other launchings.

A comparison, though not too applicable, might be found in some American agricultural procedures as compared with agricultural procedures in the Soviet. For example, sweetpotato farmers in the United States use one machine which simultaneously plows a furrow, inserts tiny sweetpotato plants into it, covers their roots with dirt, and waters them—all at one shot. The Russians, in such an activity, would first plow the furrow and then come back and put in the seedlings and then come back and go along the furrow again to cover the seedlings and finally make a fourth trip for watering—four steps taken separately where American farmers would take them simultaneously. It is somewhat the same way in space development—the United States is proceeding along several paths simultaneously where the Soviet proceeds separately.

No one can question the world prestige which the Russians have gained—and earned—by sending a rocket into orbit around the sun, even though they intended to send it into orbit around the moon. The sun achievement is far greater than what they attempted and fate was with them in that respect. But neither should what the United States is doing and what it has succeeded in doing be sold short because it has not yet shot the moon. While the United States has not yet matched this latest Russian achievement, neither has Russia

matched several scientific achievements by American satellites and rockets.

So far as any race between the two nations is concerned, it will not be won by the achievements of the American Atlas or the Soviet sun-orbiter. It will be won by the nation which can first use space experiments in the most deadly and destructive way. Russia, if it wins that race, will destroy much of the world. The United States, if it wins that race, will prevent destruction by the Soviet and certainly will not seek to use its advantage in any way of aggression.

Battler for School Aid: Frank Thompson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I enclose a splendid article appearing in the New York Times of January 12, 1959, relating to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], entitled "Battler for School Aid." A sound progressive, FRANK THOMPSON performs his legislative duties with great ability, vision, and courage. He is a true progressive in every sense of the word, looking forward and not backward in supporting progressive legislation that is for the best interest of our people; and in the field of foreign affairs and national defense, for the best interest of our country.

The article follows:

BATTLER FOR SCHOOL AID: FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey's Fourth District, had a reputation as a fighter long before he entered Congress. His 4 years at Washington have only enhanced that reputation. Ever ready to espouse a good cause, he has battled for measures as diverse as Federal aid to education and a National Culture Center, assistance for small business and more democratic congressional procedure. Not every encounter has been crowned with success but the 40-year-old legislator—"THOMPY" to his friends—has lasting qualities that match his fighting spirit. This combination of traits make him much in demand as an advocate, on and off the floor of Congress.

So it is that the National Education Association, again striving to have a multibillion-dollar aid-to-education bill passed, has entrusted its fate in the House of Representatives to Mr. THOMPSON.

HE PREDICTS PASSAGE

He steered the bill to a floor test last year, only to lose by five votes. He says he will win its passage this time "with a more sympathetic Congress."

"Whether the President will sign it or not is something else" said Mr. THOMPSON, a free-swinging Democrat who does not always treat people in high places with the usual deference.

The Congressman has all the attributes of a fighter. He is a 6-foot-3-inch 185 pounder. He has a certain brashness that complements his fighting, sticking qualities.

During World War II, he thrice was awarded combat decorations while in the Navy during action in the Pacific. When fighting in Korea broke out, he reentered service for 17 months.

MAKES EASY TRANSITION

After leaving service the first time, Mr. THOMPSON practiced law for a while in Trenton—then made what was for him the easy transition into politics. One uncle, Crawford Jamieson, had been Democratic leader and State senator in Mercer County. Another, Frank, is the special consultant and behind-the-scenes adviser to Governor Rockefeller in New York.

Mr. THOMPSON easily won election to the assembly in 1949. In his first term he was named assistant minority leader. He served only two terms before making a bid for Congress, winning the Democratic nomination in a three-way contest.

In Congress, he has taken a lot of kidding about some of the legislation he espoused. He was the author of many bills to advance national interest in the arts. Colleagues named him the "culture vulture." He surprised them last year when he was able to have passed and signed a bill setting up a National Cultural Center.

FAVORED ARTS PLANK

His interest in art centers in music where his tastes go from jazz to opera. He caused a stir in 1956 when he sought to get the Democrats to include an arts plank in their national platform.

The Congressman has a keen sense of public relations. His nose for news may be inherited. His late father and his uncle Frank were newspapermen and his brother still is.

Married in 1942 to Evelina Van Metre of Washington, D.C., he has two daughters, Ann, 14, and Evelina, 7. The family maintains a home at Parkfairfax, Va., not too far from the capital, as well as their year-round home at Trenton.

"Family life is too important to let politics give it the go-by," the Congressman insists.

U.S. Judge Thomas W. Slick: A Distinguished American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to one of the finest men I have ever known, the Honorable Thomas W. Slick, retired Federal judge for northern Indiana, who died this month in South Bend.

I knew Judge Slick for over 15 years. He was a Republican and I a Democrat and we used to joke about our party differences in a way that left me with deep respect for him and great pride in our friendship.

Judge Slick was one of Indiana's finest citizens.

I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Hammond Times of January 7, 1959, paying tribute to him:

U.S. JUDGE THOMAS W. SLICK

The death last weekend of retired U.S. Judge Thomas W. Slick, the first judge to sit in the Northern District of Indiana, removes from the scene a jurist particularly noted for

his conciliatory efforts in labor disputes that entered the courts during the thirties.

Judge Slick, 89, died at his home in South Bend. He had been seriously ill for 3 years and ill health had forced him to retire from the Federal bench in 1943 after 18 years of service. His successor was U.S. Judge Luther M. Swygert of Hammond, now the senior of two judges on the northern district bench.

Born in South Bend, Judge Slick taught school for 2 years to accumulate enough money to enter the University of Michigan law school. After he began practice in South Bend, he became active in Republican politics. He had been St. Joseph County prosecutor and South Bend city attorney, in addition to his private practice, before being named a Federal judge.

President Calvin Coolidge nominated Slick to be the northern district judge when the former single Federal court in Indiana was split into northern and southern districts in 1925.

During the thirties, nearly two dozen cases were filed against organized labor as the industrial union organizing movement sprang up. Judge Slick made it a matter of personal interest to try and settle these cases without prolonged litigation. In this he was successful. All of the cases were settled before final court decision was necessary.

Conferences in Judge Slick's chambers between the contending parties played a big part in these peaceful settlements. Judge Slick was always a champion of the idea that management and labor could settle their main differences around a conference table once all facts were properly marshaled, presented and discussed.

Cuba's Wholesale Executions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment by WDSU Broadcasting Station, New Orleans, La., is most timely and excellently stated. I commend it to the attention of Members of this body:

CUBA'S WHOLESALE EXECUTIONS

The firing squad executions of Batista officials in Cuba are now above the 200 mark.

The number and swiftness of these executions have provoked an eruption of criticism in this country and a backfire of blistering comment from rebel leader Fidel Castro.

Part of the shock expressed in this country may result from a basic failure to understand what the Cuban revolution was all about. We customarily pay little attention to what is going on in Latin American countries until some violent events break in on our consciousness. Then we're surprised at developments that seem to have blown up out of nowhere.

Whether it's the fault of American reporters, American diplomats, or a matter of indifference on the part of the American public, most of us were not aware until now of the bitterness and hatred underlying the Cuban revolution, or the extent of the brutality and corruption practiced by the Batista regime.

The success of the revolution itself caught us by surprise. Perhaps if we had understood the revolution a little better we would not have been totally unprepared for the violence of its aftermath.

This is not to condone the wholesale killings in Cuba. Executions on this scale must necessarily be a product more of vengeance than of justice. They are an ugly scar on the face of a revolutionary achievement that invoked the name of freedom.

We can only hope that tonight's postponement of prisoner's trials in Havana means that this unchecked outpouring of hatred has now run its course, and that more orderly processes will be adopted.

In the meantime, this country has to consider its future relationship with Cuba.

We might begin by resolving to do two things that go neatly together:

First, be more attentive to the day-to-day problems of this and other Latin neighbors.

Second, assure Cuba once again that, despite some Congressmen to the contrary, we intend to avoid interference in her internal affairs.

Despite the present agony, there is still hope that a tradition of stability and democracy may emerge in Cuba.

Drive To Destroy House Anti-Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Tablet of January 17, 1959:

DRIVE TO DESTROY HOUSE ANTI-REDS—LIBERALS, LEFTISTS CALL FOR HUAC ABOLITION IN WASHINGTON POST

(By James E. Greene)

The Soviet-inspired operation abolition, which seeks to cripple the anticomunism programs of Congress, discredit J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and abolish or shackle the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been given new impetus with publication in the Washington Post of an advertisement directed at the latter which "hits a new low with respect to deceit practiced in the attempt to divide our people," charged Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Un-American Activities Committee chairman.

The advertisement, placed in the Post by people who are "for the most part well-known fellow travelers or members of Communist fronts," asks the 86th Congress to eliminate the House committee as a standing or continuing body.

LIBERALS DISPUTE ON METHODS

It follows on the heels of announcements by the southern California branch and national office of the American Civil Liberties Union that they would seek to curb HUAC when the new Congress opens. These two "liberal" groups, however, disagree over their methods.

The national ACLU is fearful that an open drive to eliminate the Red hunters "might not only fail conspicuously but also close the door to other approaches." It would rather that "liberals" work to place the committee under the House Judiciary unit, headed by "liberal" Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn.

But the southern California ACLU wants to do the Communists' work another way, though the above method would be effective in smothering attempts by the committee to uncover the spies which it is acknowledged are responsible for the Soviet gain in the

missile and outer space field. In their calling for abolition of HUAC, the western ACLU and the Post ad signers closely follow the directive issued by the Communist front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which in September 1957 in New York City held what it called an "historical" meeting "because it opens the abolition campaign" against the House committee.

ASKS PROOF OF CHARGES

The Post advertisement states the Un-American Activities Committee has "harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice" and that it has "increased the bitterness between racial and religious groups of our citizens." Representative WALTER called upon "any of the people whose names are attached to that advertisement to state wherein this committee has ever done anything that even resembles remotely the things that have been charged in this advertisement."

The signers, who included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Judge Justice W. Polier, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Leo Pfeffer and Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, asked that the anti-Communist group be destroyed because it has "weakened America."

"At no time in history have we needed to be stronger. At no time have we needed to be wiser. Let us rid ourselves of this agent of weakness and of folly."

They charged the House unit "has become an agency for repression. . . ."

"For two decades the committee has condemned individual Americans, has wrecked the lives of some, and has denied them the due process of law. . . . It has imperiled our good relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. . . . It has discouraged social and cultural contacts with our neighbors on this shrinking planet. . . . It has discouraged U.S. students and scholars from studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand."

Representative WALTER, noting that the operation abolition committee is seeking funds, said "it is indeed unfortunate that some people have been unwilling dupes of this group. . . . The potential contributors had better realize what movement they would be financing."

AD SIGNERS AND RECORDS

Following are the signers of the Washington Post ad: Rev. Benjamin J. Anderson, Dr. Stringfellow Barr, Dean John C. Bennett, Judge John O. Bigelow, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Bernarda Bryson, John M. Coe, Rev. Ray Gibbons, Jesse W. Gitt, John Hammond, Prof. Fowler Harper, James Imbrie, Prof. Erich Kahler, Robert W. Kenny, Bishop Edgar L. Love, Dr. John A. Mackay, Daniel G. Marshall, Mrs. Dorothy Marshall, Stewart Meacham, Prof. Alex Melklejohn, Rev. A. J. Muste, Rev. Claude D. Nelson, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Leo Pfeffer, Judge Justice W. Polier, Clarence E. Pickett, Prof. Arnold W. Rogow, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Prof. Donald H. Riddle, Ben Shahn, Otto L. Spaeth, Prof. George F. Thomas, W. O. Tilenius, Prof. Paul Tillett, Aubrey Williams.

The records of some of the signers of the advertisement, according to Representative WALTER, follow:

Stringfellow Barr, a sponsor of Communist fronts who opposed the Internal Security Act but condemned the Supreme Court conviction of the first string Communist leaders.

John M. Coe, in 1950, attorney for the Communist Party of Alabama. Has sponsored Communist fronts over a number of years.

Ray Gibbons, supported the Communist opposition to our aid to England and France during Hitler-Stalin pact in 1941.

Fowler Harper, member of national committee, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which is leading the drive against the committee and which was cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In 1941

Harper defended the Communist Party in a statement to the President of the United States.

James Imbrie, supporter of Communist fronts over many years including the National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs. Member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Erich Kahler, supporter of Communist program of American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Robert W. Kenny, former president of Communist-controlled National Lawyers Guild. Sponsor of numerous Communist fronts, including National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs, member of national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

John A. Mackay, sponsor of Communist fronts such as the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Daniel G. Marshall, former president of Los Angeles National Lawyers Guild. Sponsor of Communist fronts such as National Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs.

Dorothy M. Marshall, supporter of many Communist fronts, including the west coast Communist newspaper, the People's World. Defender of the Rosenbergs, she is a member of the national committee of Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Prof. Alex Meiklejohn. Not only has he affiliated himself with Communist-front organizations, he has denounced the Supreme Court for its conviction of the top Communist leadership. He has been one of the most vocal leaders of the campaign of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee to abolish the committee.

Rev. A. J. Muste, a pacifist, he has lent his name to certain Communist organizations over the last 25 years. As chairman of the recently formed American Forum for Socialist Education, he refused to answer questions about the part Communists or the Communist Party played in its formation.

Justine Wise Polier, a onetime member of the Communist-controlled National Lawyers Guild.

Clarence C. Pickett has affiliated with Communist-front organizations over a number of years.

Ben Shahn has sponsored organizations such as the American Continental Congress for World Peace which was held in Mexico City in 1949. This congress was designed to support the Soviet foreign policy and condemn America's. An artist, he has contributed his works for use by the Communist Party in its publications.

Paul Tillet, a supporter of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which has led the Communist campaign to abolish the committee.

Aubrey Williams, a supporter of Communist fronts who refused to answer questions when questioned by a Senate committee.

which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This measure is, you might say, a "pet subject" of mine. Bills identical to H.R. 1232 were introduced by me in the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, but no action was taken on them. It is my fervent hope that the 86th Congress will see fit to enact this legislation into law.

We have academies for every branch of our armed services so that we may have officers with the best military training available. No one will argue that this is not as it should be. However, I think we will all agree that the cold war of today is no less important to our security than the military. Upon the shoulders of our diplomatic corps rests the job of preventing a hot war. Does it not logically follow that those charged with the duty of carrying on our relations with foreign countries should be given the very best training in this field that we can provide?

In 1958 I sent a questionnaire to my constituents which included this question: "Do you favor the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy to train our Ambassadors, consular and diplomatic representatives for foreign service?" The response was 86 percent in the affirmative. In addition, many newspapers throughout the country have indicated, through editorials, their support for this legislation. The Long Island Daily Press, the leading newspaper in my area of New York, has on several occasions come out in strong support for this idea.

It is my honest belief that a Foreign Service Academy is a "must," and I am confident that the people of the United States agree. I take this opportunity to call upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs to act on this legislation and to give the members of this body an opportunity to vote on same.

The Emancipation in Retrospect Prospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered for the Emancipation Proclamation Day celebration of the Nashville, Tenn., Baptist Ministers' Union at the Mount Zion Baptist Church, Monday, January 5, 1959, by Maynard P. Turner, Jr., Th. D., president of American Baptist Theological Seminary:

THE EMANCIPATION IN RETROSPECT PROSPECT

There is no virtue in looking back merely for the sake of looking back. In fact to "live in the past" is a symptom of emotional deficiency. On the other hand, to examine the past in order to secure sounder footing for positive action in the present, and to plan wisely for the future, is an obligation upon the leadership of any given time or place. It is hoped that this presentation shall be of some assistance to my fellow min-

isters of Nashville in accomplishing this purpose.

Through the years American Negro leadership has fondly regarded Emancipation Proclamation Day in a sense somewhat comparable to the Jewish regard for the first Passover. Each of these events did mark a turning point in the status of involuntary servitude of the two peoples, but other factors in the two situations prevent the analogy from being carried much further. In each instance, however, a man plays a dominant role. Abraham Lincoln, of course, is the keyman in the Emancipation Proclamation. The text of the proclamation and the date of its issuance are of immense significance, but limited when taken alone as grounds for action today. Mr. Lincoln's attitudes and motives as well as the political and social atmosphere of his day must also be examined.

Even a cursory study of Abraham Lincoln's speeches and writings reveal an astoundingly contemporary attitude, and motives which were at times more pragmatic than altruistic. Due consideration must be given to Lincoln's temperament and personality. Scholars of all opinions seem to agree that Lincoln was decidedly conservative in every respect. He was persistent but not impetuous. He was a man of deep sympathies and broad understanding but it could hardly be said that he allowed himself to be carried away at any time. For example when Lincoln campaigned against Stephen A. Douglas for Senator, (1858) Douglas rode about the State of Illinois in a private car with his political retinue. In contrast to this, Lincoln rode in crowded coaches or in freight cabooses to deliver his speeches. Now, of course, some would argue that this reflected Lincoln's superior showmanship and that he identified himself with the people, while Douglas did not. But such cannot be said of his continued disregard for his clothing and personal appearance. It was the usual thing to find him clad in an ill-fitting suit, unpolished boots, and battered stove-pipe hat in which he carried piles of papers. Clothes and social niceties simply did not interest Lincoln. Yet in his work as a lawyer he paid attention to every detail to the point of meticulousness.

When we consider Abraham Lincoln as a man, it is quite in character for him—even at the age of 25—while a member of the Illinois State Legislature to studiously avoid association with abolitionists. The national controversy of abolitionists versus slaveholders frequently caused emotions to reach fever heat. However in 1837 when the legislature passed resolutions condemning abolition societies, Lincoln together with Dan Stone, a colleague, entered a protest in which they said slavery was "founded on both injustice and bad policy, but that the promulgation of abolition doctrines tends rather to increase than abate its evils." This statement should be considered side by side with the fact that he never allowed himself to become identified with any religious denomination, but was a constant Bible reader and his life was lived on an exceptionally high moral plain. This morality was true even during his youth on a wild frontier with ruffians as neighbors and companions. Lincoln was an anomaly. He tried to occupy a position on the burning issue of the day which became increasingly difficult to do.

In the years 1847-49 Lincoln served in Congress from Illinois. In January 1849 he offered Congress a proposal to abolish slavery in Washington, D. C., on three conditions. They were that (1) emancipation was to be gradual, (2) compensation was to be made to slaveholders for the loss of their slaves, (3) the act would not go into force unless approved by vote of the citizens of Washington, D. C., in special election. This measure failed and his influence as a Whig

H.R. 1232: A Bill To Create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1232 to create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy

waned. His temporary setback in politics could well be attributed to his willingness to try to see both sides of an issue, and his subsequent denunciation of President Polk for the Mexican War.

Roughly 10 years later Lincoln joined the newly formed Republican Party and campaigned for Senator from Illinois. During the course of this campaign against Douglas he exhibited great skill as a politician. He tried to capitalize on the growing split in Democratic ranks, while at the same time he labored with an eye for vote-getting to unite the incompatible elements of the newly formed Republican Party. Therefore he did not advocate unconditional repeal of fugitive-slave laws. He did not oppose the admission of States in which slavery might be established. He did not endorse Negro citizenship. He did not endorse nor urge political or social equality for the races. He continued his proposal of gradualism, and compensation to masters for freed slaves in Washington, D.C. This was good politics. He welded the Republicans together and became their leader in Illinois, even though Douglas won the seat in the Senate. Lincoln was maneuvered into position to be regarded as presidential timber. It must be remembered that there was no significant Negro vote to lose.

Democrats were hard at work to identify the Republican Party with the spirit of John Brown. This was interpreted as an attempt to discredit the party, so in his Cooper Institute speech in New York in February 1860, Lincoln urged understanding and friendliness toward the people of the South. Thus he advised "yield to them if * * * we possibly can," do "nothing through passion and ill temper." After his election to the presidency, Lincoln wrote to Samuel Haycraft (a southerner) that the "good people of the South" would find in him "no cause to complain."

Upon taking office as President, Abraham Lincoln was hard pressed with numerous duties and burdens. He was inexperienced in handling an organization as large as the Federal Government with the great affairs involved and the vigorous decisions required. Crowds of job seekers and political hangers-on beset him on every hand. The social life and its demands embarrassed him. More aggressive subordinates challenged his leadership by their actions if not by their words. The rumbling of civil war was upon the horizon. Things seemed to be exploding and falling apart. There were about 5 months between his inauguration and the convening of Congress during which positive action in regard to the insurrection had to be taken. Both Congress and the Supreme Court supported his bold action, but this did not offset a sector of the population from calling him a dictator.

As the war progressed his problems naturally increased. At its best, the machinery of government as Lincoln found it was not well suited to meeting the crisis. In the area of military action there was much confusion between Federal and State handling of troops. States were either ahead of the Federal Government, or dragging their feet. Further complications set in when in 1862 an unfavorable Congress took its seat.

In September 1862 we do not see a placid humanitarian who by a flourish of his pen cut loose the shackles of an enslaved people. Instead we see a harassed man with an inflamed nation on his hands. We see a President who has been pummeled by too much of the press. We see an administrator with a self-appointed committee, the congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War, breathing down his neck and making an already hard job impossible. We see an observant man lose soldiers by the thousands. We see a wise and practical man note the contribution of refugee slaves to the Union war effort. Slavery was now only

one among many burning issues. When Horace Greely wrote, "All attempts to put down the rebellion, and at the same time uphold its exciting cause, are preposterous and futile," a distressed but still conservative Abraham Lincoln countered with, "My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that." Thus Lincoln wrote his proclamation statement which was to become effective on January 1, 1863, with certain political and military expediences in mind. First, he realized that all northerners were not abolitionists. Secondly, he was mindful that the border States, although having Union sympathies and ties, also held slaves. This support could not be cast to the winds. Third and finally, the Union army needed 500,000 troops to replace their losses.

The Emancipation Proclamation read in part:

"All persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

"And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service."

This document cannot be properly evaluated apart from the times out of which it grew and the personality and temperament of the man who wrote it. Abraham Lincoln was not a moral weakling, nor was he a political neophyte. It fell his lot to attempt the always thankless task of seeing all issues within their perspective as part of a whole. He stood steadfast at a post from which lesser men (from whose ranks come most of his bitterest critics) would have run quite early in the conflict. Therefore in all the earnestness which he possessed and with all the pragmatism which the times demanded, Lincoln issued a wartime executive decree as Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces. Such measures, by their very nature, fail to provide a permanent and thoroughgoing solution to social problems of the magnitude of human slavery. In fact it must be remembered that Lincoln's stated purpose of the Proclamation was not to solve the social problem of slavery, but to solve the political problem of a divided Nation. Thus only those slaves in the still rebellious States were declared free. Slaves in Tennessee, parts of Virginia, all of West Virginia, and parts of Louisiana were not affected. Neither were slaves in such border States as Missouri and Kentucky affected. Freed slaves were invited into the Army and Navy but citizenship was not bestowed upon any freed men. Hence on January 1, 1863, the practical effects of the Emancipation Proclamation echo Lincoln's letter to Greeley when he said "If I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

Positively speaking the Emancipation Proclamation heralded the sunrise of a new day for Negro slaves in the United States. These benefits could not help but spill over to the advantage of free born Negroes in the North. The technical question of Lincoln's authority in the Confederate States presented an initial difficulty to the slaves involved, but military emancipation advanced through the South as the Union armies advanced. The paramount contribution of the Emancipation Proclamation is the fact that it paved the way for more durable final measures. Some of these measures were State action against slavery in the border States, and the 13th amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery throughout the Nation for all time. In due time came the 14th amend-

ment, which granted citizenship to the native born Negro, and the 15th amendment which gave the Negro the ballot. This was all part of the chain reaction which was set off by the Emancipation Proclamation. It is patently evident that the Emancipation Proclamation was not an end in itself, but a means to an end. It is conceivable that some other measure might have been devised to save the Nation.

If the Emancipation Proclamation served as a means to an end, it now falls the responsibility of enlightened Negro leadership to know that end and to examine it, and to do so in the light of today's situation. To unite our great Nation and to keep it strong is a worthy end. Such an end is no less worthy today than it was 96 years ago. The American Negro is an integral part of the citizenry of these United States. As such he has a contribution to make to the continued life and strength of this Nation. It is a disservice to the Nation and a failure to pursue the best interest of the Nation when any person or group of people, be they white or black, hinders the making of this contribution.

As of January 1, 1863, the freedman was at liberty to join the Army or Navy if he chose to do so, but his political status was the same as any other alien or immigrant. He was not a citizen. Emancipation from slavery and the right to vote is yet to come. 89 years later. The fact that the right to vote was so long coming shows remarkable lack of political acumen upon the part of the leaders of Mr. Lincoln's party. In the light of this the Negro vote belongs in nobody's vest pocket. On the other hand, keeping our great ideal of a strong nation in mind, neither should the Negro voter selfishly indulge in shopping around for a mess of pottage. Ultimately, as the Negro is benefited so is the Nation, and vice versa, as the Nation advances so should the Negro.

Today the American system of government is still one whose power to govern is derived from the people. That government is strong or weak as it represents all or only part of the people. Two insidious factors work to weaken our governmental system. The first is the organized effort of some people to deny the citizenship right to vote to those to whom that right belongs. The second is the lethargic spirit exhibited by the failure to register and to vote on the part of far too many who are not otherwise hindered in doing so. Therefore, if an Emancipation Proclamation Day Celebration is to make any sort of positive contribution to Negro life in particular and national life in general, it should mark a time of rededication to the universal realization of full citizenship. Negroes are only half emancipated and no further advanced than they were in 1863 if they are not citizens. They are only half citizens if they do not vote.

Nashville ministers, you need not be apologetic, neither in word nor deed, in identifying yourself in the struggle for full citizenship.

In fact you should be taking the initiative in such fights. You have a mandate from God to cry out, "Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." And no apologies are due. You have a mandate from God to cry out, "Woe to them that devise iniquity, and work evil upon their beds. When the morning is light, they practice it, because it is the power of their hand." And no apologies are due. You have a precedent from Christ Jesus to declare, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." And no apologies are due. A gospel which closes its eyes to prejudice, hatred, malice, vengeance, and in-

justice, all those things which fill the air today, is not from God. For these are the things which enslave men even more effectively than chains and shackles. And a gospel which is not concerned with these things is not the gospel which Christ Jesus preached.

Finally, too much of Negro American are only freedmen and not citizens. You not only have to fight such satanic schemes as the attempted abolishing of Macon County, Ala., but black freedmen must be urged to register and to vote. Emancipation might well have never been if full citizenship does not follow.

Text of Address by Hon. L. H. Fountain, of North Carolina, Before the 35th Annual American Municipal Congress, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass., December 1, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that one of the increasingly critical situations we face today involves the need of growing metropolitan areas for more efficient means of servicing their huge populations.

One of the principal handicaps in the way of developing such improved means is the lack of coordination between the large number of Federal, State, regional, county, and local governmental units that exercise at least partial legal authority within metropolitan areas—despite the fact that their individual problems are often areawide in scope.

The challenge that this situation represents to the people and the governing bodies of such areas has been strikingly set forth in an address delivered before the 35th Annual American Municipal Congress in Boston on December 1, 1953, by our distinguished and esteemed colleague, Congressman L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina.

His address, which I include as a part of my remarks in the RECORD, is the kind of clear-minded and thoughtful analysis of a complex problem which we have come to expect from the gentleman.

His awareness of the problem, his understanding of the factors delaying progress, and his insight into the need for integrating and coordinating the activities of the various levels of government impressed me greatly.

This is a problem that concerns metropolitan areas generally, but none more than the greatest metropolitan area in the world, the tri-State region surrounding New York City, part of which I am honored to represent.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, I have found it most pleasant and instructive working with our chairman, Mr. FOUNTAIN. I look forward to a continuation of this constructive association, especially in regard to the matter at hand.

Meanwhile, I commend Congressman FOUNTAIN's address to all our colleagues, particularly those Members who represent the three-fifths of our total population presently living within the 174 metropolitan areas in the United States:

CITY-FEDERAL RELATIONS

I am grateful for the privilege of being with you today. I am honored to be able to speak to so imposing an assemblage of outstanding Americans as are gathered here on the occasion of the 35th annual congress of the American Municipal Association.

I feel at home in seeing the familiar faces of so many mayors who testified last year at the hearings of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which I have the good fortune of chairing. It is an interesting coincidence that we are meeting today in the very city where the subcommittee commenced its regional hearings in September 1957. The city of Boston is also the home of our great and universally admired majority leader in the House of Representatives—JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

We are concerned at this meeting with a fundamental problem of American government; namely, the relationship of the Federal Government to the cities. In constitutional terms, of course, the cities have no independent status in our Federal system. Although the Constitution is silent on the role of the cities, realism as well as our democratic values make it imperative that municipal problems be given appropriate attention when dealing with intergovernmental affairs.

In the context of modern-day society, it is meaningless for many purposes to speak exclusively of Federal-State relations without due recognition of the municipal level of government. By the same token, realism prompts us not to delude ourselves into believing the State government, because of its shortcomings, is an outmoded political institution that will disappear in the framework of a new federalism. What is sorely needed in these times is a candid appraisal of the facts of present-day American federalism.

Woodrow Wilson said in 1908: "The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our constitutional system." That observation is equally valid today. However, in ascertaining the proper Federal-State relationship, we must not lose sight of some dramatic changes that have taken place in the half century since President Wilson's time. Let us briefly review some of these developments and assess their significance for the Federal-State relationship of today.

First, the growth of urban communities, and particularly of metropolitan areas in recent years, has been nothing short of phenomenal. Although this distinguished audience certainly needs no introduction to this development, it might be useful for the purpose of perspective to indicate the magnitude of this trend.

At the beginning of the 20th century less than 40 percent of the American people were urban residents. Today, with an urban population totaling more than 104 million, nearly 2 out of every 3 Americans live in an urban community.

In 1910 only 44 population centers, with a total of 25 million people, were found to meet the census classification of a metropolitan district, although the number of such districts would have been somewhat larger under the present definition of a metropolitan area. Today there are 174 metropolitan areas containing close to 100 million people. Almost three-fifths of our total population live in these areas, and this percentage is constantly increasing. In this connection, it is estimated that roughly nine-tenths of the Nation's population growth since the 1950

census has occurred in the metropolitan areas.

With the continuing growth of new and the expansion of existing metropolitan areas, we are witnessing a development which has been described by some observers as the urban region. The largest of these regions now extends for more than 600 miles along the eastern seaboard from north of Boston through the urbanized area south of Washington, D.C. It is not difficult to envisage the extension of this continuous urban band from Maine to Florida, as well as westward, in the years to come. Needless to say, the increase in the density of our population and the formation of contiguous urban communities increases the cost of Government services and the need for intergovernmental cooperation.

While we have become largely a nation of urban dwellers, this development has not been adequately reflected in the composition of State legislative bodies, which continue, all too frequently, to retain the representative character and outlook of our earlier rural society. Despite this political lag, municipal problems continue to increase in complexity as our growing and mobile population overflows local political boundaries to form newer satellite communities. The result is an imbalance between political institutions and social and economic patterns, an imbalance which usually means financial difficulties for the core city and the inefficient or even conflicting use of governmental facilities in the metropolitan area.

What is the remedy for these problems? As a first order of business, State legislatures should enlarge the taxing and other "home rule" powers of the cities to an extent commensurate with their administrative capabilities and their fiscal needs and capacities. At the local level there is need for bold experimentation with new organizational forms and methods to relate our large cities to metropolitan area needs and resources. These are not easy tasks. In a few minutes I want to discuss the outlook for their accomplishment and the Federal Government's responsibility in this connection.

It is my firm conviction that we must have strong local self-government in this country if we are to preserve our Federal system. Monopoly is no more desirable in Government than it is in industry or science. The free competition of ideas and a broad base of participation in the political affairs of the Nation are indispensable ingredients of democracy.

Whenever the States and the municipalities are able and willing to perform a particular public function, I believe it important that the Federal Government avoid exercising monopolistic control in that field, unless it can be clearly and convincingly demonstrated that the national interest requires a highly centralized program. State and local governments, like individuals, should and must be permitted to develop their full potentialities.

On the other hand, if the States and localities neglect their responsibilities, whether we like it or not the consequences will surely be a further concentration of power in the Federal Government. I was impressed by an eloquent expression of this thought made during the hearings of our intergovernmental relations subcommittee earlier this year. The witness said:

"The real danger to our Federal system lies not in deliberate aggrandizement of the National Government but in the invitation to national action which lies in disuse or misuse of State powers. The first line of defense against complete centralization is not in Washington but in the State capitals, the county courthouses, the city and town halls, and the polling places where State and local issues are decided."

There is much wisdom in that statement.

The question of a proper division of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States and localities is a perennial one in a Federal system.

The proposal has been made that we distribute public functions in such a manner that each level of government will have complete and independent responsibility for particular activities. In my judgment, however, it is unrealistic to assume all governmental problems can be neatly compartmentalized and handled in this fashion. Certain functions by their nature can and should be performed exclusively by a single level of government. Others, however, require a high degree of intergovernmental cooperation for effective performance.

The proper balance of Federal, State, and local responsibilities is a changing one which should depend, among other considerations, on the competence, responsiveness, and the resourcefulness of the various levels and units of government.

People sometimes lose sight of the fact that cities must undertake large capital investment programs to construct the facilities necessary for providing public services. Unfortunately, too, it is ordinarily much more difficult for a city to embark upon a capital improvement or expansion program than it is for a private corporation. Not only is municipal action frequently circumscribed by rigid debt and taxing limitations, but the city fathers must also wage a successful sales campaign for public approval. And all too often it is a thankless task to convince the voter that he should agree to bear a heavier tax burden, especially if the project is something as remote and unappealing as a sewage treatment plant which might be of greater direct benefit to the people downstream than to the local community.

Yet, as the world's wealthiest nation, it is essential that we devote a portion of our resources to public capital improvements, not only for our own welfare but also as a legacy for the generations of tomorrow. As to our financial ability, although our national debt is many times larger than the combined debt of all of the other nations of the world put together, it is a sobering experience to compare the gross national product of the United States with that of less fortunate nations. For example, the total market value of all goods and services produced last year in India, with its nearly 400 million people, was under \$30 billion, or less than one-fiftieth our current rate of output of almost \$450 billion a year. India's total national product is not much larger than the amount of the decline in the American economy during the 1957-58 recession.

It is clear that as a Nation we have the financial ability to meet our public responsibilities. The problem is more basically one of stimulating our social consciousness. For some purposes, the use of Federal incentives is unquestionably a valid method and Federal leadership a necessary condition.

However, as a political ideal, the responsibility for public services should be decentralized to the maximum extent possible. The cities should be permitted and encouraged to perform all functions within their competence and the States likewise should assume greater responsibility for meeting public needs. When the cities cannot do the job alone in some necessary but costly programs, they should, as a general rule, first look to the States and fight at the State level for assistance. If the States cannot or will not help, the cities are then justified in seeking assistance from the Federal Government.

The theory of local responsibility most often breaks down in practice, as you gentlemen are well aware, because of a restrictive attitude at the State level. It is indefensible when State governments remain unresponsive to public needs and, at the same time, prevent their political subdivisions from act-

ing in these areas. While some State officials complain very bitterly about centralization of authority in Washington, local officials in the same States complain about the centralization of State government. I believe that the States should endow their municipalities with adequate legal authority and taxing powers to govern themselves in local matters. The fear of abuse of power by locally elected officials, which undoubtedly motivated many of the State restrictions now in existence, is generally an anachronism as applied to the cities of today. Municipal government has come a long way since Lincoln Steffens reported on the shame of American cities in a series of articles published little more than half a century ago. Inflexible and minute limitations on the powers of local government also suggest a distrust of the local electorate, which is most unflattering to a democratic society.

While State government must assume a large share of the blame for obstructing local self-government, this does not absolve municipal officials and local citizens of an obligation to exert greater effort for the improvement of these conditions; nor does it automatically justify a reliance upon Federal aid. How many proposed bond issues and constitutional amendments, we might ask ourselves, have been defeated at the polls because local officials did not do an effective job of educating the voters as to their merits?

I must frankly question whether the cities are doing all that they might to solve their problems. Not infrequently cities, as well as States, neglect performing tasks of which they are capable with the expectation that the Federal Government will come to their assistance. It is my feeling that at times local people ask for help in providing services which they would be unwilling to pay for themselves. And I think it is equally true that groups interested in particular public services often take the easier course of seeking assistance at the national level rather than fight for effective and representative government at the State and local levels. For our Federal system to fulfill its greatest promise, it is essential that public officials demonstrate initiative, imagination, and responsibility at all levels of government.

Although in many States the cards are stacked against the urban communities in connection with obtaining an equitable voice in State policy determinations and adequate home rule powers, there is much that persistence and hard work can accomplish.

Existing conditions call for an organized action program directed to the State level. I believe that a great deal might be accomplished by an intensive effort to awaken citizen interest and support in this area. Your member organizations might take the lead in joining with other civic groups to conduct an all-out campaign for the fair apportionment of State legislatures and for State constitutional reform.

It is regrettable that a number of State legislatures have failed for so long to comply with their State constitutional requirements relating to the reappointment of election districts. Obviously, it is not an easy step for them to take, but it is a situation which can best be remedied by the States themselves. If these States persist in neglecting their duty to reapportion, such inaction may well be interpreted in some quarters as an invitation for Federal court intervention—a step which I believe many of us would dislike because of other fundamental principles involved. It is significant, I think, that last summer a Federal court panel for the first time accepted jurisdiction in a case involving apportionment, but it deferred a decision on the issues in order to allow the new Minnesota State legislature, which meets in January, an opportunity to take appropriate action.

Now let us examine the question of what constitutes an appropriate Federal policy toward the cities.

As a basic proposition, I would suggest the need for a Federal leadership role to help assure the maintenance of a strong, healthy Nation. National strength cannot exist without strength and vitality in our State and local governments. Our Nation has become so interrelated that disease, poverty, illiteracy, or crime in any of its parts is inevitably transmitted to the whole and weakens our national social fabric. The provision of research and technical assistance to the cities and States for combating problems such as these is universally recognized as a proper Federal responsibility.

A related method by which the Federal Government can and should help the cities to help themselves is through the planning grant. It is imperative in these times that our social inventiveness keep pace with our scientific and technological achievements. This is especially true with respect to solving the traffic, mass transportation, education, urban blight, water, and other problems that plague the large cities and metropolitan areas. Planning assistance, such as that authorized for certain urban areas under the Housing Act, is a constructive approach for solving these problems which are nationwide in their impact.

Another constructive way to facilitate local self-reliance is to assure the availability of adequate revenue sources. The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, in its recent report on Federal grants-in-aid, stressed the importance of the Federal Government's making available to the States and localities those revenue sources that are not of primary importance for Federal financing and which are well adapted for State and local use. While such Federal self-restraint would be wholesome in any event, we must recognize as a weakness of this policy the fact that it would not benefit the cities in many cases without corresponding State action.

In view of this difficulty, and also in recognition of the fact that fiscal ability does not always coincide with the need for services, the subcommittee concluded in its unanimous report that the Federal grant should be regarded as a valid method of harnessing cooperative governmental effort for the accomplishment of well-defined national objectives. The subcommittee rejected the idea that there are easy classification schemes for determining whether or not a grant program should be undertaken or continued. It concluded, instead, that each grant proposal ought to be judged completely but very carefully on its merits.

Finally, and by no means least in importance, I would suggest that the Federal Government take all reasonable steps to promote a closer and more effective cooperation and understanding between the levels of government. One move in this direction would be the establishment of a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, as was recommended by our subcommittee. Such a central body, representative of the local, State, and Federal viewpoints, would, I hope, provide needed machinery for the cooperative study and consideration of common problems. I intend to introduce an appropriate bill in the 86th Congress to implement this recommendation and invite the support of your organization for that measure.

I have no illusions that a permanent advisory body will be a panacea for all intergovernmental problems. Nevertheless, as a medium for improving communications and mutual understanding, I believe it is a step in the right direction. I sincerely believe there is an urgent and growing need for the establishment of better cooperation and closer working relations not only between the Federal Government and the States but be-

tween State and local government officials as well.

I am reminded here of Alexander Pope's couplet which says:

"For forms of government let fools contest;
What'er is best administer'd is best."

These lines undoubtedly overstate the case, but they contain a message worth contemplating. Organizational arrangements are useful tools for achieving objectives, but they do not guarantee the desired goals. We must still rely to a large degree on the ability and the willingness of men, and units of government, to see each others point of view and to seek better working relationships.

As a note of personal philosophy, I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that the possession of rights entails corresponding responsibilities. States rights should not be used as an excuse for indifference to public problems. Neither should easy access to Washington be used as a means for centralizing political power, a development which could ultimately destroy our Federal System.

There are no easy solutions or automatic mechanisms for running a democratic government. Constant vigilance and hard work are the price we must pay for our democratic institutions.

I thank you.

International Salmon Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, a communication just received from George Johansen, secretary-treasurer, Alaska Fishermen's Union, AFL-CIO. This deals with international conservation on the high seas with particular reference to Alaska's Bristol Bay area during the 1959 season and points up strongly the need for passage of my bill, H.R. 605, to conserve our salmon resources.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Members interested in our new sister State of Alaska will take the time to study this statement as a matter of information on this important subject:

In view of proposed regulations which will severely restrict, if not altogether abolish, fishing by commercial fishermen during the 1959 season in the Bristol Bay area, we offer the following comments, based on our experience in this district.

The 1958 salmon take in the Bristol Bay area was disappointing, to say the least. As a matter of fact, the 270,000 cases of reds packed are probably the smallest pack in the history of Bristol Bay. The total run was approximately 5,250,000 salmon with an escapement of approximately 2,250,000, leaving about 3 million salmon for the commercial fishermen's take.

There is little doubt that the destructive results can be ascribed to heavy fishing of the Japanese north of the Aleutian Islands and their take of immature salmon in the years 1956-57, which should have returned in 1958 as matures had they not been taken on the high seas.

We know the facts. The question is: What can we do about the present high-seas fishing to protect our stocks in the future?

During the Tokyo Conference, held by the North Pacific Salmon Commission last fall, we presented conclusive evidence to the Japanese, showing that they were fishing on salmon stocks of North American origin. While the meetings proceeded in a friendly atmosphere and ideas were exchanged freely by all parties to the convention, nevertheless the Japanese did not officially recognize the evidence presented by the United States, and would therefore not agree to a shift of the present line presently established at 175th meridian, west.

We had advocated a shift to the 170th meridian, east, which, based upon our research, would have offered considerable protection for our salmon stocks. The present line cannot be changed, except by unanimous agreement of all of the signatories to the treaty, and so the refusal of the Japanese constitutes a bar to any change in their fishing on the high seas during the 1959 season. This means that red salmon stocks, already severely depleted, will be subject to further strains. The Fish and Wildlife Service, recognizing this condition, is trying to maintain adequate escapement by denying and restricting American fishermen the right to fish in the Bristol Bay area through regulations.

We realize that, fundamentally, it is the duty of the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide escapement. However, we believe that the obligation of providing escapement is based upon the fact that the fruits of this escapement shall accrue to U.S. citizens, who have made considerable sacrifices during the past several years in order to maintain these salmon stocks on a sustained yield level.

We cannot agree that there is an obligation upon the U.S. Government to provide the necessary escapement when the fruits of such escapement will accrue to a foreign nation. It is reasonable to presume that there will be considerable unwillingness on the part of the Japanese to agree to any conservation measures on the high seas as long as they are assured by action of the U.S. Government that adequate escapement has been provided for. One cannot reasonably expect that American fishermen consistently shall be called upon to sacrifice without any benefits returning to them from such sacrifices.

The question in regard to the fisheries in Bristol Bay can no longer be pushed aside to be decided upon some time in the distant future. A decision must be made now, and due to the inability of the North Pacific Commission to reach a satisfactory agreement, we look to the U.S. Congress to enact legislation which will provide compliance to conservation of this immensely important natural resource. The Congress has recognized that the salmon fisheries of Alaska are not a local matter, but a matter of national concern. Aside from the financial loss to American fishermen and canners, we cannot overestimate the serious damage to our national food supply, should we lose this important salmon resource.

We are strongly in favor of enactment of the Pelly bill, introduced in the last session of the Congress. This bill would bar imports of Japanese canned salmon, unless conservation has been complied with. It is understandable that the Japanese are reluctant to restrict themselves on the high seas. The salmon fishery conducted by them has been a profitable fishery, and the following figures will show the approximate amounts of salmon caught each year since the Japanese initiated this fishery in 1952:

1952	2,100,000
1953	7,700,000
1954	20,500,000
1955	64,040,000
1956	52,066,000
1957	56,000,000
1958	50,500,000

We are not claiming that these figures represent all salmon of North American origin, but we do claim heavy inroads are made on Bristol Bay fish. The fact that the fish are caught on the feeding grounds indicates that a tremendous amount of immature fish are caught in the high seas fisheries of this kind. It can be fairly stated that the statistics as to catches made do not reflect the true picture of fish caught or destroyed.

Using gillnets on the high seas where the water is rough, many fish will be caught in these nets and later on wriggle free eventually to die due to the damage they sustained in hitting the nets. Also, many dead fish wash out from the nets, and consequently there are probably millions of fish destroyed for no purpose whatsoever, which does not show in the figures given.

This ocean fishery is wasteful in another way also. Salmon are a fish which put on nearly half of their weight during the last 4 or 5 months before spawning. The catching of immature fish means then that if the fish had been allowed to leave the feeding grounds on the high ocean, each fish would have brought a much higher yield, both in food value and in money.

It is doubtful that we will be able to maintain adequate escapement, even though we may completely deny Americans the right to fish in the Bristol Bay area if the high seas fishing continues without some safeguards being provided for. Alaska, the newest State in the Union, is dependent upon her fisheries for a large part of her revenue and income. Until such time as Alaska has had a chance to develop her other resources, the question of the salmon fisheries is of paramount importance to the State. The results of our scientific fishery research and the conclusions that can be drawn therefrom, indicate clearly that it is only a matter of time before the valuable Bristol Bay salmon runs are reduced to a point where they no longer will be economically feasible or advisable, conservationwise, to fish them.

No amount of diplomatic doubletalk and fancy language can explain away the inevitable results that will accrue if we fail to act in the best interests of the United States at this time. We had hoped that the result of our investigations would have convinced the Japanese of the need to exercise good judgment and the recognition that it isn't only the United States who will be the loser, but the Japanese as well.

I have consistently, since 1954, warned of the danger to our salmon fisheries, and I sincerely hope that now, when the critical period is upon us, we will take constructive action to enforce conservation. We bear no ill will toward the Japanese, but we feel that by refusing to recognize our position, based upon scientific facts, the Japanese are sacrificing conservation for temporary profits, and we are not agreeable to keep silent and be a party to the destruction of our salmon resource in Alaska.

Dr. Bela Fabian, an Expert in Giving Communists Some of Their Own Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt from the American Legion magazine for December 1958.

It is too bad for our own country that we do not give more heed to men like Dr. Bela Fabian who know the score on Communist maneuvering and are as good at putting them on the defensive as they generally are at keeping free world leaders off balance:

HE BAITS BOLSHIEVICS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

A few months ago Mikhail Menshikov, Russia's suave, blue-eyed Ambassador to the United States, was all smiles. The success of the Reds' Operation Butter-Up, their cover-up for worldwide subversion, reached its high point when a large group of Republican ladies from Ohio descended on the Soviet Embassy. Later they emerged gushing over the slave empire's jocular envoy.

Then suddenly Russian winter came to America. Abruptly, the Soviet Ambassador canceled all lectures, good-will tours, and television appearances, while at diplomatic receptions scowls replaced smiles. Reporters were puzzled. Why had the Red bear replaced the social lion?

Finally, Menshikov gave an explanation.

"Always there are newspapermen asking questions," he fretted. "I think I will sometime have to refuse to answer some questions."

A man who feeds reporters questions that put Russian diplomats on the hot seat is Bela Fabian, Chairman of the World Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners. Broad and short, with a powerful frame, ruddy face, cropped gray hair, and the lumbering gait of a peasant, this 69-year-old refugee has been called the "conscience of the West." The peppery Hungarian has put Russian diplomats on the defense by conducting a private truth campaign to replace Red promises of the better life under socialism.

Any time the Communists launch one of their phony peace offensives, or whenever the news breaks about a new Soviet crime, this stocky man swings into action. He can be found striding along the street carrying a battered briefcase bulging with documents. Since there are millions of people all over the world who either have relatives in slave labor camps or who have been inmates themselves, it isn't long before Fabian is surrounded by throngs of cheering men and women—many of whom have proved in war and revolution that they hold their liberties dearer than life itself.

Fabian's tactics in his little Russian counter-revolution include worldwide mass anti-Soviet demonstrations staged at strategic times; and constantly publicizing news of continuing Soviet deportations, murders, and secret trials in Hungary and other Russian colonies.

His work is not sponsored by angels, governments, or tax-exempt foundations. Prior to a demonstration, local Hungarians in the advertising business contribute labor and paint for the posters; a friendly printer, a graduate of Vorkuta or Karaganda slave labor camps, may work his presses overtime to print leaflets; and in every city where Fabian and his former Hungarian political prisoners hold a meeting generous people, some of whom have been victims of communism, offer the demonstrators a meal or a bed.

A 22-year-old ex-Hungarian freedom fighter, who marches regularly in Fabian's picket lines, has his own answer to why the aging exile accomplishes so much with so little.

"Some Americans who want to fight communism think the only way to do it is to get up a big organization sprinkled with a lot of big names who do no work. Then they hire spacious offices in Rockefeller Center and spend the long lunches at '21' discussing what they're going to do next. Bela Fabian just goes ahead and does it."

And while our leaders sit down to negotiate with the Soviets at summit conferences, somehow the voice of the "conscience of the West" is heard loud and clear urging "no trade, no aid, no dealings with the Communists."

Communist and Western diplomats may toast each other in the capitals of the world, but Fabian's posters speak out: "Don't drink champagne mixed with Hungarian blood."

The urge to kill must seize the Communists when they see his pickets. They know that here is a pro who knows how to deal with them from firsthand experience. He knows how to play on Moscow's real insecurity: fear of the smoldering nationalism of the captive non-Russian nations both within and outside the Soviet Union.

Recently the Soviets angrily asked the U.S. Government to halt the picketing of Soviet missions on American soil by Fabian and his group aided by other exiles and Americans. They denounced Fabian as the notorious leading hooligan, and leader in the United States of the antipopular neofascist and underground movement, and they charged that bandits, rowdies, hooligans, abetted by Wall Street and the Pentagon are deployed to insult and scare innocent Russian guests in America. Fortunately, Washington said "Nyet" to the Soviet demand, and the Russians were reminded that our Constitution guarantees free assembly and free expression, those rights upon which our peaceful picket lines are based.

Last spring Fabian learned that Menshikov had been invited to address the Baltimore Bar Association. The exile leader boarded a train and picketed the Ambassador's hotel with large posters that read:

"The Soviet peace dove feeds on Hungarian blood."

"You go to the stratosphere and stay there."

"You keep the moon: give us Hungary."

"Rooski, go home."

From Hungarian sources behind the Iron Curtain, Fabian was able to brief Baltimore newsmen on the Communist-conducted secret trials then underway in Budapest. After this address on Soviet jurisprudence, a reporter asked Menshikov about the Hungarian trials and the red-faced Soviet diplomat could only reply "No comment." Finally, always hounded by newspapermen asking questions, and some 700 stony-faced pickets, Menshikov made an ignominious departure from Baltimore under the watchful eye of the police.

Later, when the still ebullient Soviet diplomat was invited to a gala reception at the Plaza in New York, Fabian and his group picketed the hotel with signs that read: "Relieve Mrs. Khrushchev from Potma Concentration Camp."

Through former inmates of the Potma camp, Fabian had learned that the Soviet Premier's first wife had been dumped there under the assumed name of "Mrs. Gorskaja."

To Menshikov's extreme embarrassment, Peter Kihss of the New York Times made inquiries at a press conference concerning the convenient manner in which the Soviet diplomat's boss had disposed of his marital difficulties.

"It is a lie!" screamed Menshikov. Khrushchev, however, was so upset over the query that he had Mrs. Khrushchev paraded about in Karlovy Vary. "But it was the second Mrs. Khrushchev, and everyone knew it!" Fabian tells with a laugh.

The Hungarian David's challenge to the Red Goliath is not just to relieve a patriot's personal outrage. It has a long-range political purpose:

"America will never sacrifice a single one of her soldiers to defend Hungary, I know that," explains Fabian. "The main problem is to get the U.S. and the Western countries to defend their own countries and to show

them what would happen to their countries under Soviet domination."

Picketing is only one of the methods Fabian uses in attempting to influence world opinion. He conducts a mail campaign with characteristic grim humor. For instance, on November 7, 1957, the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power, delegates to the United Nations, Members of Congress, and key Government officials received a formal printed invitation to a celebration honoring the "world's most powerful slave labor empire, to be held at the delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the U.N., 68th Street and Park Avenue, New York City." Items on the menu included "Borscht Lubianka (made of Reds beat), meatballs Khrushchev soaked in Vodka, o-pressed duck captive nations, and Crimean champagne mixed with Hungarian blood vintage 1956." On the entertainment agenda were listed "East Side, West Side," (sung by Tito) and "Danse Macabre, executed by Ivan Serov and his cutthroats." Obviously, the invitations were sent by the U.S.S.R.'s chief delegate to the U.N., Arkady Sobolev, and his wife.

A Christmas card sponsored by Bela Fabian and signed "Political Prisoners of the Soviet Union," put a damper on whatever holiday spirit Communists manage to generate. The front of the card bore a picture of shrunken, staved faces staring out from behind barbed wire. Beneath the doleful photograph were the words: "We wish you a Christmas as merry as ours." Inside the greeting card was a drawing of a Christmas tree, its branches decorated with guided missiles, a globe of the world with arrows pointing to areas of Red infiltration, and a U.N. gavel labeled veto. Beside the picture was an ominous message, hinting of a day of reckoning for Red oppressors:

"Rest ye not, merry gentlemen—
Henchmen of our nation;
Get ye out ere it be too late.
For all of ye there lies in wait
A camp or power station."

Soviet diplomats have techniques for silencing this kind of refugee activity—murder, kidnapping, and blackmail. But Fabian is impervious to threats and attempts at intimidation. On New Year's Eve, a few days after he had sent out his Christmas card, he received an anonymous telephone call. A voice said:

"Stop your activities, Mr. Fabian, or you'll be a dead man in 90 days."

Three minutes later the telephone rang again. Fabian's wife answered it, and the voice said:

"Tell your husband to stop his activities, or he will be a dead man in 1958."

A half hour later the telephone rang once more, and when Fabian picked up the receiver the familiar voice started in again.

"Look here," bellowed the Hungarian, "we know each other 40 years. I will not change; you will not change. Now why not let me sleep for the night?"

The gangster the Reds call the notorious leading hooligan likes to spend quiet "bourgeois" evenings in his modest apartment in New York City. After an early supper he dictates letters to his wife or works on a book or a political article. As he paces about his sitting room, as he habitually does when planning some new anti-Soviet move, he often pauses to take a few grapes out of a fruit bowl and pop them into the cage of sputnik, the Fabians' canary. The couple named the bird after the first Soviet satellite because "he likes to fly off in orbit."

The arrival of a friend or relative from Hungary calls for a party given in the generous, outgoing manner of Hungarian country people. Mrs. Fabian, red-headed and plump, bustles in, apologizing that "it's too bad I had no time for shopping," or "I have no food to eat because my husband ate it all," and "You must not mind if it is not much." But

the guest soon finds before him platter after platter of steaming paprika chicken, yellow rice, stuffed meatballs, cucumbers with vinegar and sugar dressing, Hungarian strudel, fruit, nuts.

A typical Fabian party ends in the singing of Hungarian folk songs. Sometimes, after a glass or two of Tokay wine, Fabian will throw an arm about a fellow exile and sing in his rich bass the beautiful air:

"I started from my lovely land,
Beloved little Hungary,
But I stop and look back
And tears flow from my eyes
And tears flow from my eyes."

Bela Fabian owes much of his sincerity and simplicity of character to his upbringing as the son of a grower of Tokay grapes who lived in the small Hungarian town of Taliya. Lajos Fabian taught his son to put God and country first. The Fabians were not wealthy, but they managed to send each of their five children to a university.

After receiving an LL.D. degree, young Fabian became a law clerk in the office of Dr. William Vazsony, an outstanding legal authority, leader of the Democratic Party of Hungary, and later Minister of Justice.

But his law work was interrupted by the First World War. He served as an officer of the Hungarian Army, and was captured by the Russians in 1915 and confined for a year in a camp at Tashkent in Middle Asia.

Captured officers were properly treated by the authorities of czarist Russia, but the rank and file prisoners of war were worked to death on a starvation diet and succumbed by the thousands to epidemics of such diseases as typhus.

When Fabian organized a protest against their inhuman treatment, he was sent to a punitive camp at Krasnaya Riechka, 500 miles north of Vladivostok.

Early in 1918, with the help of false papers, Fabian escaped and reached Leningrad. There he lived under an assumed name and witnessed the cruel fratricidal war launched by the Communists against the followers of all other political movements.

After he returned to Hungary, he wrote about his experiences in Russian captivity, about his escape, and the revolutionary turmoil he had witnessed. His books, "Russian Inferno, Petrograd," and "Russia's Decay Under Bolshevik Rule," met with cold incredulity on the part of middle-class intellectuals and made Fabian a target of venomous attacks from the extreme left. As a result, he was one of the first to be thrown into prison when Hungary's first Communist stooge, Bela Kun, seized power in 1919.

After the collapse of this short-lived dictatorship, the other extreme, the White Terror regime, temporarily won the upper hand in Hungary. It subjected thousands of innocent victims to cruel sufferings along with the guilty. Fabian believed that a rule of law, not counter-revolutionary terrorism, should prevail, and he published three additional books, including "The Russian Counter-Revolution."

"My fight against both forms of extreme reaction was not confined to public forums," Fabian recalls, "but as was the custom of that time I had to fight numerous duels with sword and pistol in defense of my principles."

His democratic record led to his election as an executive member of the Budapest Municipal Council in 1920, and in 1922 he was elected to the Hungarian Parliament on the Independent Democratic ticket. He held this office for 17 consecutive years. In 1928 he became president of the Independent Democratic Party.

When the German hordes invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia in the late 1930's, a

Budapest magazine, knowing Fabian's opposition of all forms of totalitarianism, published on its front page a cartoon in which he was represented as a dwarf battling a tornado. The caption asked: "Little man, what now?"

The Nazis answered that question by stamping serial No. B12305 on his brawny right arm—a mark he still bears—and sent him to Auschwitz with its mass-devouring gas chambers. By a near-miracle, Fabian was not one of the thousands of gas victims. The Nazis assigned him with a group of other prisoners who were given the job of dismantling and reprocessing parts of American planes which had been shot down by the Germans. Fabian and his fellow prisoners, secretly hid radio parts from these damaged aircraft, and from them made receiving sets which brought them news from the BBC and American transmitters.

"In order to keep up the spirit of the rest of the prisoners," Fabian recounts, "a grapevine news service repeated throughout the camp what was heard at the listening posts. When the Germans discovered one of these radios, they promptly hanged anyone who had anything to do with the news transmission service. But hunger for news was so persistent that even though a radio team were hanged one day, the next day a new radio would be working."

Transferred to Ohrduf, Fabian escaped in March 1945 with three comrades, hid 10 days in the forests of Thuringia, and crept through the German lines to find refuge with General Patton's 3d U.S. Army.

At the end of the war, he was joined in Paris by his wife who succeeded in getting out of Hungary after 2½ years of maneuvering. Like true Europeans, the couple felt much at home in France. But, Fabian explains, "We believed we could be more useful to our country in America, which is the biggest force against Communist imperialism."

The couple arrived in New York on October 9, 1948, and a year later Fabian launched the opening volley of his truth campaign on these shores with his book "Cardinal Mindszenty," about the religious leader whom he had known personally. The book revealed to an indignant West how the Reds had drugged and tortured the elderly Hungarian cardinal. Fabian also founded the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners. Almost 15,000 former Nazi and Soviet victims joined, 3,000 in this country alone.

As the United Nations began to play an increasing role in the direction of American foreign policy, Fabian insisted that it should be a truly representative forum where oppressed peoples under Soviet domination should have a voice.

Accompanied by other former Hungarian political prisoners, Fabian began attending U.N. meetings in the blue and white striped suit worn by Soviet slave-labor prisoners.

Mrs. Fabian will never forget the night of November 4, 1956, when the U.S.S.R. invaded Hungary.

"I was listening to television while cooking in the kitchen," she says, "When I heard a very penetrating voice shout 'murderers.' I rushed to the set and saw U.N. guards taking my husband away. I heard later that they put him in a room and wouldn't let him out until the end of the meeting."

But if Fabian's voice is angry and penetrating when he talks back to Reds, it becomes gentle and persuasive when he talks to non-Communists who are not yet committed to the free world's fight.

When 150 pacifists demonstrated against nuclear weapons in midtown Manhattan, Fabian persuaded the group to let him give a speech. He told them in restrained and measured words that they were mistaken in their stand.

"The problem is not peace or war, but freedom or slavery," he said.

A New York Times dispatch of April 6, 1958, showed that the Hungarian leader's tactful offensive had been a success:

"With handshakes and exchanges of mailing addresses among the two groups the meeting soon dispersed in an atmosphere of harmony."

Another example of tactful agitation by the exiled leader took place after Vice President Nixon's visit to Latin America. Fabian asked members of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners in every place where the Vice President was humiliated to write demonstration leaders requesting a personal interview. Then the Hungarian former prisoner would ask this man:

"If you are on our side, against what you call colonialism, why do you then work with Communists?" Then the Hungarian would proceed to give him a few facts about how captive nations are treated under communism.

Last summer Fabian went on a 6-week tour of Europe in which he successfully challenged the Russians at two large international conferences, setting up truth meetings of his own.

The first was the Fifth World Peace Congress in Stockholm in July.

At his own meeting, Dr. Fabian challenged Ilya Ehrenburg, president of the movement, and Jean-Paul Sartre, a member, to public debate. They refused. But while their meeting drew only some 250 persons out of 1,700 delegates, Fabian's rival conference drew daily crowds of more than 1,000.

At a meeting of the World Council of Churches in Utrecht, August 8, Fabian's target was the 10-member delegation representing the Russian Orthodox Church. At a widely publicized press conference he charged that the Russian Orthodox Church had become "the subservient tool of the Soviet regime."

He also challenged the Russian church leaders to "raise their voice against religious persecution . . . to demand the release of thousands of churchmen languishing in Soviet concentration camps . . . to demand the free practice of all religions in the Soviet orbit."

Although Dr. Fabian received no answer from the churchmen, he is convinced that confrontation with the facts brings an inevitable propaganda victory for the West.

"It is not enough to talk theoretically," he says. "Knowledge is the best weapon against the Soviet because when confronted with the truth, the Soviet will not reply."

Fabian's happiest moment came last summer when, at an appearance of a Russian ballet troupe in this country, he led a poster denunciation of Communist crimes, and two of the ballet's members surreptitiously told him:

"You are right; go ahead with your good fight. Wish we Russians could join you."

And Fabian has vowed he'll keep right on protesting—in his own dramatically effective kind of way—until they too will be free.

U.S. Navy's First Nuclear-Powered Missile-Launching Submarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1959, the U.S. Navy launched

its first nuclear-powered missile-launching submarine at the Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo, Calif.

Rear Adm. M. J. Lawrence, the commanding officer of the base, is highly commended for his able administration of this great naval yard. Admiral Lawrence and his production officer, Capt. E. H. Tilburne, have left no stone unturned to achieve this milestone in naval submarine construction.

The official and featured speaker at the launching ceremony was Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, U.S. Navy, commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

Because of the importance of this event in terms of national security, I am asking unanimous consent to have Admiral Grenfell's speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Hon. and Mrs. HOLIFIELD, Admiral Lawrence, members of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, distinguished guests, this is one of my last official acts in my current assignment as commander of the submarine force, U.S. Pacific Fleet. It is certainly one of the most momentous and proudest occasions of my tour of almost 2½ years in command. Proud because I have been asked to speak on this occasion when a *Halibut* is reborn. This new *Halibut*, however, is not just another submarine, for she will be the greatest and most powerful individual submarine weapons system in any navy in the world at this time. For the first time in our Navy's history, we will see the combination of a powerful nuclear powerplant with an equally powerful nuclear weapons system. The military capabilities of this submarine are almost beyond comprehension. Suffice to say, however, *Halibut* will have the military power backed by millions of tons of destructive ability, if required—that is the equivalent to a small size task force of World War II type.

In the event of an all-out war she will be able to prowl undetected close off the enemy's coast, position herself accurately, surface, and in minutes fire her atomic missile with great accuracy at a vital target; submerge, and speed away to a new area many hundreds of miles away. Next day the enemy, with no knowledge of *Halibut*'s new position, would receive another sudden and deadly blow in like manner. In a war of the nuclear-type *Halibut* could eliminate whole industrial areas, shipyards, submarine bases, and other military targets.

It is a chilling and sobering thought to realize that this mighty submarine could, in a matter of minutes, without prior warning, reduce this great shipyard, as well as much of the surrounding area, to a vast pile of rubble.

The submarine forces have been hard at work for many years testing the two great components of this ship. *Nautilus*, *Seawolf*, *Skate*, and *Sargo* have all provided valuable data with which to refine *Halibut*'s great nuclear powerplant. *Grayback*, *Tunny*, *Cusk*, and *Carbonero* have launched and guided almost 100 Regulus missiles, demonstrating the high degree of reliability of this system.

The marriage of nuclear power and guided missiles into this submarine has not been brought about through haste, accident, or guesswork. It has been a preplanned, carefully calculated wedding of two time-tested, thoroughly proven components.

Halibut, however, is not just a missile submarine to be used in the event an all-out war is forced upon us, for she will have in addition to her greatest characteristic of stealth that second most important characteristic, versatility. *Halibut* will carry a large load of vastly improved torpedoes of the latest type. She will have the most

modern sonar equipment and other new electronic devices necessary to carry out effective antisubmarine warfare. She will have the ability to detect enemy submarines at long distances and more important, with her high speed and maneuverability, she will be able to close the contact and strike home with a successful attack on any enemy submarine she can hear. *Halibut* will play a most important part on the Navy's antisubmarine warfare team. For some time early in a war an enemy, with strong defensive air superiority, would have control of the air and sea adjacent to his coastline. Thus, our friendly antisubmarine warfare vessels and planes will not be able to operate in those waters. *Halibut*, however, can operate in such waters and will seek out and destroy enemy submarines close to their home bases.

Halibut will also be able to roam the enemy's seas and cut very vital and important sea lines of communications; vital and important because in the Pacific, for instance, practically all of any potential enemies' industrial centers and areas of military operations will be supported by water shipment. *Halibut*, with her high speed and powerful torpedoes can raise havoc with enemy shipping throughout the western Pacific and thus, at will, rupture these lines of communications.

Halibut can also perform air-sea rescue of friendly aviators in distress at sea close to the enemy shorelines; aviators who have been in attack groups attacking the enemy mainland and have been shot down can be rescued by submarines such as this. She will also be able to perform many other types of missions. Missions such as periscope photographic reconnaissance, landing of saboteurs and espionage agents anywhere along the enemy's coastline, mining, and so forth.

In another sense, *Halibut* may also be considered to be a forerunner of things to come in the way of new submarine mobile offensive capabilities. Her immense hangar in which she can carry a load of missiles dictated that she be built with many, many tons of carrying capacity and many thousands of cubic feet of storage space. Indeed, the interior volume of her hangars alone approximates the entire interior volume of our famous World War II fleet type submarines. This space and great capacity may be utilized to carry many other items of large size and number. For example, *Halibut* could carry hundreds of troops and their equipment at high speeds for long distances under the sea; she might carry several helicopters of various types to be utilized for a myriad of missions in enemy waters; or she could carry large amounts of badly needed supplies to beleaguered outposts of our own or friendly forces.

Halibut will indeed be a powerful fighting machine with versatility greater than ever before in submarine history.

This mighty ship, soon to become a fighting part of our wonderful navy, is the masterpiece, the work of art, of the submarine naval architects and designers who built her. Thus it is appropriate at this point to pay tribute to those responsible for this wonderful submarine. This is not the work of one man, this is not the brainchild of one individual, this represents the unified effort of thousands of men and women, military and civilian personnel of the Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the powerful industries of America. This submarine was conceived in the minds of submarine naval officers in the planning sections of the office of the chief of naval operations several years ago. She was designed in the workshops and on the drawing boards of the Bureau of Ships and Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Her weapons systems are products of the design sections of the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance. The

Office of Naval Research contributed much by the way of new developments and ideas. The Atomic Energy Commission contributed to the design of the powerplant. Many other Government activities had responsibilities in her building. Finally, the Congress of the United States approved of her and authorized the funds to build her. In other words, hundreds of men and women all over the United States in Government and private enterprise alike are represented here in the work and building of *Halibut*.

Last, but not least, are the workers of this fine Mare Island Naval Shipyard. The officers, the men and women of Mare Island have a right to be proud of this fine submarine today for it has been their personal blood, sweat, and tears that have gone into building the first nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine the world has ever known. Once again Mare Island has scored another first. Once again Mare Island has turned out a product that they, the Navy and the country may well be proud of for many years to come. To Admiral Lawrence and his outstanding organization, I, speaking for the submarine force, pay you all tribute for a job well done.

And now a word to the prospective captain, Walter Dedrick, the officers and men who are going to man and take this fine ship to sea. You are fortunate men, fortunate indeed to be in the crew of this wonderful and powerful new weapons system of the Navy. You have a great responsibility to your Navy and to your country, for you are the ones who must operate *Halibut* to develop her fullest and most efficient capabilities. You are the ones who will take her through the trials and tribulations of initial exercises and maneuvers. You have arduous days of hard labor ahead of you, but at the same time most interesting days, which will prove highly rewarding. You have a wonderful new ship with all of the modern advancements possible, with a high sustained speed that would have been inconceivable several short years ago, plus an endurance second to none. It is up to you to test her and to develop new tactics which will make her an important halfback on the naval varsity team.

In addition, you will prove to the world that this submarine is another partner in the democratic nations' deterrent program, for with your missile capabilities combined with your stealth and secret operations you will indeed cause any potential enemy to stop and think carefully before he might take offensive action against the United States and its allies. *Halibut*, like the future Polaris submarines, will have a deterrent capability that will give any potential aggressor much to worry about and thus because of her presence in the ocean may continue to bring peace to the world for many, many years to come.

To you officers and men who will dedicate many hours of your life to the successes of *Halibut*, I think it is fitting to remind you briefly of the fact that the first *Halibut* was a great submarine. She had terrific successes in World War II and fought the enemy for almost 2 years in the waters of the Pacific. She sank many, many enemy ships of all types. She battled ferociously and with venom. Indeed, her last patrol was so vigorous that her battle scars were beyond repair. *Halibut*, in a tenacious battle with a heavily escorted convoy on her 10th war patrol was subjected to a terrific depth charge attack. Her commanding officer, Captain Galantin, now rear admiral, U.S. Navy, stated in his report of her final war patrol and I quote, "the beating the ship took and survived brings our admiration and respect to the men who designed her, the people who built the *Halibut*, and those who recently refitted her." The endorsement to her patrol report also stated that after first aid at Saipan and more repairs in Pearl Harbor, she was sent

back to the specialists in the navy yard who decided that her injuries were far too extensive to justify funds for the necessary overhaul. Reluctantly the first *Halibut* was relieved of further duty. Commander of Submarines, Pacific Fleet, stated:

"*Halibut* was a fine fighting ship with a captain and crew who were likewise made of high-grade steel." I am sure that you, Captain Dedrick, your officers and men will be just as tough, just as brave, just as determined as those valiant men of the first *Halibut*. Thus, Captain, to you and your fine crew, I wish you all the good luck in the world, fair sailing, long, fast, and successful undersea voyages and Godspeed.

The Ideals Set Forth in the Preamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and in connection with the introduction of a resolution proposing a Christian amendment to the United States Constitution, I insert in the Appendix to the Record a radio address of Dr. R. J. G. McKnight delivered on the Christian amendment hour, entitled "The Ideals Set Forth in the Preamble":

"THE IDEALS SET FORTH IN THE PREAMBLE"
(By Rev. R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

We have been examining the preamble to the Constitution and we found many worthy ideals set forth: (1) To form a more perfect union, (2) establish justice, (3) insure domestic tranquillity, (4) provide for the common defense, (5) promote the general welfare, and (6) secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

"We the people" propose to attain these worthy ideals without declaring any dependence on God to guide us in their attainment. We have already pointed out how far human efforts have come short in accomplishing what we set out to accomplish; e.g., in "forming a more perfect union."

Let us look at item (5): We propose to "promote the general welfare." That is a broad term—general welfare. It embraces the crops, the weather situation, industry, wages, employment, health, and 1,000 other accidents of existence, as we call them.

We are all dependent on crops for our sustenance. Crops depend on the weather. Will our croplands turn into dust bowls, or will the topsoil be washed away by raging floods? That depends on the regulation of the rainfall. And who regulates the rainfall? We know, of course, that we can blame the administration in power, whether it be Republican or Democratic, if there is a countrywide crop failure. But who does control the forces that contribute to the general welfare?

When we turn to the Bible we find that God "causeth grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that he may bring forth food out of the earth" (Psalms 104: 14).

"The eyes of all wait upon Thee; and Thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing" (Psalms 145). O the blessedness of the people in such a case. "Yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord" (Psalms 144). It is so obvious that the general welfare of the Nation is in the hand of God.

The sixth and last thing we ourselves propose to do is to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We cannot, apart from God, secure the blessings of liberty. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8: 32). "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8: 36).

The ideals set forth in the preamble are high and worthy. Without God, the ability to attain to them is pitifully inadequate. Indeed, without acknowledging God or seeking His help, we the people have assumed the task of doing what only God himself can do. As a Nation we have said with Babylon of old, "I will be like the Most High" (Isaiah 14: 14). One needs no great mental ability to discern the folly of presuming to sit in the seat of God.

One thing more needs to be considered in our evaluation of the preamble to our Constitution. Ignoring, as it does, any recognition of divine authority, and assuming, as it does, the functions that belong to God alone, the preamble, as soon as the Constitution was ratified, made this Constitution the supreme law of the land. That rules out the Bible, which is the word of God, as the final source of appeal in matters of national morality. Legally it is impossible to get back of the Constitution. It is, at once, the supreme law and the ultimate source of appeal.

The noblest moral sentiments have been expressed by men who have occupied the highest positions the Nation has to offer. For example: George Washington in his "Farewell Address" said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports." He continues in the same "Farewell Address" as follows: "Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" He says further in this address: "Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

But, my friends, the sense of religious obligation has deserted the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice. The sense of religious obligation was taken out of our oaths by the amendment to article VI of our Constitution in these words: "But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

And as national morality, which George Washington said cannot prevail "in the exclusion of religious principles," there is not now, nor was there ever, in our Constitution any mention of a standard of morals. There is but one perfect standard of morals, both for men and nations, and that is contained in the Bible, the word of God. And no mention of the Bible or of morals is to be found in the Constitution.

Whatever "we the people" in our Constitution declare to be right is ipso facto—right, regardless of any other standard. Whatever "we the people" in our Constitution declare to be wrong is wrong. And there is no room for appeal. We do have a Supreme Court to which we may appeal to interpret the meaning of the Constitution. But when once the Supreme Court hands down a decision, that becomes the law from which there can be no appeal. Nine mortal men become a Supreme Court.

And, my friends, to leave God, who is our judge, out of our decision in matters which involve morality or immorality is the most serious mistake a man or a nation can make. Listen to the words of Paul: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge" (retain His standard of right and wrong), "God gave them over to a mind with-

out a standard, to do those things that are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

So the floodgates of all iniquity are opened up, and society becomes corrupt, which is what has happened in our own country and throughout the world. This is what happens when men operate without a divine standard of morals.

Sinking of the "Arizona"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a very interesting account by Edward Janikowski of the sinking of the *Arizona*:

ASTORIAN SERVED ON "ARIZONA"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Fleet Reserve Association has launched a nationwide campaign to raise funds to build a permanent memorial over the rusted hulk of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor. It has obtained accounts of the event from several of the 289 living men who survived the sinking. One of them is Edward J. Janikowski, 5 McCain, Astoria. Here is his account.)

"I was one of the fortunate ones to survive that fatal day of December 7, 1941, aboard the U.S.S. *Arizona*. It is a day I shall long remember," relates Edward J. Janikowski, of 5 McCain, Astoria.

"At the time of the attack, I was a coxswain in the seventh division. I had just gone on quarterdeck watch. Suddenly, planes came out of nowhere and started bombing Hickam Field.

"The officer of the day told me to pass the word that we were being attacked. Minutes later, bombs were falling all around us. The planes came so low we could see the pilots' faces.

"General quarters had been sounded, but many men never reached their stations. The bow of the ship was hit by a bomb, exploding the forward magazine. Another went down one of the stacks, so the men below hardly had a chance.

"I'd say a good thousand were trapped below plus the 200 who were killed topside from wounds and burns.

"I was sent to a compartment with a message. When I opened the hatch, another bomb exploded inside the ship. The concussion and flareback from the bomb blew me over the side.

"Burning oil was all over the water. I was fished out by a motor launch to be taken to the hospital ship U.S.S. *Solace*. We had no idea we would ever reach her. The launch also was being machinegunned.

"Once aboard, I was treated for shock and injuries. I was burned about my hands, head, face, and legs. I also had several shrapnel wounds in my chest and legs.

"I stayed on the *Solace* for 10 days. On December 20, I was transferred to the U.S.S. *Scott*. We arrived in the United States on Christmas day.

IN HOSPITAL

"I spent the next 3 months in the hospital at Vallejo, Calif. In March 1942, I was sent back to Pearl Harbor where I stayed for 38 months.

"I have a special reason for wanting to see a memorial built over the *Arizona*. I lost a lot of my shipmates in the *Arizona*.

"Everybody should have a special reason for having this memorial built. For not only will it stand in tribute to those 1,102 men still locked in the ship's decaying hulk, it will also stand as a living memorial to all those men who died on the battlefields of the Pacific.

"And it will be a lasting reminder that what happened at Pearl Harbor must never be allowed to occur again."

Small Business Tax Adjustment—H.R. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the President revealed to congressional leaders an administration budget of over \$77 billion—the greatest peacetime budget of this or any nation. I do not wish to speak on that budget, but on the source of Federal taxes which must support that budget—our free economy.

Ours is a growing Nation. During the past year, our population increased 3 million and our Nation's work force increased about a half million. To sustain a growing population and provide jobs, a growing economy is necessary if we are to maintain our high standards of living and support increased Federal expenditures.

We have had a growing economy. The gross national product of 1957 was the highest in history, and indications are that 1958 exceeded that mark. But one segment continues to lag—that commonly referred to as small and medium-sized business.

In our analysis of small business conditions, we are fortunate indeed to have the reports of the Small Business Administration. May I call to your attention that in the 10th semiannual report for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1958, the Administrator reported that business failures through June 30, 1958, had been reported as 8,071 compared to 7,089 in the similar period for 1957.

Mr. Speaker, this is an increase of 14 percent—an alarming rate for a growing nation. May I point out that many Members of this House were alarmed last year when reports indicated that business failures in 1957 were 8 percent higher than in 1956. Why, in a period of national growth, are business failures continuing at such a high level?

The same reports show that in 1956 larger manufacturing corporations returned 12.4 percent on stockholders' equity; in 1957, 11.2 percent; and in the first quarter of 1958, 7.3 percent. The smaller manufacturing corporations, however, showed a return of 10.4 percent in 1956; 7.6 percent in 1957; and dropped

to four-tenths of 1 percent in the first quarter of 1958. This is a tremendous difference.

The Small Business Administration also points up a long-term trend which is of interest to every Member of this House. The Administration reports that from 1947 to 1957 the stockholders' equity in smaller manufacturing corporations increased from \$5.9 billion to \$9.5 billion—an increase of 62 percent. The equity in larger corporations increased from \$59 billion to \$132 billion—an increase of 122 percent for the same period.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one facet of the problem. The great bulk of small business is unincorporated, and the most substantial part of it is in the distribution and service trades. While there are no accurate figures on these unincorporated concerns, all the available evidence shows similar conditions exist.

Mr. Speaker, our economy has grown during the 10-year period covered by those figures, but it is evident that the rate of growth of smaller concerns has been less than half the rate of growth of the larger ones. Certainly with a growing nation it is necessary that the economic climate be sustained which will be favorable to the growth of all business enterprises. In the construction of tax laws, the Congress must not only look for revenue but seek that revenue by methods which will continue to foster and encourage further economic growth.

A review of the economic indications leads one to the firm conclusion that the tax laws, as now construed, do not grant small business concerns the same opportunity for growth as is enjoyed by their larger competitors.

Last year, your Committee on Ways and Means held extensive hearings on the general economic conditions and the influence of taxation on the health of our economy. These hearings demonstrated one fact above all concerning the sector of our economy known as small- and medium-sized business today. It demonstrated clearly that the greatest problem faced by the smaller concerns is their inability to retain sufficient after-tax funds to finance their growth. Most small- and medium-sized concerns are unable to obtain capital required for expansion in the open market as the larger concerns can do.

Over 85 percent of the Nation's business enterprises are unincorporated and hence are not in a position to raise capital by the issuance of stock. Further, experience indicates that the smaller concerns which are incorporated and do issue additional stock are unable to compete in the capital market with their larger competitors.

During the last session, the Congress authorized the Small Business Administration to license small business investment companies chiefly for the purpose of making long-term loans to smaller concerns. These loans constitute additional liability for business enterprises. There is a limit to the amounts of money which a small business should borrow. Indeed, many firms have already borrowed all they can or should from banks and other commercial lending institu-

tions. Right now, the greatest need of the smaller concerns is increased equity capital, the chief source of which is retained earnings.

After extensive hearings last year, the Ways and Means Committee, in Report No. 2198, dated July 16, 1958, reported to the House:

Your committee is convinced that one of the greatest problems confronting small and medium sized business is the acquisition of sufficient capital to modernize and maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors. In this regard your committee is aware of the fact that small and medium sized businesses must rely to a very large extent upon retained earnings for modernization and expansion. Thus, there is a need to allow such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes to provide the funds necessary for growth. To aid in achieving this end your committee has investigated thoroughly various proposals to postpone, or to reduce, taxes based upon reinvestment in inventory and depreciable property, and would have liked to have included a provision along these lines in this bill. However, it has been forced to the conclusion that the budgetary limitations under which all tax relief must now be considered are such that any tax reduction which now could be granted under a reinvestment formula is so small as not to represent any meaningful tax relief to small business.

Mr. Speaker, the small business tax adjustment bill, H.R. 2, which I have introduced, is designed to assist small and medium sized businesses to maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors by allowing such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes. The bill provides that a person engaged in a trade or business shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the trade or business during that year. This deduction shall not exceed \$30,000 or 20 percent of the net income of the trade or business, whichever is the lesser. Additional investment is measured in the bill by the aggregate of the increase in depreciable property used in the trade or business, inventory, and accounts receivable attributable to sales to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business.

This adjustment will make immediately available to all businesses an opportunity to obtain capital for business expansion, thus widening employment opportunities, stimulating competition, and broadening the sources of revenue needed to sustain an increased budget for a growing nation.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of the House will give earnest and sincere study to conditions now confronting small and medium sized business. The principle of a tax adjustment based on the reinvestment of earnings is the most meaningful step which the Government can take to help solve this national problem. America has long been recognized as a land in which the door of free enterprise is always open. Passage of this act would reaffirm the determination of the Congress that a free government through the proper construction of tax laws can create an economic climate in which these smaller concerns can grow and prosper.

Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 last, I introduced H.R. 2323, a bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual. The perpetual calendar is the product of my constituent, Mr. Willard E. Edwards, electrical engineer. The great Commonwealth of Massachusetts has endorsed the calendar, as has the Legislature of Hawaii. At least 195 cities in 65 foreign countries have been made acquainted with the perpetual calendar.

I include for printing in the Record a statement by the originator of the calendar, Mr. Willard E. Edwards:

February has only 24 working days in usual years, not counting holidays, but the months preceding and following it can have 27. This causes much confusion and a difference of three twenty-fourths, or 12.5 percent in the number of working days in January or March, compared with February.

When both Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays are holidays, this difference becomes even greater. It can then be five twenty-seconds, or 22.7 percent. Employees paid by the hour thus earn considerably less money in February than in January or March. However, from this reduced income they may have to pay the same monthly rent and utility bills.

Conversely, employers paying employees a monthly salary may have a reduced output in February. In either case, such a short month is unfair, expensive, confusing, and unnecessary.

History says February used to have 30 days in the old Roman Calendar. It was then the 12th month of the year. September, October, November, and December were also in their Latin-numbered places as the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th months.

The fifth month was a 30-day period named Quintilis. But during Julius Caesar's reign, its name was changed to July to honor Julius. However, Romans considered even-day months unlucky and odd-day months as lucky. Therefore, to pay further tribute to Caesar, a day was taken from February and added to July. This left February with 29 days in the Julian Calendar.

When Augustus Caesar became emperor, he was similarly honored. Sextilis, the sixth month, was renamed August. But since it had only 30 days, another day was taken from February. Vanity and superstition thus disrupted the previous order and left an awkward 28-day February in the Augustan Calendar.

Other faults were inequalities in its divisions, its lack of fixity, and its inaccurate leap-year rule. Pope Gregory corrected this latter fault in 1582, and the calendar then took his name. He also made January the first month of the year.

However, the month lengths are now exactly the same as in the Augustan Calendar. Consequently, the lack of fixity and the inequalities still exist. The inconvenience of using the Gregorian Calendar, and the cost in time lost in reference and in computations, are incalculably great.

This has been obvious for many years, yet correction is a relatively simple matter. It would affect nobody injuriously and everybody beneficially.

The calendar is an instrument in daily use for measuring time. It should be precise and fixed. It should have equality in all its divisions. In 1919 such an arrangement was devised, and it is now known internationally as the perpetual calendar.

This proposal has fixity through the simple means of counting one day each year as a day apart. It has equality in that each month has 28 working days, plus Sundays or Sabbaths. The quarters are also equal. It has regularity in that the months of each quarter always have 30, 30, and 31 days, as shown herein.

The day apart is counted outside the order of the week. It is called simply "New Year's Day," an international holiday, and the third day of an annual 3-day weekend. The second day of the year becomes Monday, January 1, the first business day of the new year.

The day apart is counted exactly as the extra day we now have when traveling from Japan to Hawaii. In crossing the International Date Line, ship captains call this extra day "Meridian Day." Just as a ship may be known as the USS *Thomas Jefferson* or the APA-30, so this day apart may be also known by a name or a number.

If called by a number, it would become January zero and would be easily accounted for in all computations. The logic of this is that we start all measurements with and from zero. Look at your speedometer, an engineer's scale, or a 24-hour clock.

Other advantages of the perpetual calendar are evident from its study, as shown in this article. Many holidays (all of them, if so legislated) fall on Monday; and all birthday and other anniversaries would always fall on the same day of the week.

Change is the result of natural growth, and no progress is ever made without change. Let's be progressive and adopt the Perpetual Calendar for our daily use. We can thus eliminate the lack of fixity in the present calendar and the inequalities of all the months, especially February.

A Discriminatory Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long subscribed to the merits of the "try, try again" principle as applied to meritorious causes. Therefore, in introducing H.R. 2413, I am urging for a third time the repeal of the so-called, but misnamed, cabaret tax—the most discriminatory, ancient, and unrewarding of all the wartime emergency excises. I believe I was the first Member of Congress to initiate legislation to eliminate this discriminatory tax. This was in the 84th Congress, when on January 5, 1956, I introduced H.R. 8153, and I believe my renewed proposal to the 85th Congress was the first of some 17 such repeal bills presented at the last session.

Recent legislative history records, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives, as a whole, conforms to my "try, try again" principle with respect to this sorely needed legislation. Three times has this distinguished body voted relief from this onerous excise and sent its recommendations to the Senate. Unhap-

pily, that body has not seen fit as yet to concur. I trust that in this 86th Congress perseverance will have its reward.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this so-called cabaret tax would have long since been repealed had it not suffered from an unfortunate christening some two-score years ago, at the time of World War I. That, Mr. Speaker, is the hoary vintage of this unjust and still uncorrected Federal taxing policy. Realistically, the cabaret has passed from the public scene; only our seniors in this body will remember it, and not too nostalgically; only a smattering of our more youthful colleagues would now know how to search out a lingering vestige of this unmourned symbol of the gay nineties or the roaring twenties. Yet the prohibitive 20-percent excise that was written for and named for the cabaret applies to the hotel dining room and the wall-lighted, carefully operated supper club where dine-and-dance entertainment still survives this 20-percent impost. If, perchance, some of my distinguished colleagues are contemplating a social night out to celebrate the wife's birthday, they would have but meager choice in this Capital City of an appropriate venue affording opportunity to dine and dance. And if they are lucky enough to find a surviving establishment where they might enjoy an anniversary waltz with their ladies fair, they must face up to a 20-percent charge on top of the dinner check.

But the problem of this discriminatory tax is not to be considered lightly, because, in principal effect, it is a tax on employment. Over the last decade it has been an excise of declining return for the Treasury; it has become, in fact, a tax of no return. The paltry \$40-odd million per annum this tax now returns to the Treasury likely does not pay for its policing and certainly does not compensate for the personal and business income-tax revenues lost because of the almost complete blackout this uneconomic tax imposes upon what once was and again would become a substantial segment of the entertainment business. I am impressed by the comprehensiveness and conservativeness of an independent economic survey made by a reputable national factfinding organization at the instance of the American Federation of Musicians.

The Research Co. of America reported that of the 83,000 playing musicians who earned their principal livelihood from music in 1954, 40,912 were employed in places subjected to the 20-percent tax and an additional 13,429 had part-time employment in this area—the dine-dance business representing more than half of the gainful employment for all instrumentalists. The average earnings for musicians thus employed was \$3,042, making the musician one of the most economically distressed of all American workmen.

The survey revealed that repeal of the 20 percent tax, which I seek in H.R. 2413, would immediately result in a gain of 63 percent in employed hours for 41,000 musicians working in dine-and-dance establishments and thus increase

their annual earnings by some \$2,000 each. Up to 35 percent more musicians would be employed—a total employment gain of more than 100 percent for this sorely distressed category. Surely, in point of employment alone, this tax must be repealed without further damage to our national job potential.

In the event of repeal, the survey found, establishments now struggling under the 20 percent impost declared their intent to expand their business and employ more musicians to the extent that \$36 million more in Federal income taxes would flow to the National Treasury. This factor, together with the resultant gain of 65 percent in the working hours of musicians already employed in 20 percent establishments thus adding some \$16 million in income tax revenues, more than compensates the Treasury for the \$40 million per annum now derived from an excise that multiplies business and denies employment.

These economic findings, Mr. Speaker, do not take into account other substantial gains to the Treasury that would flow from the repeal of the 20 percent cabaret tax. The survey from which I quote found that for every additional musician thus returned to work by reason of the repeal of this tax, there would be employed between five and six additional people such as other entertainers, waiters, cooks and other service help.

It happens that my personal interest and sympathy lies in great measure with the American musician upon whom we must depend for the propagation, even the survival, of a fundamental living art. In my home city of Seattle I served as a trustee and as president of our Symphony Orchestra Association. Thus I know intimately how severely the music art is beset by a chilling climate compounded of technological displacement and an indefensible Federal taxing policy.

I yield to no Member of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, in my desire for a balanced national budget. I trust that my colleagues in the House will join me in the unique privilege and opportunity of disposing of at least one of our many excises while at the same time making possible the flow of more sorely needed tax revenues to our National Treasury through the creation of employment and the stimulation of legitimate business.

Hawaii Statehood—50 in '59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, recently Hawaii was highly privileged to welcome five very able and distinguished Members of the 85th Congress who came in their capacities as Members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to the request of the

Delegate from Hawaii made of the chairmen of the respective committees.

The purpose of the visit was to scrutinize at first hand existing conditions in Hawaii and Hawaii's readiness for statehood. No one could have worked more diligently or more thoroughly than did these capable and outstanding Senators and Representatives. In accomplishment of their mission they pursued every avenue of pertinent inquiry; talked to as many people as possible; and, under the least constrained circumstances, left, in a word, no relevant stone unturned to obtain every fact.

In a New Year's message to Hawaii's people the junior Senator from Idaho, the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, has stated brilliantly and concisely the conclusions he drew from his searching inquiry. With his usual graciousness, the distinguished Senator has consented to my insertion of this message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress faces tremendous challenges. Legislation that will be considered is of grave importance to the lives and welfare of our people. It is my considered opinion, objectively, that no legislation is of greater import than Hawaii statehood. There could scarcely be a more convincing statement in support of this fact than the message of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH. I am most highly honored, therefore, to present for the consideration of the Members of the House the thoughtful, closely reasoned, and brilliantly stated report of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH on his inquiry in Hawaii:

TIME FOR STATEHOOD IS RIGHT NOW

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho)

We are fast approaching the time of decision on whether Hawaii is to become our 50th State. In all likelihood, the decision will rest with the coming Congress.

If its answer is "Yes," then we will have welcomed in, as an integral part of our country, the last of our incorporated Territories.

Statehood will confer upon the people of the islands, long since citizens of the United States, fundamental rights of self-government equal to our own.

They will then elect their governor, as we do ours; they will then be entitled to two U.S. Senators and a voting Representative in the Congress; and they will participate with us, every fourth year, in the election of the President.

But if the answer should be "No," let no one be deceived that Hawaii will remain indefinitely an American Territory.

To be neither in nor out, but to stay a colony, is no more acceptable to our fellow Americans in Hawaii, than it was to our own forefathers.

They were subjects of the English king; they bore arms in his defense, and paid the taxes he levied upon them.

Again and again, they petitioned him, through his appointed governors, for redress of their grievances, but he refused to grant them more than limited rights of self-government.

So, their call to reason, "no taxation without representation," became, at last, a call to arms.

Yet, despite this national birthright, we are today denying our fellow citizens in Hawaii many of the same prerogatives refused our forefathers by George III.

TAX PAYMENTS

In 1957 the Hawaiians paid over \$150 million in Federal taxes, a larger total than several of the existing States, but Hawaii

had no representation in Congress to vote either on how much tax should be collected or upon how the money should be spent.

In time of war, Hawaiians shoulder arms with the rest of us, yet they cannot vote for the President who shapes their foreign policy, or for representatives in Congress who together hold the purse strings over their defense.

To remedy these inequities, the people of Hawaii want statehood. They are tired of standing, hat in hand, at the door of our Union.

But what we must understand is this: if we refuse to let them further in, they will, in due course, demand to be let further out.

That we actually face a choice between these alternatives, my recent visit in Hawaii has convinced me.

There, I was privileged, as one of five members of Congress from the Interior Committees of both Houses, to conduct a joint investigation of the statehood question.

I talked with hundreds of Hawaiians from all walks of life. I listened to every argument, pro and con.

The consensus of this opinion, together with the most current information we could gather about social, economic, and political conditions in Hawaii, left me strongly persuaded the islands are ready for statehood, and we'd best admit them now.

FOR STATEHOOD

There is no doubt but what the vast majority of Hawaiians favor statehood. Even before Pearl Harbor, a plebiscite showed the population indorsing statehood by a margin of two to one.

Since then, support for statehood has steadily grown stronger. In 1950, a proposed Hawaii State constitution was approved by the people of the Territory by a vote of more than 3 to 1.

Today, I would judge that the Hawaiians want statehood fully as much as did the Alaskans, who a short 4 months ago, proved their sentiments when five out of six voted to ratify the bill admitting Alaska as the 49th State.

DESERVING CASE

The proponents of Hawaiian statehood believe their case just as deserving as was that of Alaska. Indeed, the islands' economy is far more developed.

Sugar and pineapple are produced in abundance by the best paid field workers in the world. The export of Kona coffee is increasing.

On the big island of Hawaii itself, the 300,000-acre Parker Ranch is next to the world's largest for Herefords, while to every island the tourists comes in burgeoning numbers, beckoned by the gentle trade winds, in quest of the dazzling beaches and inviting waters.

Hawaii, for all its tropical beauty, is bustling and prosperous. No one can charge it with being a poor relation.

MELTING POT

It is true that Hawaii is the melting pot of the Pacific. The people are a polyglot mixture of native Hawaiian, Caucasian, Japanese, Filipinos, and Chinese, and the crosses between.

But it is also true that Hawaiian life and culture, though it clings naturally to many happy phrases, songs, and customs out of its colorful past, is nevertheless essentially American.

The cities, the stores, the homes, streets, and schools, all bear the unmistakable stamp of the United States.

In fact, anyone from southeastern Idaho, accustomed to a tabernacle in his neighborhood, would not feel a bit estranged in Hawaii.

One of the most striking tabernacles I have ever seen is in the center of Honolulu, and on the windward side of Oahu there is

located a Latter-day Saints temple fully as impressive as that in Idaho Falls.

Nearby, 20 newly completed buildings on a 100-acre tract mark the site of the \$3½ million Latter-day Saints College of Hawaii.

MANY TALKS

These are but a few glimpses gleaned from many I gathered during the inquiry we made in Hawaii.

We met with public officials and private citizens alike, with teachers and students, with judges and housewives.

We talked with businessmen and labor leaders. I had a morning's conference, in private, with the presidents of the Big Five, interests that were once opposed to statehood but now favored.

When we were through I came away determined to work hard for Hawaiian statehood in this coming session of Congress. Already a Commonwealth Party has been activated in Hawaii.

COMMONWEALTHERS

I talked with several of its leaders, who would like to see Hawaii set loose from the United States, absolved of all Federal taxes, and granted full rights of self-government, while the people retained for themselves American citizenship and the continued protection of the American flag.

Patterned after the British system, the commonwealth idea is alien to our American tradition of building one nation, rather than a loose-knit empire.

Today, this Commonwealth Party is small, but if statehood is refused to Hawaii, it will grow rapidly.

I shall not forget the parting shot of one prominent commonwealth proponent.

"Senator," he said to me, "right now, the people of these islands want statehood."

"If you refuse it, they will turn to our solution, and the time will come when you will have to recognize the independent Commonwealth of Hawaii."

To us on the mainland, facing westward toward an Asia awakening from its slumbers, Hawaii is much too important, not to be made an inseparable part of the United States.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio.-----
Bailey, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3606 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Christopher, George H.,
Mo.
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa.-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine.-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio.-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio.-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.

Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio.-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio.-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa.-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah.-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Address by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, Before the 40th Annual Meeting, American Farm Bureau Federation, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on December 10, 1958, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] delivered a thought-provoking and challenging address at the 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Boston, Mass.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read this address, which calls attention to some of the most vital issues of our time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TREND AND A CHALLENGE

(Address of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. Senator from Florida, Democrat, before the American Farm Bureau Federation's 40th annual meeting, December 10, 1958, Boston, Mass.)

I am happy to be one of your speakers at this 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and to join such distinguished guests as Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, my able colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and your former president, Allan Kline. I had the pleasure of addressing you at your 36th annual meeting in New York City and I am indeed glad to be with you again today.

May I express to you, and through you to all members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, my deep appreciation for your naming me to receive the American Farm Bureau distinguished service award in 1956 at Miami. This award brought to me very great pleasure and pride, and I am humbly grateful for all it signifies.

My association with your splendid organization has brought me many pleasant and helpful experiences. I have frequently sought and obtained valuable assistance from the members of your exceedingly capable Washington staff, and have always enjoyed the full cooperation of the officers and members of our Florida Farm Bureau.

I have found you thinking on agricultural legislation—and indeed on national affairs generally—in close accord with mine, in most instances, and when we have not been in complete agreement you have always been courteous and tolerant of my convictions. In my opinion, your State organization in Florida, and your national organization always approach constructively and patriotically the many difficult problems in the field of agriculture, and I congratulate you warmly for your sound leadership and your major contributions in this vital field.

I am glad to have this opportunity to talk to you this morning about a trend in our country which disturbs me greatly and which, if permitted to go unchecked, may well lead to the destruction of our American way of life—the finest yet conceived by man.

The trend I speak of is that which is now moving away from individual freedom and initiative toward an ever enlarged Federal Government and a labor supergovernment—at the expense of the rights and privileges of States, local governments, and individuals. Unfortunately, many of our people cannot understand that they themselves are the Federal Government, that they pay all of its bills, and that they the people get nothing free from their Government. They do not realize that by looking to that Government for handouts—each of which costs them certain rights and privileges—they lose each time a little more of their freedom, and that little by little they are giving away their heritage. Even as small children we heard with amazement the Bible story of a hungry Esau who carelessly sold his birthright for a mere bowl of pottage, but now—as mature men and women—some of us are willing to actually give away our heritage—since we not only pay for the small bowl of pottage we receive in return for certain of our freedoms but we also pay extra for handling charges.

Having worked closely with your officials throughout the years, I know that they and you are well aware of this dangerous trend. I know that the American Farm Bureau is moving in many ways to try to reverse that trend, but I hope that all of you, as individuals and as members of this powerful organization, will leave this meeting today determined to personally wage an unrelenting fight against a situation which, if it is permitted to continue, will gradually—but surely—take away from us many of the precious liberties for which much blood was shed by our forefathers. Perhaps some of you will feel that I am unduly disturbed over this drift away from our constitutional form of government. I hope that my remarks will convince you that the situation is serious—almost perilous—and that it presents a personal challenge to every man and woman within the sound of my voice.

For a first point in this connection I mention the stand of the American Farm Bureau in the last Congress on legislation designed to curb the Federal courts by prohibiting the invalidation of State laws by Federal laws—under the doctrine of preemption—unless Congress has clearly so provided or unless an irreconcilable conflict exists between the Federal law in question and the State laws. I commend you strongly for this action, and I hope we will enact such legislation early in the next Congress. Certainly I will do my utmost toward that end.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States adversely affecting States rights, have caused alarm and consternation in the minds of many of us who respect and wish to preserve both a Federal union of sovereign States and the clear separation of powers among the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches of government.

It was heartening to note that on August 20 of this year, at a meeting of the conference of chief justices of the State courts, the alarming trend of these Supreme Court decisions was condemned by chief justices from the North, South, East, and West. The chair-

man of the committee that submitted the report was the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan. I am happy that distinguished lawyers all over our Nation—particularly those holding positions of highest judicial responsibility—find it no longer possible to keep silent in the face of these constant invasions of the rights of the States and of our legislative branch of government. I am glad that most of the chief justices of our State courts share my belief—and your belief—that State and local governments should be sustained and strengthened.

The overall impact of U.S. Supreme Court decisions during the past two decades has been to press rapidly the extension of Federal power at the expense of our citizens' rights to govern themselves through their State and local governments in matters of primarily local concern. In my opinion, the Supreme Court has wrongly assumed the function of policymaker and has arrogated to itself the important legislative function. Under our Constitution the function of making policy is delegated to Congress, to elected representatives of the people who are directly responsible to the people. It is for this fundamental reason that all of us must feel concern that members of the Supreme Court, who hold office for life and are responsible only to themselves, have abandoned the role of judges and assumed the role of lawmakers.

The power of the Supreme Court is very great, and its decisions are not reviewable by anyone. It is, therefore, of critical importance to every American that this Court adhere strictly to the judicial role and abide by those enduring principles which are enshrined in our Constitution.

We have long boasted that in our free country we have a government of laws and not of men. Let me state here, along with most of the chief justices of our States, that a study of recent Supreme Court decisions will raise grave doubt as to the present truth of that proud boast.

No one expects a dynamic country like ours to stand still. Moreover, we expect our body of law to grow in meeting new and changing conditions. But under our Constitution it is not the duty of the men sitting on the Supreme Court to write into our law their passing notions about sociology and economics and education. Nor do they have the right to nullify and destroy the powers of our sovereign States and of our local units of self-government.

In my opinion, the recent strong pronouncement of the State chief justices is an important first step in reversing the trend which is rapidly destroying State and local governments and the fundamental principle of separation of powers. They have accepted the challenge and I am sure their courage and convictions will encourage others to face up to the serious realities of the situation. Now such organizations as this one must join in an active effort to enlighten the general public as to the seriousness of this problem. I am convinced that, when informed, the public will see to it that we return to our constitutional form of government.

A second element in the national trend away from basic freedoms—and a real challenge which must be met by organizations such as this and the rank and file of labor, is that disclosed in recent months by the McClellan committee which has pointed up

so that everyone could see—and no one could seriously deny—the appalling corruption, crime, and violence which exists in the high circles of some labor unions. Gang bosses, goon squads, bribery, and embezzlement have no more place among unions than they have among our other American institutions. Our working people themselves are the ones who are most hurt by immoral and dishonest union leadership in those unions where it exists.

Perhaps some of you saw a few weeks ago a statement by Jimmy Hoffa, the head of the giant Teamsters Union—which has been one of the main targets of the McClellan committee—predicting that he would lead a mighty Teamster Union of 4½ million members spanning virtually the entire transportation industry, and then added, with characteristic brashness, "We will not be stopped by the McClellan committee, laws, or the courts".

After listening to dozens and dozens of witnesses one of the members of the McClellan committee, Senator Ervin, of North Carolina, stated a few days ago that "This superlaw which the teamsters attempt to interpose over the government of the United States and the arrogant implementation of their activities is something which continues to concern this committee and I believe the entire country."

This situation certainly should cause great concern to all Americans and to the agricultural producers in particular, because the trucking industry performs a vital and necessary service in getting a large part of your produce to the market place. As a matter of fact, trucking has become so highly important in the transportation of food that the Nation's total trucking bill for the shipment of food now exceeds that paid for rail shipments. An extended tieup of this industry at harvesttime could wreck entire segments of agriculture and bankrupt thousands upon thousands of farmers—as well as handlers and processors of farm products—throughout the Nation.

In the next session of Congress, I expect to join again with other like-minded Senators and Representatives in support of legislation to prevent the domination and exploitation of rank and file union members by irresponsible and greedy labor bosses. Only in this way can the workingman know that his dues will be properly spent and that he will have the traditional rights that should be accorded to American labor. Only in this way can the farmer have reasonable assurance that his products will get to market, and the millions of inhabitants of our great metropolitan areas be sure that their food needs will be supplied.

One would naturally hope that the rank and file of labor would take the lead in this fight which is of such great importance to them, but since the actual livelihood of these men can be cut off in the twinkling of an eye by the labor bosses—and human nature being what it is—the major brunt of this effort may have to fall upon shoulders such as yours and the shoulders of the general public. If this proves to be the case, I am confident that you and the millions like you in America today will meet the test. Although this is in the field of labor, it is primarily a fight for freedom—and if the fight is lost our very way of life may be lost with it. This is indeed a serious challenge which requires the attention of every American.

A third battle in which you have been engaged and in which I hope you will continue to interest yourselves, and one which illustrates possibly clearer than any other the objectives of those who continually press for an ever larger and more powerful Federal Government, is the constant effort to increase the coverage of the Federal wage-and-

hour law, which already applies to approximately 24 million workers in interstate commerce.

In the last Congress bills were introduced to extend coverage of the law to activities affecting commerce which would bring under the law even the corner drugstore with one employee. Even a cursory reading of the Constitution and the debates on this act when it was first enacted will show beyond the slightest doubt that this spread of control over local mercantile and service organizations was never intended nor deemed constitutionally possible by the New Deal sponsors of the act—President Franklin Roosevelt and Senator Hugo Black—now a member of the Supreme Court.

One of these bills of the last Congress would have extended coverage to almost 10 million additional workers, including roughly 1½ million agricultural workers. The bill finally reported by the Senate Labor Committee would have added 6 million employees, and did not include the agricultural workers. Obviously those who push the measure prefer to follow a course of divide and conquer.

Fortunately, these measures were not passed, but the efforts which I have mentioned indicate so clearly the ultimate goal of their sponsors—to finally bring every employee and every business in the Nation within the scope of these laws by regulating local wages and local hours of employment.

We have defeated these efforts before, but those who keep pressing this issue are continually working to sell their philosophy, and unless the millions of citizens who oppose this paternalistic trend join in opposition to this drive to further encroach upon our freedoms, the day will surely come when we will not be able to stem the tide.

This effort illustrates clearly the lengths to which some eager so-called ultraliberals will go, regardless of constitutional limitations, to force the Federal Government to take over the control of the everyday local activities of our people.

Of course, we are always hearing stories with reference to the relationship between agriculture and labor, and I heard one recently which may bear repeating.

A farmer in Virginia was plowing one day when his tractor turned over on him, badly injuring him. He was immediately rushed to an overcrowded hospital in the Washington area but because of the lack of a bed in the proper ward, hospital officials were forced to place his bed in the hall in the maternity wing. The farmer was in a great deal of pain and was anxiously hoping for relief. To his great delight he heard two new mothers talking about a new practice which resulted in no pain at all. This they call twilight sleep.

A few minutes later a doctor came down the hall and the suffering farmer caught him by the sleeve and said, "Doctor, I am in horrible pain. Can't I get some of that twilight sleep?" The doctor said, "Well, sir, that is used only for labor." In all his pain the farmer came back angrily, "That's the trouble with the world today—everything for labor and not a single thing for us poor suffering farmers."

I have mentioned only three of the major problems, not solely in the field of agriculture, which mark the present dangerous trend in other fields, but which are just as important to the members of this organization as are strictly agricultural problems. But I am sure that you know that the next Congress must continue to face serious problems directly in the field of agriculture, made more serious by the trend which I have mentioned, as well as by the changed makeup of the new Congress, which will contain more so-called liberals than has been the case in many years. Incidentally, the other day I heard a present-day liberal de-

fined as one who has his feet firmly planted in the air.

Some of you may recall that several years ago in a Senate speech I brought to the attention of the Senators and the American people the seriousness of the situation then existing in some of the agricultural areas of our country where farmers were openly advocating complete dependence on the Federal Government. I said at that time that I did not want to cast any reflections on sections of our country or on organizations or individuals, but I was alarmed and felt it my duty to call attention to what I had observed.

The information upon which I based my comments was gained through my personal participation in hearings held by the Senate Agriculture Committee in many of our States, particularly in the great Northwest. I was astounded to hear witness after witness come before our committee and plead for Government support prices at 100 percent of parity on every agricultural product—across the board—on nonperishables and perishables alike—produced on a so-called "family unit farm." One witness, franker than most of the others, stated in so many words that what he wanted was to have the gravy train start running again.

I was shocked to hear numerous witnesses state that their objective was the redistribution of the land and fairer distribution of the wealth produced on the land—a philosophy which should curl the hair of all of those who have worked and fought for the preservation of the American system of free enterprise. How foreign this thinking is to that which has always characterized typical American farmers. There is no group in America today which—as a whole—has enjoyed a higher reputation than the American farmer, for being independent, conservative, and willing to stand and fight for individual opportunity, private enterprise and, in short, for our way of life. I glory in that fact and warmly commend this organization for insistently carrying forward in that noble tradition.

The Congress must take its share of the blame for the situation which I have mentioned because, almost without exception, I found that farmers in those areas which had relied heavily on high rigid price support programs—which they had used as a crutch so long that they were afraid to try to walk without it—were the ones pressing for this additional Federal assistance. It is beyond my comprehension why these people do not look around them and discover that the only major agricultural crops in real trouble today are those very ones which have been depending too long on high price support. Many other crops, not dependent on price supports, are in healthy, prosperous condition. It is so clear that the solution to their problems—and the restoration of that wonderful feeling of self-reliance and freedom—lies in the direction of less Government support and control, rather than more.

It was considered necessary during World War II that we have high rigid price supports as an incentive to achieve the necessary increase in production for our war efforts—and it was only fair to continue them briefly until agricultural producers had sufficient time to level off their production compatible with peacetime markets. But the longtime continuation of such a program in peacetime could only lead, as it has led, to a greater loss of freedom by the farmers affected and to the piling up of huge surpluses in Government warehouses which hang over market prospects like black clouds above the horizon. The complete unsoundness of price supports large enough to induce farmers to produce crops to sell to Uncle Sam for storage has been thoroughly established.

Since 1954 the Congress has been making some progress in the effort to solve this huge agricultural problem. You are familiar of course with the long-drawn-out congressional fights which produced the Agricultural Acts of 1954 and 1956, which in the main followed the American Farm Bureau recommendations. Limited flexible price supports were provided in 1954 to replace high rigid price supports, much land was taken out of production under the soil bank, set up in 1956, and other provisions of the acts of 1954 and 1956 were steps in the right direction. Great efforts to reduce surplus supplies by various export devices and by enlarged domestic grants for food and feed programs were made—with some success. Expanded research for new uses has been helpful. Cooperating with Congress several producer groups are doing helpful things for themselves, such as advertising, trade promotion, dealer service, private research and greater use of Federal marketing agreements and orders.

This year the Agricultural Act of 1958 was passed in the effort to deal on a trial basis with those three basic crops which were in worst condition—corn, cotton and rice. This act provided an opportunity for corn and cotton growers—corn producers by referendum of the whole group, and cotton producers as individual planters—to move away from some of the domination and regimentation by the Federal Government. I was greatly pleased when our corn producers accepted by overwhelming vote the challenge to do away with acreage allotments and the artificial distinction between commercial and noncommercial areas and also to accept lower and more realistic support prices. I am proud to report that our Florida corn farmers voted 97.8 percent to do away with corn acreage allotments, leading all other states in the referendum. Your organization is entitled to greatest credit for the favorable result of the corn election. I am convinced that many cotton producers who must soon make their decisions will also choose to regain much of their independence by increasing their acreage and accepting lower price supports. Only in this way can they make American cotton competitive again in world markets and also discourage the speedy growth of the synthetic industries. In the case of rice the act applied a freeze to the current acreage allotment, which otherwise faced a ruinous 50-percent cut, and also permitted reductions in price support after the first 2 years.

In the last Congress we also increased the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. With the aid of this act our exports of farm products have reached an all-time high. We extended the program from June 30, 1956, to December 31, 1959, at a rate of \$1½ billion per year—or by a total of \$2¼ billion. This program has proved quite helpful in reducing our surpluses and in improving our foreign markets, but I hope we will not become overly dependent upon it. It has proved to be an exceedingly fine emergency measure to handle surpluses, but it can never be regarded as a substitute for private trading.

It appears likely that in the forthcoming session, Congress will allow the temporary programs for corn, cotton, and rice sufficient time to demonstrate their value, but meantime will tackle the problems now faced by the other so-called basics—wheat, peanuts, and possibly even tobacco—and I hope the final results there will be as encouraging as the 1958 act promises to be with reference to cotton and corn.

Of this group, wheat is in the most serious trouble and will almost certainly require new legislation. With an existing surplus already on hand the wheat crop this year

approaches 1½ billion bushels—53 percent larger than last year's crop and the largest in history. Without growing a single bushel of wheat next year we would be able to supply our domestic and export needs with 325 million bushels to spare on July 1, 1960.

Probably one of the first major agricultural bills to face us in the next Congress will be one to provide for direct payments to farmers out of the Federal Treasury. Several similar bills for this purpose were introduced in the last session of Congress, and I think we can anticipate their reintroduction and consideration early in the next Congress.

It was about 10 years ago that the so-called Brannan plan of direct production payments was originally proposed and the Congress has repeatedly refused to adopt it. This latest version leaves many questions unanswered and there are a multitude of reasons why it should not be favorably acted upon by the Congress. Among other things it would stimulate production and bring about a greater surplus to depress the market prices, which in turn would increase the cost of the proposed program which is already estimated to run between \$8 billion and \$16 billion per year.

Because of the size of the refund payments the program would become one of the greatest political footballs of all times and because the proposed program is limited to the six basic commodities, the Congress undoubtedly would be subjected to strong political pressures to include more and more commodities.

I hope Congress will continue to disapprove such measures and will continue to enact constructive farm legislation working patiently step by step toward the new farm program which so evidently is required. But I cannot emphasize too strongly that the existence of the dangerous philosophy in other fields which we have been discussing, and some of the activities of the U.S. Supreme Court, the aggressiveness of ultraliberal Members of Congress, labor leaders and even some of our farmers, present a real challenge to every American.

We may as well realize that if Congress turns to the left generally in solving other important national problems, we must expect the leftwing philosophy to prevail in the field of agricultural legislation.

I commend the American Farm Bureau for its constant efforts to help lead us back to the highway of basic Americanism and away from the road which leads to a paternalistic welfare state.

I commend the cotton industry and corn producers for their strong desire shown in their support of the 1958 legislation and in their reactions since that time to alter their course away from more and more Government assistance and control and toward more freedom and self-reliance.

Thanks to groups such as this, we see some glimmer of hope that we will be able to reverse the trend which is leading us down the road to socialism—but let there be no mistake about it, we are still in the midst of a devastating attack in the name of so-called liberalism on individual and State rights intended to be protected by the drafters of our Constitution. These attacks must be met fearlessly and forcefully.

Unquestionably a mighty struggle is in the offing and we can win it only if those of us who feel strongly about preserving individual freedoms and private enterprise are willing to make real sacrifices. We cannot win it by sitting idly by while ultraliberals sell their unsound theories to unwitting people throughout every economically troubled area of the Nation.

As individuals I hope you will make your views known to your friends and your acquaintances and most of all to your Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

I feel particularly close to the American Farm Bureau, and I think one of the main reasons for this is that for years you have approached problems of national importance with the basic proposition always in mind that the continuance of individual freedom and responsibility, and the maintenance of strong, independent and responsible State and local governments, are all necessary to the preservation of stable, constitutional government.

I am glad that you, our strongest agricultural organization, are committed to this fundamental principle and it is fortunate for the Nation as a whole that you take an active interest in matters of general interest and importance outside of agriculture, realizing, of course, that if the political and economic structure of our Nation is unsound, agriculture will suffer along with everyone else.

As an organization you appear to have accepted the challenge to help lead the way back to our fundamental Constitution and to the way of life which has made this country great. I hope each of you as an individual will also accept that challenge. Agriculture has an opportunity—indeed a high responsibility—to return to the self-reliance which has characterized the American farmer throughout all of our history and point the way to the return of all of our people to basic Americanism. I wish for you the fullest measure of success in your dedicated efforts and I shall have a small part in working with you to bring about that success, in the best interest of agriculture and of all the American people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceptionally fine editorial concerning the speech entitled "A Statesman From the Deep South," published in the Oklahoma City Times of December 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATESMAN FROM THE DEEP SOUTH

A refreshing breath of true statesmanship has come from Florida in recent days, and it is all the more gratifying because it is that of a Democrat speaking courageously after the recent Democratic victory in which many observers claimed to see a mandate for more spending, more labor domination, and a greater leftward shift coming out of the election returns.

Senator SPENSARD L. HOLLAND obviously doesn't go along with those timid souls who have been panicked into the idea that the Federal Government must now spend more money than ever, provide more gimmicks for the voters, kowtow more cringingly to Walter Reuther and his cohorts, and wander still farther into the welfare state concept.

Addressing the recent annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Senator HOLLAND pulled no punches in the arena of farm policies. He said that the only major agricultural crops in real trouble today are "those very ones which have been depending too long on high price support."

He enlarged upon this theme when he said that it is clear that "the solution to the farmer's problems lies in the direction of less government support and control rather than more."

He added: "The complete unsoundness of price supports large enough to induce farmers to produce crops to sell to Uncle Sam for storage has been thoroughly established."

"Unfortunately," he said, "many of our people cannot understand that they themselves are the Federal Government, that they pay all of its bills, and that they, the people, get nothing free from their Government. They do not realize that by looking to that Government for handouts—each of which

costs them certain rights and privileges—they lose each time a little more of their freedom, and that little by little they are giving away their heritage."

Mr. HOLLAND is senior Senator from Florida and member of the strategic Senate Appropriations and Agriculture Committees. He warned his hearers that the Government "is now moving away from individual freedom and initiative toward an ever-enlarged Federal Government and a labor 'super-government' at the expense of the rights and privileges of States, local governments, and individuals."

In the field of labor-management relations, he said: "A real challenge which must be met by organizations such as this and the rank and file of labor is that disclosed by the McClellan committee, which has pointed up so that everyone could see, the appalling corruption, crime, and violence which exists in the high circles of some labor unions. Gang bosses, goon squads, bribery, and embezzlement have no more place among unions than they have among our other American institutions. This situation should cause great concern to all Americans and to the agricultural producers in particular, because the trucking industry performs a vital and necessary service in getting a large part of your produce to the market place. An extended tie-up of this industry at harvest-time could wreck entire segments of agriculture, and bankrupt thousands of farmers, as well as handlers and processors of farm products, throughout the Nation."

Undoubtedly the majority of Oklahoma voters, regardless of party, wish that equally courageous and statesmanlike utterances might come from members of the Oklahoma delegation in the House and Senate.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, inflation is a vital subject that concerns us all.

It has been the subject of much study by many persons.

In this connection, there has been brought to my attention a noteworthy dollars-and-cents appraisal of what the word "inflation" really means.

It was prepared by Sylvia Porter, a discerning observer of our economic scene, who writes a column "Your Money's Worth."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column carried in the Monday, January 19, 1959, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

WHAT INFLATION IS AND WILL BE

This is what inflation is—this is what you have lived through if you are over 20 years old.

In 1939 a quart of milk cost under 12 cents; in 1949 a quart cost 22 cents; in 1959 the price in my neighborhood store is 29 cents. In 1939 a loaf of sliced white bread cost under 8 cents; in 1949 a loaf cost under 14 cents; a loaf now costs over 19 cents.

In 1939 a leg of lamb, per pound, cost around 28 cents; in 1949 lamb per pound was over 71 cents; it's now over 77 cents. In 1939 a pound of coffee cost a bit over 22 cents; in 1949 it was over 55 cents; the average per pound now is in the 70-cent range.

In 1939 the lowest priced, five-passenger, four-door car in the Buick line was \$984; in 1949 it was \$2,089; in 1959 it's \$2,545.

In 1939 the wholesale price of a gallon of gas, excluding taxes, was under a nickel; in 1949 it was a dime; now it's 12 cents. And in 1939 a ton of cold rolled steel at wholesale was \$62; in 1949 it was \$90; in 1959 it's \$146.

Meaning of inflation

This is what inflation is—a sharp rise in the prices of goods and services, an extraordinarily rapid climb in the cost of living in a relatively short period.

Only when you compare the price of milk and bread, of bus fares and meat, does the tale come through. Only as I dug through the newspapers of 1939 and 1949 did I truly understand what I'm saying when I write that the dollar which bought 100 cents of goods and services in 1939 buys less than 48 cents worth in 1959.

Because we lived through this 1939-59 inflation does it mean that we will repeat the experience between 1959 and 1979?

It does not follow. Not at all!

Just recall the background and you'll see what I mean.

In 1939 we were coming out of a decade of depression. During all those years of stagnation in the thirties we built only a picaresque number of houses, plants, factories, machines. We had not only been stopped in our economic tracks by the great depression of the thirties; we had been pushed into a massive retreat.

Economy strained

On top of this stagnation came World War II. Suddenly our woefully underbuilt economy was strained to the utmost. Suddenly tens of billions of dollars were poured into the business stream as the Treasury did the equivalent of printing money to finance war production. With so much cash chasing so few goods, only wartime controls and our patriotic acceptance of them kept the price lid from blowing off.

Then came the postwar period and the removal of controls.

Under the circumstances the price levels of prewar days were utterly unrealistic. Money pent up during the war was scrambling for goods and services at almost any price. We were striving to make up for more than a decade of depression stagnation and war. The upsurge in prices and wages was simply a normal response to conditions then existing.

Now reread those little down-to-earth statistics. Notice how the pace of the price increase in most cases has slowed.

That's only logical, too. We have more than caught up with the underbuilding of the depression years and the scarcities of war.

Barring another global war, there is no basis for price rises in the next two decades to match what we've seen in the past two.

A gently rising price level is a reasonable expectation.

Steel in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was nearly 300 years ago that Thomas New-

comen was born in England. His improvements of the steam engine were so successful that up to the time of the American Revolution it became known as the Newcomen engine.

In honor of his memory, about 30 years ago there was set up a voluntary group called the Newcomen Society. Its members meet all over the country, and it is the custom to have addresses made by persons who are experts in their line.

Mr. Roger Blough, president of the United States Steel Corp., addressed the society on the 4th of December last in New York. The title of his address was "Steel in Perspective."

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Public Printer that certain remarks on this subject which I desire to have printed will occupy about two and one-half pages of the RECORD at a cost of \$202.50. I therefore ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding this cost estimate, that the remarks I send forward be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL IN PERSPECTIVE

(A talk by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp., before the Newcomen Society in North America, Hotel Pierre, New York, N.Y., Dec. 4, 1958)

Last year the steel industry of the United States observed the hundredth anniversary of the Bessemer and Kelly processes which launched the age of quantity steel production in this country. For that reason, my associates and I are particularly pleased that the Newcomen Society honors steel tonight.

It is the custom of Newcomen on these occasions to appraise and record the progress that has occurred in some particular field of human endeavor, and, in keeping with this worthy tradition, it had been my intention this evening to review the history of these past hundred years in steel, to point out a few of the myriad ways in which the almost explosive growth of this industry has influenced the growth of America.

But the more deeply I delved into the past the more clearly I seemed to hear the portentous rumble of events taking place today all around the globe, an insistent, earth-shaking rumble with profound and perplexing implications, not only for the steel industry but for all industry, and, indeed, for our Nation's future position in the world.

So it occurred to me that the mere contemplation of our yesterdays, however gratifying that may be, can provide little more than the momentary illusion of escape from the vexing realities of today and the pressing hazards of tomorrow. For history is truly meaningful only when viewed in perspective—only as we discern how past events have shaped the present and foretell the future.

Therefore, I propose that we try for a moment tonight to lift ourselves out of the earthly clay that surrounds us and to seek some vantage point in time and space whence we can look down upon the whole tableau of world progress in steel.

And from that vantage point let us glimpse in passing this land of ours as it was a hundred years ago, when the modern age of steel began.

In those days we were not far advanced from a frontier nation. Buffalo still roamed the great plains and Indian war whoops were still heard in the West. Steel, such as it was, was scarce and expensive. Its production was measured in pounds, instead of in millions of tons as it is today. And when Andrew Carnegie was born, for example, it was selling at \$500 per ton.

Then came the invention and development of the processes which brought mass production to the steel mills. From the volcano-like maw of the Bessemer converter, steel poured forth in a veritable flood, and sold in the marketplace at a tiny fraction of its former cost. Except for the iron from which it was made, it became, in fact, the most inexpensive and most plentiful metal in America; and today, of course, it still is.

That the strongest and most versatile of metals should suddenly become the most economical and most available of metals was a miracle which produced a mighty surge of progress that no other nation in the world, as yet, has equaled. There was abundant steel for everyone and every purpose.

There was steel for the plowshares that transformed the vast prairies of the West into productive fields. Steel for the blades of reapers and binders that harvested our multiplying supply of grain. Steel for barbed wire to fence in great herds of cattle on our unwooded grasslands. Steel for bridges across our rivers and for rails that soon knitted thousands of isolated communities into one great, united Nation. And, above all, there was steel for the tools of industry—for machines that multiplied the strength of men many thousands of times, and raised them from muscular pygmies to productive giants.

In less than half a century—a mere wink of Father Time's eye—the United States became the foremost producer of steel in the world. And simultaneously it became the world's leading industrial nation. Never in all the annals of history had there been an equal economic advance in so short a time.

But that was as nothing compared to the progress of the last half century. Our material well-being moved to unheard of heights, and was shared by every economic group at every economic level of our society. In two world conflicts at a time when we had about 50 percent of the world's steel capacity, we were able to furnish the counterweight which swung the balance in favor of democracy. And since World War II we have shared over \$60 billion worth of our wealth with our friends in many parts of the world. That is no mean accomplishment for the youngest of major powers.

Now, I do not mean even to suggest, of course, that the revolution in steelmaking was solely responsible for the spectacular growth of America's productive power in this past century. It could not have been; for we had no corner on steel's raw materials, and the processes were available to all visitors.

Clearly there were many other factors: the climate of economic and political freedom which has been our heritage, the adventurous spirit of risk and reward that uniquely motivates private initiative, and the insatiable competitive urge that is so characteristic of the American people and their enterprises.

Yet no one can doubt that supremacy in steel has been an essential ingredient in the achievement of America's productive leadership. A nation's economic wellbeing and its standard of living may be measured in terms of money, or kilowatts, or in many other ways; but one of the most reliable guides for this purpose, perhaps, is found in its per capita use of steel.

It is not accident, then, that in 1956 United States led the world with a reported 1,232 pounds of steel per person annually, followed by West Germany with 847 pounds, and the United Kingdom with 788. Soviet Russia had moved up to fifth place 481 pounds and China trailed at the bottom with 18 pounds per capita.

So if we look only at the past we might feel pretty complacent and smug about the margin of leadership that we have established; and we might even conclude that the

miracle of this past century could only happen in America.

But if—well aware of the past—we look down from our imaginary vantage point in space, and view in perspective the whole of history as it is being written now, we cannot escape the fact that the same irresistible, surging force that has swept us forward during these past 100 years, has been reborn in nations all around us. It has been sired by a new awareness among people on every continent that they do not have to be hungry, shabbily clothed, or poorly housed. They insistently seek the same improvement enjoyed by the Western World—not alone as an end in itself—but primarily, perhaps, as a means of achieving the highest purposes of human freedom and culture, through an ever-rising level of life and service.

And so it is that wherever we look, we see the world in a state of ferment.

That has happened many times in the past, and when the ferment subsided, the world was no longer the same. Yet this ferment differs from all the others. It is not only global in scale but is reaching even to the firmament. It has many new ingredients—political, social, economic, scientific and technological—and they are reacting more violently than ever before. And of one thing only, I think, can we be certain: that when this ferment, too, subsides—perhaps not in our lifetime—the world will be changed again in remarkable ways. For the great tides of history are as ripples when viewed in the light of the change that impends.

In the field of metallurgy and particularly steelmaking we are only at the beginning of a revolution that will dwarf any that has preceded it. And what is happening in steel is but a part of a fast changing science and technology, moving so rapidly that it defies prophecy.

We, at once, lift our eyes to the stars in anticipation of space travel and at the same time we are discovering a whole new universe within the tiny atom. In practical terms, this means that we will conquer space and that nuclear energy will one day be universally available at any place on the globe—from pole to pole, and at the far reaches of every ocean.

The importance of this perspective in steel was brought home by an incident which occurred at the White Sands Missile Proving Ground in New Mexico some weeks ago. After a day devoted to missiles, faster-than-sound planes and much conversation about lunar probes and the limitless thrust of man into space, an earnest young scientist, who knew we had built launching platforms, asked this very simple and revealing question:

"How far along are your plans for building a launching platform on the moon?"

Fantastic question, but which one among us deems it as fanciful now as a mere 10 years ago?

Accompanying this atom-space revolution is the up-welling desire I have mentioned of many millions of people for more knowledge, more economic tools and for more power to improve their lives and their well-being. The teachings of our own American story of how to create more for the many by providing more and better tools of production are having far-reaching effects. Those American teachings are pointing the way and providing the motivation for the earth-wide surge of peoples seeking their own better day and their own better way. We can see it in Latin America, in Europe, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Russia, in India, in China, and Japan. As a measure of this surge, let me point out to you that since World War II 20 or more new nations have come into existence.

Here we begin to gain a little perspective. This surge of peoples for economic betterment, embracing many conflicting political creeds and many different stages of indus-

trial development, has one thing in common—the recognition of the value of steel as the foundation of physical strength, and as a basic tool of production from which is generated the many needed tools of production.

At the turn of the century, more than a quarter of all work energy in our own Nation was supplied by animal and human muscle. Today, nearly 99 percent of all useful work is performed by machines—from the giant steel rolling mills to the tiny mechanism which activates an electrical watch. That, too, is a part of our American teaching, clearly visible to others around us.

It is significant, therefore, that since World War II, at least 20 nations have more than trebled their production of steel, while several other countries are starting to make their own steel for the first time. In fact, the only major steel producing nations which failed even to double their output during this period were the United States and the United Kingdom.

Under the auspices of the State Department, representatives of the American steel industry gained further perspective recently when they toured the steel operations of the Soviet Union and studied the methods and plants which give Russia, today, an annual capacity of only slightly less than 60 million ingot tons which compares with our 141 million tons. Much, I think, was learned on both sides, but particularly impressive to the Americans was the determination of the Soviets to narrow the gap between us with all possible speed.

In this year alone they are constructing seven new blast furnaces having a daily capacity of 3,000 tons each. And if you have read Khrushchev's announcement of the new 7-year plan, you know that Russia intends, by 1965, to increase its steel production to 100 million ingot tons per year. That is about 15 millions tons more than the American steel industry will turn out in this present year of low demand. You may have noted also that this enormous expansion of Soviet capacity will require a capital investment which—at official rates of exchange—amounts to \$25 billion.

By way of another example, a recent news dispatch reports that out of more than 600 million people in Communist China, 50 million are engaged in a feverish campaign to produce iron and steel in the crudest of makeshift furnaces. Their aim is to double, within a single year, their last year's output of about 5 million tons.

It is not well to smile at these early efforts of the Chinese to build a steel industry where manpower is so plentiful and so low cost. The Chinese in ancient times had a flourishing iron industry. It is only reasonable to foresee sizable steel production in that land.

In India three new 1-million-ton-capacity mills are being built and a fourth is contemplated.

A number of other countries, since the war, have built or are planning to build their first steel plants. Among them are Pakistan, South Korea, Portugal, the Philippines, Israel, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, and our own Hawaii. Several Latin American countries are already producing steel and together, can now supply about 50 percent of the steel needs of that entire continent.

Now what does all this industrialization in other parts of the world mean to us? Here are some significant trends. Although we have grown from 66 million ingot tons of production in 1940 to 112 million in 1957, steel producers in other lands have moved from 89 million tons to 209 million—or twice as much. In recent years, our Nation's proportion of world steel production has dropped substantially—from 54 percent in 1948 to 43 percent in 1950; from 46 percent in 1950 to 35 percent in 1957. And in this recession year of 1958, we will have produced less than 30 percent of the world's steel.

Even for so short a time as the next 5 years, we may project an increase in capacity of our own industry of about 15 million ingot tons; but any realistic appraisal for the rest of the world must be triple that amount.

Now for additional perspective. With reasonable accuracy one can project the world's population for relatively brief periods. It is said that the United States will have 260 million people in the short span of 22 years—by 1980. By then it is estimated that world population will have increased from 2.9 billions to 4.2 billions—a tremendous growth indeed.

Now what does all this portend for us? A few things are clearly visible and they are not years away but at hand. The great bulk of the population growth will take place outside of the United States—15 times our own. That population growth will be accompanied by an increase in steel production at an accelerated rate which we cannot hope to match—pound for pound—nor should we expect to do so. For each additional pound of steel wherever it may be produced is one more pound inevitably devoted to raising the living scale of someone among these billions of people, unless—perish the thought—that pound of steel should be destined to take part in a world holocaust?

I should make it clear in passing, perhaps, that this challenge to our industrial leadership is by no means confined to the realm of steel. It is everywhere. At the beginning of World War I, for example, the United States produced 83 percent of the world's oil and had 80 percent of the known reserves in what is now the free world. Today it produces only 47 percent of the free world's oil and has but 13 percent of the known reserves.

So we must face up to the probable fact that our Nation will no longer have the preponderance either of steel production or of total production that it has enjoyed in the past—nor, let me say parenthetically but emphatically, will any other nation fall heir to that preponderance.

It is also plain to see that, in the steel industry, we will encounter tougher and tougher competition both internally and externally. We will have to compete against products made by our industrial imitators under conditions where the operators of the machines of production in foreign lands will receive only a fraction of the compensation they are paid in this Nation. And no one should underestimate either the quality of those machines or the aptitude of their operators.

Already, in steel, there is a straw in the wind. It may be only a straw, but I give it for what it may be worth. Exports of steel from the United States in 1958 will fall off roughly 40 percent from 1957. But what is more significant, in this year when our industry operated far below its capacity, our steel imports are expected to be 10 to 15 percent above those of a year ago. And may I add that while recognizing the value of such expedients as tariffs and quotas, increased tariff protection is not the ultimate or basic answer because free nations must depend upon trade. Trade is mutually beneficial. Moreover, if experience teaches us anything, then certainly we have learned that the power to erect tariff walls is not one in which America enjoys a monopoly.

All these observations are enough to induce us to do some sober thinking.

The challenges which face us, as I see them, are of two kinds and they are interrelated. One is in research and technology, and, great as that challenge is, the second is far greater. It relates to ourselves as individuals and what we are going to do, even now, as the ferment I mentioned earlier boils up around us and changes the world in which we live.

In the whole spectrum of science and technology, there is probably no more important

field than metallurgy, for what we accomplish there may well determine our survival. Metallurgy is rapidly entering upon a new era. Two others preceded it. The first was that of chemical control when man began to understand the chemistry of steel and to develop steels according to chemical composition. In the second, metallurgists with the aid of the microscope, began to see and understand changes in the properties of steel which had formerly been achieved empirically. This was called "visible micro-structure." But, now we are venturing into the tiny universe of the atom, the era of atomic structure.

It has been possible in the laboratory to produce a single crystal of pure iron in the form of a filament with a tensile strength approaching 2 million pounds per square inch. That is more than seven times the strength of the strongest steels that exist today. As I understand it, the problem is to find a way to get rid of the defects ordinarily existing in iron crystals, and, by rendering them more nearly perfect, to produce the super steels of tomorrow.

Why is steel of so much greater strength needed? Well, until recently, our efforts have centered around those steels which hold their strength at the exceedingly high temperatures generated by air friction on plane or rocket surfaces at supersonic speeds. Such metals are still very important—and stainless steels figure prominently among them—but the emphasis has shifted to steels of greater strength at ordinary temperatures. Why? Because with the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles, the supersonic plane will be relatively less important in our national defense.

But beyond the stratosphere, where there is no air friction, the problem of rockets or space ships traveling at 18,000 miles an hour is not so much one of heat as of strength. A space vehicle passes through the atmosphere in a relatively short time and is not subjected to anything like the frictional heating of the slower supersonic plane. Consequently, designers want a steel of a vastly greater strength at relatively low temperatures and one with greater resistance to corrosion—especially corrosion under stress. It now takes 1,000 pounds of rocket and fuel for every pound of "payload," in the form of a satellite or what may eventually be a space ship. Obviously, if a steel could be made twice as strong as at present, the weight of the rocket could be cut in half, or the payload could be greatly increased.

There is, moreover, a need for greater resistance to corrosion under stress which has been accentuated by use of "exotic fuels" to power vehicles for space travel. Some of these fuels, such as fuming nitric acid or materials containing fluorine, are extremely corrosive, and all the more so under conditions of stress. Even if a steel can be developed that will cut the weight of a space vehicle in half, it will be of no avail if it cannot resist corrosion of fuels within the container.

What we learn of value about steel for interplanetary travel will undoubtedly be applied to great advantage on this planet we call earth. In this dawning age of nuclear energy there are certain to be countless new requirements for steel, and structures of new steels, not yet dreamed of in our most imaginative moments. Whether it be in a rocket we loft a third of the way to the moon, or in a drill pipe that dips 25,000 feet into the earth or in a submarine gliding under the North Pole, steel will be there, provided we in steel and in all industry find better ways of meeting our greater challenge.

For however successful we may be in maintaining leadership in the field of scientific research, our greatest challenge relates—as I said a moment ago—to what we are going to do as individuals, as economic groups

and as a nation in the face of this fermenting world.

Can we in business and industry fully grasp the meaning and the implications of this ferment? Can we aid our fellow men to understand it so that they in turn may act in the common interest? And can we bring to our elected representatives in Government a real and dispassionate comprehension of the part they must play if they are to enhance—and not weaken—our Nation's position among other nations of the world?

In the answers to these simple questions lies the destiny of America. But how shall we answer them?

We know for example that America's ability to compete successfully with these other nations in the years ahead will rest primarily upon what is known technically as the "formation of capital"—or, in simpler language, upon our capacity to acquire and to pay for new, more efficient, tools of production.

We know that the nation which equips itself most widely and wisely with the most efficient and productive tools will be the strongest nation in the world when this present ferment subsides.

We know further that when Soviet Russia—or any other Communist society—needs \$25 billion for new and better steelmaking facilities, it raises the necessary capital through taxation—direct or hidden—and the people have no voice in the matter. We in America, however, rely, and happily so, only on the voluntary action of those who have saved, and are willing to invest, such sums in these tools.

The Communist governments can be ruthless in the imposition of taxes and can thus provide themselves with vast quantities of tools. We, on the other hand, must rely upon incentives if we are to keep pace in this international race for supremacy in productive facilities. So clearly we cannot afford to discourage saving and investment if we are to keep in the running. Yet that is exactly what we have been doing for years in this country.

Let's look at this picture for a moment:

In any free capitalistic society, the only way to acquire the tools of production is through profit or the expectation of profit. But how many of our people really understand the nature and the function of profit. Not one, I suspect, in a thousand.

Even if they turn to the dictionary, they are led to believe that a profit is something that is left over in the till after all the expenses of a business have been met.

But the truth is, of course, that a corporate profit, in industry, is what is left over after all expenses—except one—have been met. And the one expense that has not been satisfied is the payment we must make for the use of all the tools, machines, and other capital facilities that are necessary to the process of production. And of all the costs of doing business, this payment for the use and improvement of tools is the most important, perhaps, to our national growth and survival.

When a corporation has paid all its other expenses, provided for depreciation, met its Federal income taxes and come down to its last-line profit on the income statement, it has not yet paid 1 penny for the use of the tools that its shareowners have provided for it. And since there is nothing left but profit out of which to pay for those tools, it is clear that the size of the profit determines the quantity and the kind of tools that an enterprise can command.

Thus the simple fact of the matter is that, over the years, a profit is not something that a corporation keeps in the till. It is something that a corporation pays out of the till for the use and improvement of tools.

Yet today there are people who would tax our profits away, control them away, or bar-

gain them away. But what thoughtful American would wish to tax our tools of production away, or to control them away or to bargain them away and thus consume the basic industrial resource from whence cometh our strength? Nobody would expect us to employ men without paying them; and certainly nobody expects us to use tools, machines, and other capital facilities without paying for them also. The trouble is that people do not understand that profits mean tools and tools mean profits. They are in a very real sense the selfsame thing. You can't have one without the other.

Now this, I think, is probably the most important lesson in what might be called the economics of production. We in business and industry understand this branch of economics because we have learned it in the school of experience, and because it is our very life. But did you ever stop to think that few of our fellow men have had the opportunity to study and understand it because the school of practical business experience is really the only school in which it is being taught?

So if our labor leaders inveigh against corporate profits—and if they force uneconomic wage increases that are "costing" American products out of markets at home and abroad and American workmen out of their jobs, whose fault is that? Can we honestly say that we have done everything in our power to share with our own employees this specialized knowledge we have in the economics of production?

And if our representatives in Government impose burdensome penalties upon thrift and investment—and if they are reluctant to revise the depreciation provisions of our tax laws as the governments of all the other leading industrial nations of the world have done, is that really their fault? It is their responsibility but is it their fault? Have we done our part as fully as we should?

Gentlemen, we are only in the first skirmishes of a worldwide battle of production that is destined, I believe, to rage for many decades to come. America's resources in this economic contest include, and must include, the use of its first team both at home and abroad. And that first team is a strong, well-equipped American industry. A moment's reflection is enough to demonstrate that whether or not America will emerge triumphant from that contest depends in large measure on the virility of American industry. And industry's strength depends directly on our ability to win the understanding of Government, of labor leaders, of investors, and of all other groups in our land, in a national effort to encourage—rather than hinder—the investment of the capital necessary to develop and acquire the finest tools of production on earth.

And if America does not survive that battle, upon whom will future historians lay the blame?

Will they say that our Government officials were too engrossed in the pursuit of politics to care about production? Will they say that our labor leaders were too selfish to consider the future of their country? Will they say that our educators were too cloistered in abstract economic theory to open their minds—and their curriculums—to the basic economic facts of life as they apply to business?

Or will they say—with greater truth, perhaps—that we of business and industry—we who know and understand the facts—were too busy, too indifferent, too impatient, or too inarticulate to teach these facts in the simple, straightforward language that our fellow men could comprehend and believe? Will they record that we, who have been so successful in winning public acceptance of the products of industry, just simply didn't bother to try to gain public understanding of the profits of industry?

You know, somewhere, in some undiscovered cave, there may be some fugitive from a television set who does not know that LS/MPT—Lucky Strike means fine tobacco. But have we ever advertised the fact that LP/MPT—less profit means fewer tools? I leave that question with you.

And in doing so, let me quickly grant that within the boundaries of these economic ideas I have expressed, there are many areas within which reasonable men may differ. But upon issues as vital as these to America's future, there is surely no area within which men of patience and understanding cannot arrive at an agreement. To promote that understanding is the greatest challenge—and the gravest responsibility—that confronts us today.

Now I have led you far from those happy achievements of the past to which I had once intended to devote this talk tonight. But as we come back to earth from our vantage point in outer space let no one suppose that we in the steel industry are dismayed by the worldwide surge of competition that I have just described.

Never before have we done so much research nor had so many developments underway to meet our technological and production challenges. Never has our industry been more aware of the manmade hurdles that stand in the way of mutual understanding, industrial growth, and the preservation of our national strength. And never have we had more determination to rise above those hurdles.

In the last analysis it is all part of doing the job we know best how to do—the job of production—the task of creating more things for more people to the advantage of all.

So as we face the challenge ahead, let us always remember that, as a nation, we still have the only abiding advantages we have ever had in world affairs—the advantage of ideas and of ideals. And, curiously enough, these ideas and ideals have been of the greatest advantage to us when they have brought advantage to others. Guided by that central and simple thought, our people—armed with understanding—will not falter in their progress.

More Funds for Great Lakes Connecting Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared entitled "More Funds for Great Lakes Connecting Channels."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE FUNDS FOR GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

In reviewing the 1960 budget submitted to Congress yesterday, I am deeply disappointed by the inadequate funds recommended for a particular program—the deepening and development work on the Great Lakes connecting channels.

The \$23 million proposed for this work is, I'm informed, absolutely inadequate—if we are to put the target date of 1962 for completion of the work on the connecting channels.

As we recognize, the Great Lakes States beyond Lake Erie will be denied the benefit of the completed seaway until the connecting channels are deepened to handle 27-foot, deep-draft shipping to and from the lakes region.

OPENING OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN APRIL

As we know, the St. Lawrence Seaway itself is scheduled for opening in April of this year.

The event will mark a milestone of progress in this great joint United States-Canadian project that will open the door of the Great Lakes to deep-sea trade and commerce of the world. Until now, the seaway commerce into the St. Lawrence has, unhappily, been restricted because of limited depth—prohibiting the passing of deep-draft vessels through its channels.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area includes many of our States of the upper Midwest, and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec in Canada. Within this area live one-third of the people of both countries.

In this Great Lakes region, too, is concentrated the greatest industrial-agricultural complex in the world. To unwisely postpone benefits of the seaway to the major portion of this region, I believe, would be detrimental to both United States and Canadian interests.

Subsequently I shall make recommendations for additional moneys, in accordance with the amount the Corps of Engineers can effectively put to work, to try to assure completion of the connecting channels by the target date of 1962.

In the days ahead, also, the Congress will be faced with a number of additional important decisions on the seaway.

SEAWAY FILM

Incidentally, I am aware that a great many Members have not had the opportunity to benefit from an on-the-spot look as the St. Lawrence development project—one of the greatest engineering and construction feats in history.

To provide an idea of the scope, magnitude, and potential of this great project, I have arranged for a film to be shown in the Old Supreme Court this afternoon.

The film, produced by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, is the fourth in a series of many entitled "The Fourth Seacoast," portraying the most recent development in the seaway.

The film, a 14-minute, color movie, will be shown between 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. this afternoon. As necessary, it will be rerun during that period to assure interested individuals a chance to see it.

Although I know that Senators will be extremely busy, I cordially invite you to drop in to see the film, if it is at all possible.

Stephen W. Downey, Able Lawyer, Civic Leader, and Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the truly great citizens of our country are distinguished by one common characteristic: they are primarily interested in people rather than just things. California lost a great citizen last week. He was Stephen W. Downey, a prominent civic leader and lawyer of Sacramento for almost 50 years. He died on January 12. Mr. Downey had a big mind and a warm

heart; he was a friend of the people. Never a holder of high public office or a seeker of political favor, he faithfully served the people by being a great citizen in his profession and in his community life.

As the accompanying press items report, Mr. Downey gained statewide, in fact national, recognition in the field of water law. He was always on the side of the people. He represented local water districts, power districts, and public utility districts. He understood California's complex water problems and he helped solve many of them, especially in the long years of legal work and legislative effort which gave rise to the authorization of the Central Valley project in 1935, and the establishment of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in 1948.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a news item from the Sacramento Bee of January 13, 1959, and an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of January 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the news article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 13, 1959]

Stephen W. Downey for nearly half a century one of Sacramento's leading citizens, died in the Sutter Hospital last night. He was 72 years of age. Downey was a nationally recognized authority on water law and the senior partner in the law firm of Downey, Brand, Seymour, and Rohwer. He was active in many of the community's most ambitious endeavors and had gained the respect of two generations as an expert attorney and a guiding light in development of Sacramento and California.

After a year of illness begun by a stroke, he entered the hospital Sunday.

Funeral services will be conducted at 11:30 a.m., Thursday, in Trinity Episcopal Cathedral. Burial will be private. The family requests remembrances be sent to the Golden Empire Council of the Boy Scouts of America or to the Red Cross.

PUBLIC POWER SUPPORTER

He specialized in representing agencies engaged in the construction of public projects and long had been an advocate and friend of public power development.

Both the city of Sacramento and county of Sacramento called upon him in recent years as the key consultant in water and pollution problems involving the waterways of metropolitan Sacramento.

He spent much of his life as an attorney for the State reclamation board and was the chief water counsel for the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

Legislative committees and scores of State and regional administrative agencies sought his expert testimony on the water problems of the State.

WORKED FOR FOLSOM DAM

He was selected to head the committee for the dedication of Folsom Dam in May 1956, a project which he long supported and helped to bring about.

He represented water districts, flood control districts, power districts, irrigation and reclamation districts, and similar agencies in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

He also represented SMUD in the legal condemnation of the electrical distribution system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

In recent years he was engaged in attempting to work out a settlement of water rights on the Sacramento River and the completion of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District project.

He appeared before many high courts on numerous occasions with major issues regarding irrigation and reclamation districts, including the Supreme Court of the United States.

BACKER OF CIVIC PROJECTS

In spite of being deeply and continuously engaged in complicated water-law problems of great moment, Downey gave generously of his time in furthering worthwhile civic endeavors.

He headed a community factfinding committee on hospitals in Sacramento. The committee's report led directly to the successful fund campaign to enlarge the Mercy Hospital.

The Boy Scout movement was one of his abiding interests. For many years he was president of the Golden Empire Council of the Scouts which serves metropolitan Sacramento and surrounding counties. He was honored with the Silver Beaver Award for distinguished service to boyhood.

Downey was named to head the Community Chest in 1933 and during World War II he was president of the United Service Organizations in Sacramento.

From 1947 to 1950 he was a member of the Sacramento County Probation Committee. In 1953 he became a member of the California Museum Association and was named chief of the trustees in charge of special bequests of the Golden Empire Council.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Although he never held public office, he was active in Democratic politics in Sacramento and the Nation. He was the brother of former U.S. Senator Sheridan Downey and was active in his brother's campaigns.

He often endorsed candidates for public office.

NATIVE OF WYOMING

He was born of frontier parents in Laramie, Wyo., on June 14, 1886. His father commanded a Union regiment in the Civil War and went to Wyoming shortly after the end of the conflict. His mother, whose emigrant train to Idaho was attacked by Indians, later went to Wyoming where she met the senior Downey.

Downey was graduated from the law school of the University of Michigan. He came to Sacramento in 1909 and opened a law office with the late J. F. Pullen, who later became the presiding justice of the district court of appeal.

Downey served with the 35th, 91st, and 40th Infantry Divisions during World War I and went to France in the summer of 1918 as a first lieutenant.

WIFE SURVIVES

After he left the service in 1919 he met and married Persis McIntire who survives him.

Downey was a member of the Sutter Club and for many years was an active member of the Sacramento Rotary Club. He was made an honorary member of the latter organization 6 months ago. He also was a member of the American Legion, an affiliation dating from the end of his World War I service.

Downey's other survivors include his children, John F., a partner in his father's law firm; Stephen, Jr., an Army colonel now stationed in Paris, France, with the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe; Mrs. Henry Teichert of Sacramento; Mrs. F. J. Boutin of Woodland, Yolo County; and sisters, Mrs. Willie Fitch of Dallas, Tex.; Mrs. Dorothy Spicer of Berkeley, and Mrs. Alice Nelson of Alexandria, Va.

He also leaves 20 grandchildren. The family home is at 1300 41st Street.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Jan. 14, 1959]

Sacramento has lost one of its most distinguished and useful citizens in the death of Stephen W. Downey.

A leading member of the city bar for many years, he long ago became known as a foremost authority on State water law and its many practical applications.

As such he gave invaluable personal service to many public and quasi-public agencies such as irrigation districts, the State reclamation board, the Sacramento Public Utilities District, and the city of Sacramento.

He was as well a lifetime supporter of public-power development.

Yet, busy as he was in his own profession, Stephen Downey found time to give of his talents to many other worthwhile activities. His lifetime interest in training youth in the way it should go was expressed in long and active association with the Boy Scout movement.

He was a devoted man and won enduring respect from all with whom he came in contact because of a personal integrity which was reflected in everything he said or did.

He exemplified in his life those characteristics associated with the highest type of citizenship.

Who can measure in mere words the good such a man achieves in service to his generation?

Happily the good lives on after he is gone and what Stephen W. Downey did will go on and on to make his community and his State better and happier places in which to live as long as there are a Sacramento and a California.

Address by Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, at Plant-To-Prosper Meeting, Memphis, Tenn., December 18, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on December 18, 1958, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] delivered a most interesting address at the plant-to-prosper meeting in Memphis, Tenn. It contains a concise history of farm problems and legislative action over the past two decades.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the address and benefit from the experienced analysis of this great agricultural statesman concerning the many farm problems discussed, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It was 18 years ago next month that I went to Washington as a Senator from my State.

Having lived on a farm all my life up to that time, it seemed to me a bit of remarkably good luck that I was assigned to membership on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The farm I had lived on comprised some 50 acres of woodland, pasture, and cropland.

Today it would probably be called a subsistence farm.

It kept about five cows and produced some fruit and vegetables as cash crops.

We never raised any wheat or cotton or peanuts or rice.

There was usually an acres or so of corn and a half acre of cigar-leaf tobacco.

The half acre of tobacco got all the fertilizer and the buyers who came around every

fall got all the tobacco at their own price—8 cents, 9 cents, 10 cents, or whatever they were willing to pay for it.

My efforts to raise peanuts and cotton ended in frustration.

The peanut shells didn't have any peanuts inside and the cotton proved to be ornamental only as it never got past the blossoming stage.

So, you see how well prepared I was to take my place on the Agriculture Committee headed by Cotton Ed Smith and which included veterans like Bankhead, of Alabama; Reed, of Kansas; Thomas, of Oklahoma; McNary, of Oregon; and Ellender, of Louisiana.

I started to learn something about agricultural politics almost the first month, being named to a subcommittee headed by Senator John Bankhead to hold hearings on the cotton-storage program.

Of course, I knew that a good share of our cotton farmers were producing about 200 pounds to the acre and sometimes more, and that it was un-Christianlike to expect them to sell that cotton for less than 10 cents a pound.

I had never given much thought to the storage program, however.

I didn't realize that ginning and compressing and storing was quite a good-sized business by itself.

At the very outset of the hearings, I learned that cotton storage wasn't just a simple economic system of carrying cotton over from 1 year to another.

I learned right away that there were big storage fellows at the ports and little storage fellows inland—at least that's what the witnesses said—and that there was some competition between the two.

It took me a little longer to find out that some of the big fellows also had a slight financial interest in the operation of the little fellow's facilities.

However, in real orthodox fashion the subcommittee set out to protect the little fellows.

Senator Bankhead was one of the most astute and lovable southern statesmen I ever knew. That means he was one of the astutest that there was anywhere.

It may have been his intuition and it may have been just his desire to see what the Yankee farmer from Vermont would do under certain circumstances that prompted him to leave me in charge of the hearing one afternoon.

No other member of the subcommittee was present.

I sat at the head of the table—little warehousemen sat on my left—big warehousemen sat on my right.

I felt pretty good at this display of confidence in me on the part of Senator Bankhead.

The hearing got underway and warmed up as it proceeded.

Pretty soon the sparks began to fly, my doubts began to rise and the practical results of that particular hearing was zero, except that I had had my first lesson in cotton diplomacy.

Since that first hearing in the winter of 1941, I have been on hearings relating to every conceivable agricultural program here and abroad.

I have heard expounded every possible theory which its author though would promote a more prosperous agriculture for the United States—or at least provide some specific advantage for the group which he happened to represent.

I have seen candidates for public office rise and fall on the issue of national farm policies.

Farm issues have permeated every election campaign and occupied much of the time of the Congress.

Farm organizations and commodity groups have clashed with one another and frequently

factions within the same commodity group have opposed each other bitterly.

The only time I have known all major farm organizations and both major political parties to work together for a single farm program was during the years 1947 and 1948.

About 6 o'clock in the morning of June 20, 1948, the Congress presented the country with a new farm program backed by President Truman and the Republican Congress and by every major farm organization.

The two main features of this program were flexible price supports running from 72 to 90 percent of parity and a new parity formula which was so constructed so that it was expected to work properly forever after.

What happened? The flexible price supports were promptly suspended and until very recently only operated during the years 1951 and 1952, when the Korean war made price supports inoperative anyway.

The new parity formula was so completely outmoded within a few years that it became worthless as a yardstick for measuring the parity price of many commodities.

Possibly cotton is the commodity to which the new parity formula is most applicable today.

We have had some good years since 1941; we have had some lean years—but, as for developing a national farm program which will serve us successfully for an indefinite number of years ahead, we are just about as far from success as we were 18 years ago.

Of two things we may be sure:

First, that any farm program which we may devise today will not necessarily be applicable to conditions which prevail tomorrow; and, second, politics will never supplant economics as a means of promoting farm prosperity on a long-range basis.

In this year of 1958, in spite of acreage restrictions, soil-bank incentives, production controls and other devices, American agriculture is setting an alltime record for production.

Temporary surpluses of certain commodities have become greater surpluses and apparently less temporary.

Technology and biology have thwarted every effort of the Congress to control production by law.

There are basic economic laws which do not lend themselves to political maneuvering.

Personally, it makes me feel good to think that the United States is the most productive agricultural country in the world and that our troubles are caused by surpluses rather than shortages.

The other day I read a prediction that the population of the United States would increase 100 million in the next 20 years.

While this may be disputed, we do know that at the present rate of increase we will be called upon to feed and clothe this increased number in not over 30 years.

This is the reason that while we stumble over the problem of surpluses, we are also planning to not only bring more land into cultivation but also to greatly increase the productiveness of acres and animals.

Sometimes I wonder if we really have surpluses today.

Or are we, through sheer obstinacy in refusing to see the facts of life accumulating, in the name of surpluses, food and fiber which ought to be flowing freely in the markets of the world?

The United States produces exportable quantities of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and vegetable oils.

The rest of the world needs these commodities, but because we have for years refused to look at the situation realistically we have seen the tobacco capital of the world move to Africa, competitive cotton production develop in a dozen countries, and the production of wheat subsidized by people of other lands who ought to be looking to us for their requirements.

The year 1958 marks a milestone in the course of agricultural legislation.

I am not referring to the corn, rice, and cotton legislation enacted by the 85th Congress.

I refer to the fact that in 1958 we took off the blinders and recognized our farm problems for what they are.

The fact that we have surplus problems is a tribute to the American farmer.

The fact that for over 20 years we thought we could solve those problems through political action alone is no tribute to anyone.

Our political thinking simply has been unable to keep up with the technological and biological progress in the field of agriculture.

In a sense, the work of the 85th Congress was as constructive as that of any session since I have been in Washington.

It may be that the legislation we enacted will not be any panacea so far as the producer of cotton and other crops is concerned.

We did have the honesty to recognize the fact that some of the remedies we had advocated in the past had not effected cures.

We did acknowledge that medicine which might be effective in time of emergency was not always effective in maintaining the health of the patient after the emergency was past.

The 85th Congress did have the courage to break away from the orthodox political position that only high guaranteed prices and greatly restricted production can cure the ills of agriculture.

Imbued with this new found courage, the Congress enacted legislation which, with the approval of the producers, removes the restriction on corn production and will permit greater production of cotton and rice at a lower guaranteed price.

Right here, I want to pay tribute to the cotton producers and the cotton industry for taking the lead in this epic departure from a practice of 20 years' standing.

I want to pay tribute to the Memphis Commercial-Appeal and its ace farm reporter, Jerry Dearing—not only for an outstanding job of farm news coverage, but also for the fact that Jerry works constantly to improve the farming industry of the South and is frequently called upon by Members of Congress for information.

Heaven knows what a Member of Congress, with an experience with cotton as limited as mine or even a member with the experience of my chairman, Senator ELLENDER, would do if we could not call upon the Rhea Blakes, the Jerry Dearings, and other leaders of the cotton industry from California to the Atlantic coast for help and information.

Heaven knows too what we would do without the fighting leadership of men like JIM EASTLAND when it comes to cotton legislation.

No one can possibly know how many times these men have been called upon for help by Members of Congress who would otherwise be left largely in the dark in working on such legislation.

For the full 18 years I have been on the Agriculture Committee, my relationship with the southern members and the southern chairmen has been a satisfying experience. Let me say here that much of the success in getting new legislation through the Congress last summer was due to the perseverance and the courage of Chairman ALLEN ELLENDER.

You know, we did have difficulties here and there even up to the day the conference report was finally accepted, but as members of the Senate conference committee, Senators ELLENDER and EASTLAND never wavered in the position which you folks for the most part sponsored. I stuck along with them believing their position to be sound.

As to the legislation itself, I think it is going to be beneficial.

It ought to make it possible to restore cotton to its time-honored position as an export crop, to put our domestic mills in a more favorable competitive position with the foreign industry and to ease the pressure on other farm commodities by reducing the competition which they would otherwise incur from unused cotton acreage.

I don't guarantee that the new legislation which takes effect next year will do all that we hope for it.

I do guarantee this—if, after a reasonable trial, it appears that the legislation is not in the best interest of agriculture and the national economy, I will be glad to cooperate in improving it.

There are some impatient souls who probably can't wait to find out whether this new legislation will work or not and we may expect the usual number of panacea proposals in the next Congress.

One proposal which seems to be enjoying a resurrection is the proposal for production payments on all leading farm commodities, the theory being that if production payments work for sugar and wool why aren't they good for every other farm commodity, too?

The supporters of this proposal fail to take into account the fact that in the interest of national security we are trying to increase the production of wool in this country and that we are not self-sufficient in the production of sugar.

It would be quite a different matter to apply the rule of payments to surplus commodities.

The theory is, of course, that every farmer would produce his crop, sell it for what he could get and receive a check from the Government to make up the difference between the selling price and 100 percent of parity.

This plan was formally promoted 9 years ago by the then Secretary of Agriculture, although I understand that it was originated years before that in the minds of a group of agricultural economists.

I was strongly opposed to the Brannan plan in 1949, not because of the payments themselves but because the producer in order to receive such payments would be required to operate his farm and each acre of it in a manner approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The present restrictions on the planting on cotton, rice, tobacco, and other basic crops are comparatively mild in comparison to the controls which would have to be exercised over the producer under the so-called Brannan plan.

The cost of an agricultural program which even now is creating widespread resentment would be multiplied several times over under the reincarnated payments program.

My allusion to the resentment against the cost of farm programs does not refer to an imaginary situation.

The public looks at the total amount of the agricultural appropriations legislation.

They say, "Oh, the greedy farmer is getting \$6 billion or \$7 billion a year out of us poor taxpayers."

They don't take into consideration and probably don't know about the two or more billion dollars a year that are charged to the farmer that is spent for the benefit of the nonfarm population.

They don't know that the loans of the REA, Farmers' Home Administration, and others are returned to the U.S. Treasury.

But, regardless of the motivation for the resentment, we must not ignore the fact that the political influence of the farmer is not what it used to be.

The urban Members of Congress, particularly in the House, have been increasing their strength and can now vote down the farmer Members whenever they wish to.

They have demonstrated this several times in recent years.

Far be it from me to say that the public resentment against farm programs is entirely unjustified.

We have worked ourselves into some ludicrous situations.

Take the case of wheat, for example.

Congress has stated that the minimum planting of wheat should be 55 million acres.

Yet, because millions of acres that used to produce 15 bushels to the acre are now producing 35 bushels to the acre, we have accumulated a surplus that is literally running out our ears.

Cotton land has been put into wheat. Hay land has been put into wheat. New land has been put into wheat.

The high-grade wheat-producing States have seen their production shift to low-grade wheat-producing areas, while the surplus owned by the Government has climbed to mountainous proportions.

It may be said that the tobacco grower is also finding himself being edged into a difficult situation.

I have been waiting for the producers themselves to come up with workable solutions to their problems.

They know the fix they are in and I hope they know how to get out of it.

Personally, I would not try to impose any specific plan on these commodity producers but would first await practical proposals from them.

I could not support proposals which would only result in making a bad situation worse.

Representatives of the cotton industry and the rice industry and the corn producers came before the Congress last summer with proposals of their own which were adopted.

There were only 11 votes in the Senate against their proposals.

If the wheat producers come before Congress with workable proposals to improve their position, I am sure they will get very sympathetic consideration, but any commodity group which proposes to improve its own position at the expense of others would probably not get very far.

Last summer, I worked very closely with Senator ELLENDER and other Senators of both parties on farm legislation.

I know we are going to work together during the coming session.

Farm legislation should not be partisan legislation and, so far as I am concerned, it will not be.

There is one particular aspect of the present agricultural revolution that concerns me very much.

That is the plight in which the small farmer finds himself.

You notice I don't say family farmer.

When farm work was done mostly by hand or mule power, the family farmer was indeed a small farmer.

That is not true any longer.

Many farm families are now producing a hundred thousand dollars a year or more of commodities without outside help except of a seasonal nature.

But, as the agricultural evolution has gone on, as developments have progressed in the field of technology and biology, large numbers of farmers on small farms find themselves in a position of being unable to make even a modest living for their families.

Even if supported at 200 percent of parity they still could not make a decent living according to present standards.

The Federal Government has taken recognition of this fact and, through the rural development program, has been undertaking to find ways to deal with the situation.

It is obvious that we cannot gear price support programs to the needs of the most uneconomic producer.

If we did this, we would impose a terrific penalty either on the taxpayer or on the consumers of the country, without ade-

quately improving the position of the small farmer.

To produce food and fiber at excessive costs and hold it for excessive prices destroys both domestic and foreign markets and, hereby, reacts directly against the people it is planned to benefit.

By all means, we should continue and step up our research programs aimed at increasing production per acre, lowering costs, improving methods of handling, processing, and utilization and the development of new uses for farm commodities especially for those which are chronically in surplus.

I would also favor increasing our efforts to solve the problem of the uneconomic farmer, encouraging the production of specialty crops, shifting to crops which do not require extensive capital outlay, improving the available land on the small farm, increasing the number of productive acres where possible, and developing part time off the farm employment.

I know we can make progress in this direction, because I happen to live in a county where this transition has already taken place.

My own neighbors are living better than they used to and the value of the taxable property has greatly increased.

To make the rural development program successful and to enable people who love the land to continue to live on the land and to adequately support their families, we have to look beyond the matter of crop production alone.

Better rural highways, continuation of rural electrification programs without increased costs, better education and health facilities, and all these things which go to make a better living have to be part of the rural development program.

We have to do those things which will make industries want to come into our communities and provide work for our people.

The more people we can keep on the land, owning a bit of the soil and taking pride in that ownership, the more secure our Nation and our democratic form of government will be.

Finally, let me say that one reason I am here in Memphis today taking part in this great plant-to-prosper conference is because you folks of the Southern States reconciled your varying viewpoints on cotton legislation until you had something to come to Congress with.

I know you will give united support to other programs such as the rural development program.

It was a satisfaction to work with you on the constructive proposals you made last summer, and so long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate you will continue to have my cooperation.

Address by Jose A. Benítez at the Democratic Victory Dinner at San Juan, P.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a speech which was made at a Democratic dinner in San Juan, P.R., by Mr. Jose A. Benítez, who is the chairman of the Democratic Party of Puerto Rico. On December 15, I had the privilege of speaking before the

victory dinner of Puerto Rico's vigorous Democratic Party. Mr. Benitez, who is one of Puerto Rico's outstanding young leaders, is the author of "Puerto Rico and the Political Destiny of America," and his speech conveys the talent and imagination which characterize public affairs in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOSE A. BENITEZ, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF PUERTO RICO, AT THE GREAT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER HONORING SENATOR JOHN KENNEDY, DECEMBER 15, 1958, AT THE SAN JUAN INTERCONTINENTAL HOTEL, SAN JUAN, P.R.

Mrs. Kennedy, Senator KENNEDY, and distinguished guests, thanks to all of you present and all of you listening on the radio, for the great cooperation to the Democratic Party and to me in the organizing of this great Democratic victory dinner. We are Democrats; the Puerto Ricans are born Democrats, because we unquestionably believe in the principle of our great organization, the party of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Senator KENNEDY, Puerto Rico welcomes you. You represent our ideals of a democratic way of life to which we as a community are devoted. Puerto Rico stands out in the world as one of the most progressive places. We do not know of racial discrimination, of religious intolerance, or of social and economic oligarchy (oligarqui). Our people recognize that this progress has been achieved to a large extent to the clear understanding of our philosophy by the leaders of our great Nation, like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and those in the U.S. Senate like Senator KENNEDY, who always have given us their effective support to the solution of our political, social, and economic problems.

The leadership of our Governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, has guided our people through the path of unprecedented achievements which have brought noticeable welfare and happiness to Puerto Rico, and prestige and respect to our great Nation throughout the world.

We have achieved only part of our goals. We are a young and struggling society ready to go beyond our geographical limits imposed by the great oceans, to work on behalf of effective democracy in our hemisphere. For example, we are not completely satisfied, because we do not have the internal threat of communism in Puerto Rico. We will be satisfied when we can say that the Communist threat is completely wiped out in all Latin America. The young and strong faces you have seen in Puerto Rico, and you see here tonight, is the best example of the decision of our new generations to actively participate in all phases of our democratic life. We do not want to lose time going back on what we have accomplished. This is past. We are anxious to devote our energies and intelligence to the job we have ahead.

In view of the forbidding political situation overshadowing the shrinking world in which we live, it is to be hoped that the great international leaders of the free world will come to recognize the necessity of strengthening and securing the life of their people, uniting them in commonwealths of maximum potentialities. The differences between nations having great territories and large populations together with powerful economic resources, and the nations possessed of small territory, small population, and scanty resources can be adjusted only by the unification of peoples with the same ideals, interests, and common ambitions, unification directed toward the end of becoming greater through such understanding.

In a world such as ours, full of driving and competitive tendencies, with some nations engaged in the barbaric domination that enslaves weaker ones, our chief problem is no other than that of assuring our survival by making ourselves the fittest, through mutual defense and cooperation with the other nations in our hemisphere.

From the early days of tribal life to the present, humanity has moved always toward greater community concentrations. This beneficial tendency has proceeded, however, at a slow pace, a gait that has dragged heavily on the potential advancement of civilization.

It is a shameful fact, and the fault of world leaders, that scientific progress has had its greatest and most rapid advancement in the forced culture of wartime. But such is a fact. Nations that could develop with more splendor and nobility in time of peace, have been very busy consuming the acid fruits of their selfishness, giving little consideration to the magnificent possibilities for their own enlargement through the fraternal growth of humanity.

The evolution toward a unique government of the human race—which is inevitable in the centuries to come—would have no civilized virtue if it were to come into being through the domination of men by man. However, the present leader in the movement toward the gathering of peoples is a piratical colossus. He is indeed swiftly forming mighty conglomerates, both in population and in geographical expanse. And that being the case, prudence dictates that we face the inevitable conclusions and not delay a moment the labor that must be committed for our progress toward the conquest and the fulfillment of our future.

Our hemisphere cannot ignore the realities of life at the crossroads where its nations stand today. The countries of the two Americas should earnestly and deeply meditate the historical implications of the moment in which they are immersed; their weakness in their present isolation in the stormy international currents; the greatness which they could achieve in a hemispheric bloc, and the energy which could be generated in social, economic, scientific, and cultural interchanges among the American nations. In a word, it is necessary to rationalize and to see the mission which a united America, pioneering and unselfish, could accomplish for the peaceful and fruitful organization of the genuinely civilized world of the future.

The incalculable natural wealth that the enormous territory of the American continents holds—still largely neglected, or unsuspected, in the soil—once developed to capacity could supply all the needs of the world.

The American nations occupy a comparatively virgin land. They are not subject to the grievous pressures for existence that bear upon communities of the Old World, where feelings of discouragement, despair and desperation have driven the people often to the road of war as a means of escape.

Our hemisphere must turn its eyes to its fitting and unexplored greatness, developing and directing it, and offering its fruits generously to the nations that now fight for a place under the sun. The contribution of America thus offered loyally for human fellowship could and should reestablish the equilibrium of those tormented nations whose constriction has induced them to make war and thus to retard the advancement of civilization.

The Americas could and should provide the rest of humanity the additional resources needed for its happiness, abandoning all reserve and hostility. Because of its youth, our hemisphere has all the conditions, qualities, riches, and strength needed for the task of fraternally reconstructing the world to a degree which up to now has been spoken of only in a theoretical way. Its history

youth, its unselfish and graceful spirit, place the Americas in the privileged historic position to be the human bloc that will find ways of removing disputes and problems of the world through brotherly devices, doing away with the dark barbarity of violence.

The United States evidently is the most highly developed and efficient power in the American sphere. Its strength not only could establish its leadership from Alaska to Patagonia but also could extend it to the most distant corners of the world. As the chief defense against the antagonistic attitude shown by Russia to the nations of the Occident, dominated as Russia is by an imperialistic greed for expansion and world control, the United States is under an obligation to protect the right of liberty and the useful life, and to continue in this role, maintaining through various alliances the means to safeguard conservative and altruistic ideals. These alliances must be effected even with nations which are in many respects quite different in their character and interests, to the end that there will be a universal human fraternity and the development of a common civilization which will endure forever. But she should give first thought to the protection, security, and survival of the occidental nations that have a mutual area of interests. In this time of continuous threats to world freedom, the United States has no alternative; it must put all its resources at the service of the defense of all friendly nations whose fortunes are tied to its own security.

Her responsibility and concern regarding affairs more distant certainly does not mean that the United States should not give first attention to the historic mission close at hand; that of establishing a fraternal union with the Latin American nations of the hemisphere. It is to be hoped that the leaders of our great republic to the north will consider giving urgent precedence to work for an understanding with their nation's neighbors in Latin America, so as to begin the germination of hemispheric unity as a starting point toward the greater, worldwide work which destiny seems to have reserved for our hemisphere.

On the other side, I feel sure that the leaders of the Latin American countries will do no less in the vital appointments than they have with history.

All the leaders must stubbornly strive to give creative objectivity to the mission which is theirs to fulfill in their respective communities, to build the new world that is to come. The United States and Latin America could provide preponderantly the techniques and resources and, above all, the virtues of brotherly unselfishness which would be required for the achievement of the great task.

It is unnecessary, perhaps, to point out that the peoples of all the Americas are equally obligated not to shrink from the massive demands of the glorious gesture that the desperate, cornered state of humanity calls for.

The task is there. It is for its missionaries to carry it through to victory.

In the course of the historic mission that the American nations could jointly fulfill to obtain the world fellowship that I am advocating here, an immediate benefit to all the nations of the hemisphere would be a rapport established with each other, erasing the frictions and prejudices that grew up in the creation of the intercontinental society. In a great measure, these prejudices and frictions are ghosts of doubts and suspicions begotten by the distrust and lack of communication which has predisposed the various races. In a lesser way—also ghosts, because they belong to errors of the past—the prejudices of Latin America are the result of the intervention by the United States on Latin American soil, prior to the time when President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a policy of hemispheric friendship.

As the two continents were drawn to each other in a cordial and loyal approach, they would remove frontiers that today separate North, Central, and South America, not geographically and politically, but with regard to interests and abstractions that are equally formidable.

Such an approach, based on fraternity and cooperation, would relieve the United States of an outside search for that which she needs to prosper and to enlarge herself and would similarly put within each reach of Latin America all the productive resources that are lacking within its geographical limits. The two would contribute their respective potentialities—those already developed and the much more copious ones which are yet undeveloped—so that in a few years the resulting social, economic, scientific and cultural advancement would be enormous.

Puerto Rico is by origin Latin American. It entered into political relations with the United States in 1898. The island suffered from the same problems of misunderstanding and remoteness that exist today between the United States and other Latin American communities. Puerto Ricans faced incomprehension and indifference. There could be no success for us that was not based on the greatness of both the people of the mainland and the people of Puerto Rico. As soon as we began to draw together, all incomprehensions and prejudices fell apart, and our association, fortified today by the bond of citizenship, growth in the rich interchange on which our development is based.

If our Puerto Rican leaders succeeded in helping accomplish this American union, why could not the leaders who today orient the policies of other Latin American communities broaden and advance such diplomatic gains?

Communist Russia knows that its cunning expansionism cannot undermine, even in a clandestine way, the compact and powerful unity of the North American people. That is why it is maneuvering desperately to infiltrate its germs of anarchism, weakness, and demoralization in the vital organs of the Latin American countries, through seemingly advantageous economic offers that doubtless could endanger the stability and free determination of those communities. Can we be so deceived as to yield to an economic infiltration over which hovers the steel expansionism and the grasping domination that have enslaved so many satellites in Russia's barbarous orbit?

Nothing that Latin America and the United States could wish for to improve their respective communities needs to be searched for in the Old World. They have everything needful in their own territory, or if anything is lacking temporarily it can be found by exploration of hemispheric resources. The continents—under the infinite guidance of God—must hope that the leaders of the several nations may have the vision of their enormous destiny.

The North and the South must end their disagreement and each one get rid of the limitations that hinder this settlement. And instead of addressing each other in stilted diplomatic language they should start to speak the vernacular of the family.

The hemisphere may hope that the United States and Latin America will gracefully accomplish the part which is required of each one. The destiny of both is the political destiny of all America.

God will order affairs so that the lesson of Puerto Rico will guide the achievement of the task that the American nations can fulfill for the progress of human relations.

Puerto Rico broke down the barriers of misunderstanding with the United States, and has thus developed, under the cordial influence of the resulting rapprochement, its multiple and vigorous potentialities.

This privileged position enables the Puerto Rican people, intellectually, politically, and psychologically, to serve as a responsible spokesman to the United States concerning the values which the Latin American people could contribute on behalf of the general good of this great hemisphere of ours.

The world more and more is tending to lose its nationalistic barriers. It will be ripe, in the course of time, to accept the idea of a single governmental organization administered on the concept that there is only one humanity. The leaders of the great geographic communities—as the Europeans, the Asiatics, and the Arabians have begun to do—are under the obligation of grouping and strengthening their energies, to spread the greatness that dissolves selfishness, shares potentialities, ennobles life, and perfect civilization.

Puerto Rico wishes to sow its humble portion of seed in a furrow of the planting of brotherhood that will bring forth the mighty unified America that is on its way.

Senator KENNEDY. The new generations of Latin America and right here in Puerto Rico are eagerly looking forward to a new and effective foreign policy by the United States of America, based on the philosophy that we are more than good neighbors; that in our world of today we are fraternal brothers. These new generations are anxiously waiting for men like you to implement with the help of Almighty God an effective "good brother policy."

Legislation Relating to Professional Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the texts of several radio broadcasts by Sportscaster Bill Stern, relating to the possibility of need for legislation in connection with professional baseball.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCASTS BY SPORTSCASTER BILL STERN

The Los Angeles Dodgers moved all the way across the country to gain 159 customers. Incredible? Maybe, but all that Walter O'Malley has gained by moving the Dodgers from Brooklyn to Los Angeles is a mere 159 additional customers. How do I figure? Listen.

To date, with 2 remaining home games, the Dodgers have drawn 1,807,000 persons to their at-home games in Los Angeles. Back in 1947 in Brooklyn the Dodgers drew that season for their at-home games exactly the same amount, 1,807,000 persons. And they did it in the vastly smaller Ebbetts Field in Brooklyn. In fact one of the reasons O'Malley moved west was because he thought the seating capacity of old Ebbetts Field was too small. He said that if he could move to Los Angeles and play in the huge Coliseum he would almost double his attendance. And well he might have thought so, for his old home, Ebbetts Field, seated only about 34,000 as against the Coliseum's seating capacity for baseball of 82,000. Some differ-

ence. But in actual figures so far this year, with 2 home games remaining, he has drawn 1,807,785 against the 1947 home attendance in Ebbetts Field of 1,807,526. A difference between Brooklyn and Los Angeles of exactly 159 persons.

Is this why Walter O'Malley deserted Brooklyn and moved to California. To pick up 159 persons? Is this why he fooled the public by saying one thing and doing another? Did he make himself the most disliked man in baseball for a mere handful of people?

Some will say that I shouldn't compare this year's Los Angeles figures with the 1947 Brooklyn figures. To them I say that they shouldn't use this year's Los Angeles figures, next year won't be as good, the bloom is off, the honeymoon is over. Let's see what he draws next year and compare that with last year's Brooklyn figures.

Nor can O'Malley blame it on the people of Los Angeles. Los Angeles is a wonderful sports town. Just this morning the Los Angeles Rams announced that season tickets to their games in the same Coliseum are sold out from goal line to goal line. Just think of that, every single ticket sold. In fact tickets are so hard to get for the Rams games this fall that a divorce case recently featured a battle over their season ticket. And a recent death on the Los Angeles Freeway brought calls to the Rams' office requesting the driver's tickets.

Yes, sir; every single season ticket is sold in the Coliseum for the Los Angeles Rams home games. Yet Walter O'Malley's Dodgers in the same stadium have drawn, with 2 home games remaining, exactly 159 more persons than they did in little Ebbetts Field back in Brooklyn in 1947.

I wonder if O'Malley thinks it was worth moving to California for this 159 people?

WHY SHOULD BASEBALL BE AN EXCEPTION?

Yesterday in Washington there was new legislation introduced by Representatives KEATING, Republican, New York; MILLER, Republican, New York; WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; and HARRIS, a Democrat of Arkansas. This new bill if passed would grant to the sport of baseball several important concessions. First of all, the so-called reserve clause in all baseball contracts would be free from any antitrust action by the Government. Secondly, the major leagues would have the right to police themselves as to how many telecasts they would allow on a national basis. Also excluded from antitrust action would be such baseball practices as, player trades, drafts, and territorial rights.

These are some exceptions. What the means in everyday language is that if this bill becomes law, that the major leagues may decide for themselves how many telecasts they will send into minor league territory, how they will draft their players, restricting a boy who signs with one club from ever selling his services to another team if they will pay him more money. It would also do something that baseball has been trying to do for years, namely, keep that reserve clause, the clause that many think is illegal, from ever being tried in a court of law.

For the life of me, I can't see the justification for such new legislation. Do other businesses get breaks like this from the Government? They sure don't. Can you imagine the average business asking the Government to say its employees could not work for anyone else? Or that if it signed an employee that employee had nothing to say about his wages. He could either accept or quit, and if he quit he couldn't work for anyone else. And why should the major leagues be permitted to make their own rules as to telecasts? They have already shown, according to the minors, that they don't care

how many minor leagues they destroy. So why let them police themselves when they have already shown that they won't do it?

Big baseball is claiming that unless they get these concessions that they can't stay in business. First of all, I don't believe it. But even if it were true, can you imagine how far you'd get if you went to Washington and said: "I want a whole series of new laws passed favoring my particular business. It's too bad if it isn't fair to others."

Other sports aren't asking for these special laws, so why baseball? And even more to the point. Why should we have special laws for a sport when some of these proposed new laws plainly circumvent the ordinary democratic process of law.

The thing I can't get through my head is why baseball deserves special consideration. I thought we lived under one set of laws in this country that applied to everybody.

A SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE LOOKS AT BASEBALL

A Senate subcommittee in Washington has been conducting an investigation to see whether a bill, already passed by the House, should be passed by the Senate. This bill if passed would exempt baseball from Government regulation over player contracts, the highly controversial reserve clause, unlimited radio and TV broadcasts. In short this bill if passed would give baseball advantages that other businesses do not have. Naturally baseball is all for the passage of such a bill. The top brass, the owners, the commissioner, and some players have come out for it. On the surface it seems that baseball is all for this bill, but is it?

So far the subcommittee has only called those who favor it. Men such as Casey Stengel, Mickey Mantle, Eddie Yost, Stan Musial, and Robin Roberts. These men draw huge salaries and are paid by the very owners who are trying to push this bill through. Naturally these players and Stengel are going to testify for what the owners want. Don't the owners pay them, and pay them well? What's the old saying about "never biting the hand that feeds you"?

But isn't it significant that the only two ball players called to testify who are already out of baseball, namely Jackie Robinson, and Bob Feller are not so sure to testify in favor of the bill. These two are not in the pay any longer of the owners. They can both say what they really think, not what they are told they should think. They are both due to testify next week. I'll predict that neither will be for the bill.

It's all to the subcommittee's credit that they have not been stampeded by the rich men who control the game and are willing to hear the other side. But I have a suggestion to make. Not that I expect it to be accepted by the Senators, but I'm going to make it anyway, and here it is:

It would seem to me that if I were trying to find out as to whether this proposed bill should be passed to help the big brass in baseball, I would not call the Mickey Mantles, the Robin Roberts, the Stan Musials, or the Casey Stengels. They are naturally in favor of anything their bosses are. They are well paid and quite content. No, if I wanted to pass a bill helping baseball, I would not pass one to help the rich, but rather one that might help the people in baseball who need help. How about the unknowns down in class D baseball? or class C? or even B? what about these poor, underpaid, underfed ballplayers who really need some help. How about hearing from them? If we are going to hear from the best paid men in the game, how about hearing from the worst paid men too? Let the Senators hear how shabby the slums of the minor leagues are. If Congress is going to

pass laws to help baseball, why help the men who are already rich, why not help the poor.

Let's see how some poor ballplayer who hasn't got enough to feed himself, let alone his family, feels about this bill with its special privileges for the rich club owners.

The Missing Science and Math Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a timely article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, January 13, 1959, entitled "The Missing Science and Math Teachers."

This is a subject which is of great concern to all of us, and I would exhort all the Members to read.

The article follows:

THE MISSING SCIENCE AND MATH TEACHERS

The plight of Philadelphia's public schools as the new term is about to begin shows that it isn't enough to issue an order from Harrisburg to solve a problem at the local level.

Starting in February all Philadelphia high school students are to be required to take some math and science in order to graduate. Before the change, almost half the pupils in high school did not have to study these subjects at all. Yet, even then, there weren't as many good science and math teachers as were really needed, not only in Philadelphia but in other school systems throughout the State.

This situation was as fully apparent months ago when the new State policy was formulated as it is now, yet only the vaguest of plans to deal with it have been advanced at the State level and those in the local communities for the most part are inadequate. This is especially true in Philadelphia.

The sincere efforts of Dr. Helen C. Bailey and William M. Duncan, associate superintendents, to recruit additional science and math teachers have met with little success, as it should have been known they would. The salaries they had to offer couldn't compare with those in private industry or even with what the same teachers could earn in nearby school systems, often in far more pleasant surroundings.

This, too, has been apparent from the beginning, yet the date of the pending change was permitted to arrive without any real plan on the part of the board of education to cope with it.

It seems to us that the State order, in its intent, was fully justified. We believe science and math should be taught to all students capable of absorbing the subject matter. But both the State and the city have been delinquent in failing to take the steps obviously necessary to give the order real meaning.

We think it is about time they got busy and found the needed teachers. Some of them can be lured away from less vital jobs in industry by better salary offers. The rest will have to be trained as quickly as possible, and a sound program for accomplishing this must be devised at once.

Governor Vandiver Cites Georgia Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the excellent statement on the State of Georgia's growth and progress written by Georgia's distinguished young Governor, Hon. Ernest Vandiver, for the annual new South edition of the Anderson (S.C.) Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA (By Ernest Vandiver)

It is a genuine privilege and a pleasure for me to prepare a brief outline of the steady growth and expansion we are enjoying in Georgia for publication in your annual New South industrial and agricultural edition which is of such service to the people of South Carolina as well as for a large number of Georgia citizens living in your territory.

Let me say that both Georgia and South Carolina have enjoyed amazing expansion in their industrial potential in the last few years which has been of such magnitude as to attract the attention of business interests all over our country.

Here in Georgia we are enjoying a forward movement in industry which is bringing us a substantial number of new manufacturing plants. Many of these are being established here by big companies which already are established in their fields. Many others are being built by local people using local capital for development.

Economic indexes in several areas show that Georgia is ahead of the national average in the percentage rate of growth and expansion.

In the postwar years we have added an amazing number of new workers in our industrial activities. This calls for many new payrolls, increases in existing payrolls and numerous new job opportunities for workers moving into our State as well as for workers already established here.

It has been ascertained that Georgia's rate of increase in heavy industries was exceeded in the postwar years by only three States, California, New York, and Texas.

Such industries employing 100 or more persons per plant show increases in Georgia which place this State in fourth position throughout the Nation.

Business, of course, likes to go where the markets are, and it is because of the steady increase in the buying power of the people of Georgia, South Carolina, and other Southeastern States that these new plants are being located here in such large numbers.

From what our business experts say we can expect even greater growth in the industrial field in the future.

It is our policy in Georgia to bring as many new plants as possible to some of our counties which have suffered because of migrations of workers to the urban districts.

We have found that one new plant located in one of the counties suffering from temporary loss of population means that such county can enjoy immediately a complete recovery in its economy.

Hand in hand with our industry our agriculture has marched forward with steady gains which have helped materially our entire State, as far as business expansion is concerned.

Our farmers are using more diversified crops than ever before. They have brought to their farms the most modern methods used in crop raising of all characters. They have carried out a movement to put the farms on a business basis, and in this field are enjoying pleasing and surprising results.

Georgia has enjoyed a 200-percent increase in the livestock industry in the post-World War II and is rapidly forging to the front in the Nation in this activity.

Georgia has held the leadership for some years in broiler production and continues to hold first place this year.

We have won 1st place in the South and 10th in the Nation in hog production, and continue to make steady gains each year.

Steady growth is reported in the values of the corn crop, pecans, tobacco, cotton, truck products, and in tree crops. In fact, the additional trees planted are designed to bring increases in our naval stores production, already the largest in the Nation, and to enlarge the pulp industry.

Let me say that these vast gains have established a pleasant business climate throughout our whole State, and our towns and cities are getting ready to benefit from the additional incomes coming from our increased industrial and agricultural activities.

Permit me to congratulate you on the publication of this excellent New South edition and to express the appreciation of our people for your invitation to participate.

Dr. Raymond J. Quinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week there died in Waterbury, Conn., Dr. Raymond J. Quinn, a beloved general practitioner who gave his life to the service of the people of his community and who was proud to be known as a family doctor. For over 40 years he was with the people of the Washington Hill district in their times of trouble and travail, and the memory of his cheerful presence in their days of crisis will long keep his memory green. He was an example of dedicated service for the younger members of his profession.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Waterbury Republican on January 15, 1959:

DR. RAYMOND J. QUINN

In an age when specialization is the order of the day in the world of medicine, Dr. Raymond J. Quinn took great pride in being a family doctor whose practice centered about the neighborhood in which he lived for more than 40 years. He was "the doctor" on Washington Hill.

Ever since 1916, when he first hung out his shingle in the Washington Hill section of the city, Dr. Raymond J. Quinn devoted the greater part of his time to the families in that area. As the city grew, so did his practice, and while it could hardly be said to have been confined to the "Hill" in later years, it was the people of that section to

whom he gave his first loyalty. He took deep pride in his neighborhood practice. For many years his name was a household word in Washington Hill.

Yet he found time to serve the entire city in one way or another. He served as city bacteriologist for a time and was also Welfare Department physician under the late Mayor Vincent Scully and former Mayor John S. Monagan. Three years ago he was the recipient of the Man of the Year Award of the Washington Hill AC, for his "outstanding contribution to the community."

Dr. Quinn also found time to be active in civic, community, fraternal and church affairs and as a veteran of World War I he had an unusual and deep interest in veterans affairs.

Although illness had curtailed his active practice in recent years, he nevertheless kept his interest in community affairs. His death Tuesday night, while not unexpected, leaves a void on the "Hill." His large family and his thousands of friends will miss him. But the Washington Hill community is a better place today because of his untiring devotion. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to find someone to fill his shoes.

Reappointment of Hon. Alan Bible, of Nevada, as Chairman of Senate Committee on the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial which appeared in the Sunday, January 18, issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled "Washington's Good Fortune."

This editorial points out how pleased the people of Washington should be, and surely are, over the reappointment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] as chairman of the Senate District Committee.

As all Senators realize, this job is very much a labor of love. It has never succeeded in reelecting a man in his home State, no matter how well it was done. However, Senator Bible, realizing that the job is one of great importance, even though it does not have much political significance, has been willing to take it on once again.

Surely, we all must agree with the editorial in the Evening Star that the people of Washington are fortunate in having ALAN BIBLE head their affairs once again.

He is indeed an able and conscientious public servant, who has already won, and will continue to deserve, the affection and admiration of us all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S GOOD FORTUNE

Washington has cause to be pleased with the reappointment of Senator Bible, of Nevada, as chairman of the Senate District Committee. Senator Bible has proved to be an understanding friend of the District, who

properly regards his assignment as one involving an important responsibility—that of carrying out the constitutional duty of Congress to exercise legislative jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital. The Nevada has made it plain, rightly, that he regards this as a solemn obligation of Congress toward not only the people of Washington but of the Nation as a whole.

Moreover, it is gratifying that the committee will have the services of a new Member, Democratic Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, whose pleasure at being appointed contrasts sharply with the attitude expressed by some other legislators who have shunned the District group. Senator HARTKE, who, with Senators BIBLE, MORSE and FREAR, make up the Democratic majority of the committee (the Republicans have not yet been named), said he looks upon the District as a symbol of American democracy—a place of which Americans are proud because it is their city. As a former mayor of Evansville, Senator HARTKE should be well qualified to consider the problems of Washington and the metropolitan area.

The Supreme Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last October the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch published an article entitled "The Supreme Law of the Land," written by the Honorable Ralph T. Catterall, a member of the Virginia State Corporation Commission, and who is a former president of the Richmond Bar Association and one of the ablest lawyers in my State.

In that article, Judge Catterall not only discussed the proper role of the Supreme Court in our system of government, but he also emphasized the responsibilities of Members of Congress. He pointed out that every legislative, executive, and judicial officer takes an oath to support the Constitution and that is an oath of obedience to the Constitution itself, and not to Congress or the courts. He observed also that when the Supreme Court ceases to administer justice under law and indulges in policy-making to serve alleged sociological ends, Congress has the power to curb the Court by taking away some of its jurisdiction.

Because of the merits of this interesting and well-reasoned discussion, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Oct. 10, 1958]

THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

(By Ralph T. Catterall)

The Supreme Court of the United States is the keystone of the arch of our Federal form of government. If the keystone is destroyed the arch will fall. It would produce anarchy if each State were free to disobey every decision it disagreed with. But if the

keystone becomes rotten because of internal defects, that, too, will cause the arch to fall; and it is not unpatriotic to call attention to cracks in the keystone and recommend that they be repaired. The opinion of September 29 sounds like a reverberating crack in the keystone. It sounds ominously like Louis XIV announcing "I am the State." Americans must respect the Court but must not bow down and worship it.

Carved on the architrave of the marble building in which the Court sits are the words "Equal Justice Under Law." The Court ends its recent opinion with the words:

"Our constitutional ideal, of equal justice under law, is thus made a living truth."

That is our constitutional ideal and that is why the Constitution was reduced to writing. We want justice under law. If courts render justice outside the law we are in a state of anarchy. The Constitution does not say: "Everything that is unjust is unconstitutional." The Supreme Court seems to be saying: "Everything that we think is unjust is unconstitutional." If that be true, it was a waste of time to have a written Constitution. When a mob of cowboys hang a horse-thief they do a horrible and wicked thing; but the evil is less far-reaching than the evil done by a court that administers justice outside the law. With the backing of the Solicitor General the Court tears up the Constitution before our eyes and then reads us a lecture on our duty to obey all its decisions.

The Court boasts of its unanimity. The Court seems to be saying: "We so seldom agree among ourselves that when we do we must be right." Let us consider the relative importance of this unanimity. The Court cites *Bolling v. Sharpe*, the case in which it declared that the due process clause, adopted in 1791, forbids the Congress of the United States to establish segregated schools. While we are considering the importance of unanimity let us consider also the Court's admonition: "Every State legislator and executive and judicial officer is solemnly committed by oath taken pursuant to article VI, 3, 'to support this Constitution.'"

The same thing applies equally to every legislative, executive, and judicial officer of the United States. Prior to 1954, that oath was taken by many thousands of officeholders; by every President from Washington to Eisenhower, by every Supreme Court Justice, by John Marshall, by William Howard Taft, by James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner. It was taken by all the lower Federal court judges, by all the State judges, by all the lawyers, and all the notaries public. These countless thousands of oath-takers have disagreed among themselves on every subject that it is humanly possible to disagree about. The disagreements became so violent that one of the bloodiest wars in history was fought over one phase in the preamble of the Constitution. On one point, however, there was complete, perfect, and absolute unanimity. All agreed that the due-process clause did not require integrated public schools in the District of Columbia. Nobody even suggested such a thing. The Court pays no attention to the unanimity of millions and bids us be impressed by the unanimity of its nine members.

What is the true intent and meaning of the oath to support the Constitution? By article VI, the Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, are declared to be the supreme law of the land. A constitutional act of Congress is part of the supreme law, but an unconstitutional act of Congress is not. Judicial decisions are not mentioned in the Constitution as part of the fabric of the supreme law. The framers of the Constitution expected the Court to administer justice under law.

An act of Congress makes it a crime to remove a cigarette from the corner of a package without first breaking the revenue stamp. This law is beyond question the supreme law of the land. Fifty million loyal citizens break this commandment every day; and the Attorney General makes no effort to stop this widespread disregard of the supreme law of the land.

The oath to support the Constitution is an oath to support the Constitution. It is not an oath of obedience to the Congress or the Court. A judge does not violate his oath of office when he exceeds the speed limit on Pennsylvania Avenue. He does violate his oath of office when he pretends to believe that the framers of the 14th amendment intended it to give the Court authority to abolish segregation in the public schools. The judicial oath of office means that the judge will administer justice under law. It means that he will not substitute his notion of what the law ought to be for what he knows the law is. The oath to support the Constitution is an oath to support our Federal Government against all enemies—foreign and domestic. He who takes the oath cannot assist in overthrowing the governmental structure erected by the Constitution. If he sees wicked men pulling down the pillars of our Government it is his duty to resist. It is his duty to speak out.

The judges themselves sometimes recognize and perform this duty. Listen to the denunciation of the Court by Mr. Justice Douglas (with whom Warren and Black concurred) in *Yates v. United States* (Nov. 25, 1957): "This case to me is a shocking instance of the abuse of judicial authority."

He is not suggesting that his brethren made an honest mistake. A shocking abuse of authority is an international act, a wicked and dishonest act.

The Court makes many honest mistakes. The States are not free to decide which decisions of the Court they will obey. They must obey all decisions, however erroneous, that could be thought to be honestly erroneous. When, however, the Court is guilty of shocking abuse of authority, it is the duty of every man who has sworn to support the Constitution to do what he can to curb the Court.

The Constitution contains checks and balances designed to keep any man or group of men from destroying the framework of the Federal Union. One important check is the check that Congress is given over the Court. In every appealed case that it decides, the Court recognizes that it can decide the case only because Congress has affirmatively authorized it to do so. No case is heard by the Court until the appellant's lawyer points to a specific act of Congress giving the Court authority to decide the class of cases to which the case belongs.

Each Member of Congress has taken an oath to support the Constitution and each Member of Congress represents the people of a State. When the Court ceases to administer justice under law, the Congress has the power to curb it; and it is the duty of Congress to exercise that power. Congress can restore the balance of the Constitution by passing a statute depriving the Federal courts of jurisdiction over cases involving public schools. It is no longer possible to hope that the Court will change its mind but it is possible to hope that Congress will do its duty.

The great pity is that this most fundamental of constitutional questions is viewed by so many people as an emotional or moral problem rather than as a constitutional question. We are not talking about the totally different question of whether a colored child is happier and gets a better education at Maggie Walker than at Thomas Jefferson High School. The atmosphere of public discussion is as clouded by emotion as it was when the kindest and most benevolent New

England clergymen were raising funds to buy ammunition for John Brown to shoot white southerners with. I therefore despair of making my point so clear that anybody can see it who does not already agree with it.

Start with the incontestable fact that everybody without any exception during the 163 years between 1791 and 1954 was as certain that the due process clause did not keep Congress from maintaining separate schools in the District of Columbia as he was that 2 times 2 is 4. How do the Supreme Court Justices in their own minds get around that incontestable fact? They do it by saying to themselves that the framers of the Constitution meant by the due process clause to give the Justices the power and authority to decide from time to time, from decade to decade and from year to year, what is good and what is bad, and to declare null and void any act of Congress that they think is bad.

In the first place, no framer of the Constitution ever expressed any such view as that. In the second place, the framers carefully spelled out the powers of the Central Government and the things that they thought bad enough to be forbidden by the Constitution. These things were put in writing and agreed to by the people of all the States.

With respect to the powers of Congress in the District of Columbia the Constitution says that Congress shall have power "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District. . . ." There was no sense in putting all those things in writing if the net result was to be that the Court is empowered to decide from time to time and from decade to decade and from year to year what is good and what is bad. If that is the net result, we have no effective written Constitution; instead, we have a clean slate for the Court to write on as it sees fit; we have no supreme law; we have only a supreme group of nine men. That is a fix that the framers did not intend us to be in.

If the Members of Congress would think about this question as a constitutional question they would see the importance of it and get us out of that fix.

Current Trends in Business and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," written by George Shea, and published in the Wall Street Journal of January 19, 1959. The article deals with the subject of inflation and the grave dangers of inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

One of the great debates in Congress this year apparently will be on who's to blame for inflation. Some legislators will seek to prove it's all the fault of large corporations,

which they suggest are able to charge any prices they want and force the poor American public to pay them. Others blame the never-ending demands of unions for higher wages, which the monopoly power of the unions enables them to enforce.

A third group traces the whole thing to money and the Federal budget deficit. Perhaps a look at the figures related to this last factor will help determine the budget's role, and its relation to the other factors.

The Federal debt, latest figures show, is just under \$283 billion, an increase of \$8 billion from a year ago. If these \$8 billion of additional Government securities had been bought by individuals, nonbanking businesses, insurance companies and savings banks, that wouldn't have changed the Nation's money supply in any respect. The reason for this is that these people and institutions would have paid for the bonds with bank checks, which the U.S. Treasury would have redeposited in the banks. Bank deposits, of course, are part of the money supply.

However, that isn't the way the added bonds were bought. They were, in effect, bought in large part by the banks. When a bank buys a bond, it pays for it, in effect, by crediting the seller with a new bank deposit. This process has increased the Nation's money supply by a corresponding amount. The latest figures show the holdings of Government bonds by the commercial banks up some \$7 billion, and their demand deposits up close to \$4 billion. The \$3 billion difference between these last two totals appears to have been put by the depositors into savings-type deposits; these—with the added help of true cash savings—increased by \$7 billion in the commercial banks alone.

These increases in demand deposits—and in savings-type deposits which can be quite rapidly turned into demand deposits—provide the means whereby increased economic activity could be financed. The increase, in turn, could take the form of greater physical production and sales, or higher prices, or both.

The reason for this statement is that the growth in deposits took place in a year when there was, in net terms, just about no growth in economic activity. At first a recession pulled down the total activity, then a recovery pulled it back up again, but not to the old high. And prices rose negligibly during the year.

Of course, this is all an oversimplification. An unchanged level of deposits can be used more actively by turning it over faster, and that would permit the same increases in economic activity as would an increased total of deposits with no gain in turnover. Or ample deposits can at times be accompanied by a persistent slack in economic activity—as happened in the New Deal years before World War II—because the people lack the confidence needed for enterprise.

But the point is that a steady growth in deposits through the years does provide the means whereby, under reasonably favorable conditions, economic activity will increase both physically and in terms of prices. And the current situation is undoubtedly conducive to wage rises and price rises as long as the physical volume of business done holds steady or improves.

No union leader can afford to stop demanding wage increases from time to time, unless business in his industry is flat on its back. If he does, he'll soon stop being a union leader. And with compensation of employees accounting for 70 percent of national income, and close to 60 percent of gross national output, it is obvious that pay increases must be translated into price increases.

In turn, no business can refuse to give wage increases as long as there is enough money around so customers can and will

pay for the price increases. In effect, when anyone (in the Government or outside of it) asks unions and businessmen to exercise restraint on prices and wages, he is asking them to behave as if business were bad.

They can no more act in this fashion in a free system than they can turn a depression into a recovery by producing more goods than the customers will buy. That just isn't the way things happen, because it isn't the way businesses can keep out of bankruptcy. The best service successful unions and successful businesses can perform for the Nation—within the limits that are or should be set by law—is to stay in business.

The Government is almost equally helpless to prevent the growth in the supply of money which permits these things to happen. The Eisenhower administration says it's going to do its best to reduce expenditures in the fiscal year starting next July below the total spent in the current fiscal year. But the one downward step it is trying to take is as nothing in comparison with the higher spending steps which it and its predecessors have taken through the years.

If it tried to do more, the screams of protest would be deafening, not just from Democratic politicians and voters, but from the politicians and voters of the President's own party. The American people are like the proverbial spendthrift women in a department store, so intrigued by the many goodies they can see that they want them all, regardless of cost.

The writer heard this attitude well illustrated once in a line of people waiting to vote. Two items proposed by the State's governor were a veterans' bonus and a tax to pay for it. Said one man: "What's the point in getting a bonus if I'm taxed more? I'm going to vote for the bonus and against the tax." And, sure enough, the bonus passed and the tax failed.

There lies the blame for inflation.

Economic Integrity: The Hope for a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, Mr. Lee P. Miller, the distinguished president of the Citizens Fidelity Bank & Trust Co., of Louisville, Ky., is the president of the American Bankers Association for this year. Mr. Miller is one of the Nation's outstanding bankers, and one of the keenest contemporary students of the economic problems which challenge our country. As president of the American Bankers Association, he is traveling to all parts of the Nation, addressing important and influential groups of community leaders.

In November of last year he spoke in Tucson, before the Arizona Bankers Association. In his able address he alerted this group to the danger of potential inflationary developments in this country. He condensed the remarks which he made in Tucson into an article, which appeared in *Kentucky Business* for January 1959, entitled "Economic Integrity: The Hope for a Free World." *Kentucky Business* is the monthly publication of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce. I

commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues. I point out that Mr. Miller has been a lifelong Democrat. I ask unanimous consent that the article appear along with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ECONOMIC INTEGRITY: THE HOPE FOR A FREE WORLD

(By Lee P. Miller, president, American Bankers Association)

The world is watching us. People all over the globe—in the free world, in the uncommitted countries, and behind the Iron Curtain—are observing each scene in the drama of American democracy; and certain it is that the election of a few days ago will be the basis for much analysis and comment by our friends, as well as our enemies.

The period just after a national election is always a season for sober reflection by both the victors and the defeated. Then the excitement generated by the political campaign and the voting simmers down, and the people and their institutions knuckle down to the job ahead of them. There may be disagreements over what should be done, or how it should be done; but our democratic process does find a way of pointing out the Nation's efforts toward major objectives. As the smoke of the election battle clears away, therefore, we can focus our sights once again upon our overriding objectives of peace and survival in an environment of freedom. In these objectives, we are joined by those all over the world who look to us for moral, political, and economic leadership.

The banks of this country perform functions that are essential to the preservation of that leadership. It is appropriate, therefore, that I should call to your attention the challenge to banking set forth by the resolutions committee of the American Bankers Association at the recent annual convention in Chicago.

The emphasis of the report was on the responsibility of all Americans in seeking lasting national security through military strength, economic vitality, and world leadership. The committee described three requirements which I believe should be clearly understood by every citizen and by those representing groups of citizens in government and other organizations. These requirements are:

1. A vigorous and growing economy, free from threats of serious inflation or deflation which sap economic vitality and hinder progress, and in which price stability is recognized as essential to maximum employment and prosperity.
2. A proper balance between the requirements of national security and our desire for better living standards.
3. The sacrifice of partisan interest and group pressures in favor of the broad national welfare, so that economic stability and growth can be fostered while still insuring the basic freedom of the individual to make his own decisions.

As president of the American Bankers Association this year, I believe it is my duty to see that our entire membership fully appreciates the job we have to do in carrying forward the message of our Nation's needs for lasting security against aggression. As the financial leaders in our communities, each one of us must be willing to accept the responsibility for helping the people to understand how the vitality of our Nation must be preserved to win the battle for survival.

The stakes in this battle for survival are not ours alone. The world is watching us. People abroad know that the strength of the American economy is the pivot point around which revolve the hopes for continued su-

periority over those who would destroy freedom and the dignity of man.

The American people—and especially those representing them in government and other organizations—would do well to heed the lessons we have preached to other nations since World War II. To country after country of Europe, Latin America, and elsewhere in the world, our spokesmen from political parties on both sides of the aisle have emphasized the necessity of economic integrity. They have stressed the need for sound money, fiscal sanity, and other governmental policies that encourage solid national growth rather than stagnation.

Today the shoe is on the other foot. The foreign press is taking increasing note of the recent growth of inflationary sentiment in this country, and leaders in their governments are drawing attention to the importance of our economic stability for the strength of the free world.

In recent years, this country has had a remarkable growth. Our tremendous resources have permitted us to increase our national output rapidly. We have become accustomed to prosperity and the expectation of a constantly rising standard of living. Even in relative terms, the words "austerity" and "sacrifice" seem to have been lost from the American dictionary. We have joined battle after battle in the cold and lukewarm wars since World War II; but, except in the early stages of the Korean conflict, there has been little inclination to accept the wisdom and necessity of any belt tightening whatsoever.

Just a year ago, the reality of a missile race was thrust upon us. It is interesting to observe how suddenly and dramatically the temper of political leaders shifted. Before then there were significant pressures for economy in government. The administration was being criticized for failure to achieve a better balance in the budget and for failure to cut both expenditures and taxes. But when the battle of satellites and missiles was joined last October, the tide shifted. Many of those who previously had criticized Government military spending became even more vocal in a charge that we had not been spending enough to keep even or ahead of the Russians.

Despite the demagogery and political haranguing, our people rallied to answer the challenge posed by missiles and other developments in space science dramatized by the Sputniks. Yet it is hard to believe that, in the face of this challenge, little attention was paid to the economic responsibilities it imposed. As a matter of fact, even as plans were being formulated for an intensification of our defense efforts along these lines, pressures for a reduction in taxes had to be fought off.

Our Nation finds itself in a situation where a deficit of some \$12 billion in the Federal budget can be expected in the current fiscal year. No other figure in many a year has had as much effect on the thinking and attitudes of people as the size of this deficit in its dramatic contrast with the President's budget of last January. It seems to be saying that we have been unwilling to seek a balance between the requirements of national security and the desire for better living standards.

The change in the budget situation has been accompanied by an equally dramatic and pervasive change toward inflationary psychology. The deficit is being widely interpreted as a symbol of inflation. On most other grounds, however, concern over inflation is unfounded. Our economic machine has tremendous productive capacity that is not being used to the fullest extent. Production is the only answer to demand, whether military or civilian. It is the only base upon which to build a higher standard of living, and it is the only way that the physical demands of national security and strength can be met.

If production, then, is the final answer to our problem of national security, we cannot afford to tolerate interference with its effectiveness. This is the crucial point at which the threat of inflation comes into play. If the budgetary situation is interpreted as a symbol of inflation, its impact upon the ability of our productive machine to operate with increasing efficiency cannot be ignored. One might well pose the question whether the distortions already created by past inflationary pressures are not, to a significant degree, responsible for the fact that some sectors are now operating below capacity.

With a yardstick before us that says we are doing a poor job, we must redouble our efforts to return the Federal budget to a basis consistent with economic stability and the avoidance of inflation. In the words of the resolutions committee, "A continuing Federal deficit under the inflationary conditions is unconscionable."

Organized banking, speaking through the American Bankers Association and other organizations, has repeatedly voiced its support of flexible monetary and credit policies. Yet we would be shortsighted if we were to stop there. It is one thing to accept a banking environment created for us by prevailing monetary policy. It is another to interpret that environment constructively through policies and actions that contribute to its effectiveness toward attaining the goals of economic stability and growth. The policies of every banker—indeed every lender—are daily being put to the test. They involve the fundamental question whether credit is being used to foster national security in the long run, or whether it is being employed as an instrument of instability, retarding economic growth and progress and thus weakening our national security.

In the administration of our credit policies, therefore, we bankers must take the lead in combatting inflationary psychology. It should continue to be clear to us that inflation in the future is not inevitable, as some irresponsible elements would have the public believe.

On every occasion, in dealing with those who seek to use our credit resources and those with whom we have contact in so many other ways, we should express our faith in the ability to conquer the inflation fears that have had a rebirth in recent months.

In conclusion, may I emphasize that this is a time that calls for leadership—not leadership from above, but a leadership movement through which the message of our needs for survival can be carried forward by local people in every community of our Nation. We must work for good government and sensible policies in the interest of our national welfare. This requires active participation by community leaders in the formulation of laws and in the development of public understanding of our Nation's problems. We bankers are among those leaders. In these challenging times, we must not shirk our responsibility to work conscientiously, through our representatives in Federal and local legislatures, for sound legislation not only in the financial field, but in other areas close to the broad public interest.

Stable Dollar a Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article written by financial writer Sylvia Porter entitled "Stable Dollar a Goal?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STABLE DOLLAR A GOAL?

(By Sylvia Porter)

With a single sentence in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower last week set the stage for congressional debate on one of the great economic questions of the postwar era—whether protection of the dollar's buying power should be a prime goal of national policy.

Today, through the Employment Act of 1946, we declare that the three major economic goals are: Maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

But, today there is no law saying dollar-stability also is an objective of policy. There is no law which declares it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to promote this stability.

Yet, today one of the greatest threats to our dollar is a spreading psychology of inflation—a growing belief that nothing can be done or will be done to keep the dollar's value from dwindling.

ACTION IS URGED

Responsible authorities have for months been urging the administration and Congress to do more about inflation than "view with alarm." The day after the November elections I reported to you that the new heavily Democratic Congress would be the first in history to tackle the problem of inflation in peacetime, and that it would debate amending the Employment Act to add reasonable price stability as a fourth national economic goal.

Now Mr. Eisenhower has put it on the line. "I shall," he said in his state of the Union message, "ask Congress to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make it clear that Government intends to use all appropriate means to protect the buying power of the dollar."

Everything he will say about a balanced budget, tax reform, farm legislation, spending cuts, etc., will come down to this question to you: "Do you really care enough about price stability to make it a key goal?"

Of course, saying that the dollar's buying power should be protected and maintained won't protect and maintain it. But the debate about price stability will, in itself, be valuable because it will force attention to the causes of inflation.

The arguments themselves will impress upon your consciousness the fact that in this era, the tendency is for prices to rise during phases of expansion, but not to fall during cycles of recession.

The pros and cons of the legislation will compel you to realize that if we're not to cure inflation by encouraging business slumps, we had better figure out better ways to control our own economic system.

And if the goal is written into law, the warning will be clear to powers in business and in labor that if the leapfrog of prices and wages continues, Congress will take positive steps to restrain the spiral.

POSSIBILITIES OUTLINED

The background will be created against which Congress can consider new restrictions on monopolies in business and labor, the creation of watchdog commissions to report to the Nation on inflationary price-wage moves.

The country will be prepared for—will be ready for—moves that will develop and coordinate economic and monetary policies at the national level so that expansion is encouraged; inflation is discouraged.

There will be plenty of opposition to the amendment—that's already clear. Many opponents fear that once price stability is put on the books as a policy goal, some in Gov-

ernment will try to make it the goal, will try to place it ahead of maximum employment, production, income. Others fear that the amendment will be used as an excuse for reimposition of dreaded direct controls over prices and wages.

Neither fear convinces me. As a Nation, we've made it obvious that if the choice is between maximum employment-production incomes and a stable dollar, we'll take the maximum employment-production income. No one who believes in this system wants peacetime price and wage controls.

The amendment would be an invitation to find solutions to the control of inflation in a period of prosperity. We can do it. We've conquered bigger problems than this.

The Political Relevance of Moral Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, January 18, 1959, I was among the 4,000 persons gathered in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., to hear the first annual A. Powell Davies memorial address which was delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois.

I had the great privilege of serving for nearly a year on the staff of Governor Stevenson during 1956 when he was a candidate for the presidency of the United States. I came to know Governor Stevenson and to develop a profound respect for his deep dedication to the cause of human freedom and for his conviction that America is called to give great leadership in that cause.

It is my belief that the moving and eloquent words of Governor Stevenson, one of our Nation's foremost statesmen, should be considered and heeded by the membership of Congress as well as by every thoughtful citizen in our country.

I should like therefore to insert in the RECORD the text of Governor Stevenson's address:

THE POLITICAL RELEVANCE OF MORAL PRINCIPLE

I am profoundly flattered by your invitation to inaugurate these annual lectures in memory of Dr. A. Powell Davies. It is an honor to be asked to help in any way in the commemoration of a man so eminently worthy of being remembered. But it is hard indeed to pay adequate homage in words to a man whose own words were so fresh, so apt and fitting to the important issues of the day.

But I am encouraged by one fact. Dr. Davies did not feel that his office as a minister of religion debarred him from comment upon contemporary problems. On the contrary, he saw that he could make his message relevant to his people only by showing it at work in the concrete issues of their daily lives.

I think of a story my grandfather Stevenson, a devout Scotch-Presbyterian of southern descent, told about the preacher who was driving along a back road when he espied a parishioner wearily clearing up a poor, stony field. "That's a fine job you and the Lord have done cleaning up that rocky

field," he shouted. "Thank you, parson," the man replied. "I wish you could have seen it when the Lord had it all to himself."

Dr. Davies believed that God is dependent on man, as man is on God. He believed that the clergy above all were responsible for making a reality of the bond between God and man, and he was fearless in letting his congregation and the world know the truth as he saw it. He had a sensitive awareness of peril to the individual in our day of bigness, of statism and conformity. Therefore he was impelled to fight for the oppressed and the persecuted; to fight for equal justice for all and the rights inherent in our citizenship. Ardently he defended freedom of the mind, free speech, the right of the dissenter to speak and the duty of the conformist to listen. And his compassion was boundless.

It was the tardiness of the American social conscience in understanding the severity of its ordeal with authoritarianism that made Dr. Davies impatient, that made him work so hard to awaken us to the perils. He literally wore himself out trying to mobilize public opinion and induce every American to hold himself personally responsible for the preservation of freedom.

From the mountain of vision, Dr. Davies constantly proclaimed the political relevance of moral principle and of religion as a judgment of righteousness. From the dusty plain of politics I would like in my turn to reaffirm this relevance. I like to believe that there may be some value in echoing testimony from a layman who has spent his middle life in the press and confusion of great events in government service, in diplomacy and in politics.

All politics is made up of many things—economic pressures, personal ambitions, the desire to exercise power, the overriding issues of national need and aspiration. But if it is nothing more, it is without roots. It is built on shifting, changing sands of emotion and interest. When challenged, it can give no account of itself. When threatened, it is in danger of collapse.

Today, when the threat and challenge to free society seem more total and powerful than ever before, it is not a political luxury or fruitless pedantry to reexamine our fundamental principles. I think it more likely to be the condition of survival.

There is a phrase of Dr. Davies' that stays in my mind. I do not know when I have heard a more terse and pregnant summing up of our predicament. "The world," he said, "is now too dangerous for anything but the truth, too small for anything but brotherhood." This I believe to be in broad measure a correct estimate of the condition of human society, which is now capable, with a few hydrogen bombs, of extinguishing itself. Today we can all be killed by the same bombs or atomic fallout. In that sense we have a desperate physical solidarity. But moral and social solidarity in the family of man is still to be found.

No so long ago I visited Dr. Albert Schweitzer in his primitive jungle hospital in French Equatorial Africa, and he told me he considered this the most dangerous period in history, not just modern history, but all human history. Why? Because, he said, heretofore nature has controlled man, but now man has learned to control elemental forces before he has learned to control himself.

Many of us seem to rely on some mythical God-given superiority of the white Western World to save us. And my concern is that there is more evidence that the Communists accept the reality of the human condition than we do.

It is impossible to spend weeks traveling around the Soviet Union as I did this summer without taking away an overwhelming impression of thrust and purpose in most aspects of Soviet life. The revolutionary

ardor has cooled with time, but even the very pragmatic political leaders seems to believe profoundly in the truth of their way of life, and they are quietly confident that it will sweep the world in time. I think they sincerely believe that their methods, their aspirations, their dreams, make up the final truth about the nature of man and society; that collective man in the collective state is the ultimate unfolding of human destiny, the end of history, the far-off divine event for which mankind has been in long travail, the vision of all things made new that has haunted men's minds ever since Christianity thrust into human thought the intoxicating ideal of a perfected humanity.

From this conviction, if I have not overstated it, flow two consequences. The first is that no effort, no dedication, no sacrifice is too great that may help to realize the Communist Party's goals in Soviet society. The second is that no corner of humanity can be a matter of indifference to the Communists, because the whole human race is destined to become one in Communist brotherhood.

These are not abstract generalizations. Russia is a vast powerhouse of energy all harnessed to the communal task of building the Soviet dream. The thrust of economic growth which adds a 9- or 10-percent increase each year to industrial expansion is one aspect of this energy. The vast sums available for science and research are another. The self-discipline and long hours put in by school children to train themselves as the scientists, technicians, administrators and linguists of the new world order are perhaps the most significant measure of the resources of energy, work, and skill upon which Soviet leaders hope to draw. In Moscow, Serge Obraztsov, the brilliant director of the famous Puppet Theater, said: "I visited China 5 years ago. It was the most extraordinary experience of my life. People in China have had nothing—nothing. Now several hundred million people are dreaming of tomorrow. I cannot describe to you the feeling of excitement there—much, much more even than here in the Soviet Union."

The energy, the drive, the dedication in the U.S.S.R. spill over into international affairs. In part, of course, this is the restless concern which all imperial powers must exercise, especially when the peoples they control are as restive and unreliable as the captive peoples in Russia's European empire. But Communist activity, planning and efforts in trade and aid are not confined to areas of Communist control. They are worldwide, and there is no corner of the earth's surface which they think too insignificant for their attention. While trade missions are busy in Latin America trading Soviet machinery and oil for coffee and wool, academic representatives are touring West Africa, Arab and Asian students are being trained in Moscow, technical advisers dispatched to India and Burma and Indonesia, and the glossy flood of propaganda depicting the Soviet millennium of bumper harvests and happy workers is pumped out all round the world.

All this we know or begin to know. But I wonder how often we try to grasp the scale of dedication that lies behind it. Why should they be so busy? Why so much work and thought? Why such diversion of resources? Why such patience through every setback, such forward thrusts through every point of Western weakness? Heaven knows, we only want to stay home. Why don't they? Why do we never meet an isolationist Communist? These are the questions that haunted me while I confronted at firsthand this iron, forceful, and formidable way of life.

And I don't think there is any doubt about the answer. Part of it is simply needed for foreign trade. Part is fear, the search for secu-

city through friends. And part is the historical centrifugal forces in Russia that have been pressing outward for a 100 years—to the Pacific, the Balkans, and the Middle East. But the important thing is that the Soviet Russians believe in their truth, as the men of the Western World once believed in theirs. They, not we, are firing the shots that are heard 'round the world, and also the satellites that orbit above it. The fact that their faith is in many ways an evil perversion of the great propositions that once made the blood course in our Western veins does not alter the fact that their tempo is dynamic and ours sluggish, even, I think, to ourselves.

The reason cannot be that we Americans have lost our vision of truth and brotherhood. No country on earth owes the sense of community more explicitly to the fact that it is united not by race or nationality but by fidelity to an idea. We were born dedicated to a proposition and our greatest leaders—the Jeffersons, the Lincolns, the Woodrow Wilsons—were not great because they achieved purely American purposes, but because they were able to speak for humanity at large and extend their vision to the whole family of man.

Nor, I believe, can we find fault with the American dream. Its truths are still self-evident. The possession of liberty and the pursuit of happiness—rightly understood—have not been overthrown as the highest goods of human society. Indeed, the ferment of our freedom works inexorably and dangerously in the Communist world. No one can have visited Poland without seeing how little the Polish people accept their servitude and how they look beyond their neighbors to the free world as the reservoir of power and hope.

But, alas, on the basis of the record, one would hardly suspect that the Western World possessed so powerful a weapon. All our talk—in diplomacy, in strategy, in aid and trade, in all the intricacies of our worldwide relations—has been to a depressing degree purely defensive. We have offered aid not to help others but to shield ourselves. We have reacted to countless Soviet initiatives; acted on our own initiative barely at all. We watch the skies for other people's sputniks and listen to the telegraph wires for other people's moves. Yet we are the free men of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequalled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man.

Why this lack of initiative? Why this paralysis of will? What have we done to our truth and our brotherhood, the supreme truth of freedom, the Christian truth of brotherly love? Have they failed? Or have we?

There is no more urgent duty than to discover why we have failed and to get back into the arena, aspiring, striving, fighting once more for what we believe. An examination of what you might call our collective conscience is to my mind far more important than particular projects or programs. You can have a perfect assembly of pieces for your watch, but they are worthless if the mainspring is broken. I am not basically worried about our various pieces—our technology, our science, our machines, our resources. But I am concerned, desperately concerned, about our mainspring. That it has run down, we know. But is it broken beyond repair? In the last analysis, no question is worth more consideration in America today.

And I would like to suggest some of the ways in which it seems to me we have enfeebled the great central pulse of our freedom, the great truth of liberty, which, more than any other nation, we first set working in the modern world.

The great German poet, Goethe, who also lived through a crisis of freedom, said to his generation: "What you have inherited from your fathers, earn over again for yourselves

or it will not be yours." We inherited freedom. We seem unaware that it has to be remade and reearned in each generation of man. One reason for this failure is, I believe, passing at last. In recent years we were stifled with complacent self-confidence. We believed ourselves dominant in every field. We talked of the American century. We forgot the ardors and efforts that had given us a measure of preeminence. Complacency made us impervious to ideas, even the obvious idea that we are in danger. So we assumed that all we needed was to sit still and enjoy the peace and prosperity that was our right.

I believe that phase is passing. Our foolish languor has been shaken, if not shattered. We are more ready to examine ourselves and our record. And it is a privilege of our society that every citizen should make his own inquiry. If I stress one or other aspect of our problem, this is simply my angle of vision. You have yours. The urgent thing is to feel the need for rethinking and to set to work the ultimate energies of free society, which cannot be done by the fiat of government but only by the troubled conscience of responsible men and women.

It is simply as a citizen as concerned as you are that I want to suggest what seems to me to be the obstacles to a full understanding of our great mission in this time of testing.

I believe—as I have said before—that we have confused the free with the free and easy. If freedom had been the happy, simple, relaxed state of ordinary humanity, man would have everywhere been free—whereas through most of time and space he has been in chains. Do not let us make any mistake about this. The natural government of man is servitude. Tyranny is the normal pattern of government. It is only by intense thought, by great effort, by burning idealism and unlimited sacrifice that freedom has prevailed as a system of government. And the efforts which were first necessary to create it are fully as necessary to sustain it in our own day.

He who offers this thing we call freedom as the soft option is a deceiver or himself deceived. He who sells it cheap or offers it as the byproduct of this or that economic system is knave or fool. For freedom demands infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in the place of command and obedience. By relying upon the devotion and initiative of ordinary citizens, it gives up the harsh but effective disciplines that underpin all the tyrannies which over the millennia have stunted the full stature of men.

But of what use is escape from external restraint if, given the opportunity, men simply stunt themselves? If freedom means ease alone, if it means shirking the hard disciplines of learning, if it means evading the rigors and rewards of creative activity, if it means more expenditure on advertising than education, if it means bachelor cooking and life adjustment courses in the schools, and the steady cult of the trivial and the mediocre, if it means—worst of all—indifference or even contempt for all but athletic excellence, we may keep for a time the forms of free society, but its spirit will be dead.

I believe we have had enough of adjustment, conformity, easy options and the least common denominator in our system. We need instead to see the pursuit of happiness in terms which are historically proven and psychologically correct. The dreary failure in history of all classes committed to pleasure and profit alone, the vacuity and misery accompanying the sole pursuit of ease—the collapse of the French aristocracy, the corruption of Imperial Rome, the decline and fall of the resplendent Manchus—all these facts of history do not lose their point because the pleasures of today are mass pleasures and no longer the enjoyments of an

elite. If we become a nation of Bourbons, numbers won't save us. We shall go their way. Vacuity and indifference are not redeemed by the fact that everyone can share in them. They merely restrict the circle from which regeneration can come.

I say this in no puritan or pleasure-hating spirit. On the contrary, there is no boredom or misery to equal the pursuit of distraction alone. We do not slip into happiness. It is strenuously sought and earned. A nation glued to the television screen is not simply at a loss before the iron pioneers of the new collective society. It isn't even having a good time. No society has ever spent as much as we do on drink and tranquilizers. Can one argue that this is evidence of universal fun? I ran across a quotation of LaBruyere on the court of Louis XIV that struck me as relevant: "Les joies sont visibles, mais fausses, et les chagrins cachés, mais réels"—its joys are visible, but artificial, and its sorrows hidden, but real.

But perhaps this misunderstanding of the true nature of happiness, and of the conditions of its pursuit is simply an aspect of something else—our misunderstanding of the real nature of freedom. I recall the words of the wise Judge Learned Hood, who warned us that freedom would not survive in our Constitution if it had already died in the hearts of the people. We shall not have a free society unless we have freemen.

And how often do we reflect upon what this inner freedom entails? "Give me the man," cries Hamlet, "who is not passion's slave." But this is what we are in danger of becoming, slaves to a tyranny more intimate and inescapable than any Stalin or Mao Tse-tung could impose. We can be made slaves simply by the clutter and complexity of modern living which notoriously leaves no time for serious thought and offers every means of distraction so that we can avoid such thought. Between aircraft that take us everywhere more rapidly, newspapers that grow in weight and coverage, news that flashes round the globe, ceaseless and competitive entertainment fashions—God help us—that change from sack to trapeze and back again, we can fill up every unforgiving minute with enough trash and preoccupation to still forever the deeper voices of the soul. Like Matthew Arnold, we can

... see all sights from pole to pole,
And glance and nod and bustle by.
And never once possess our soul
Before we die."

How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control we substitute the clattering, clattering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss? This freedom for our souls, freedom at the profoundest level of our being, is not a gift to us by our contemporary way of life. On the contrary, much of this life is a direct conspiracy against it. And if we cannot—by a certain discipline, by readiness for reflection and quiet, by determination to do the difficult and aim at a lasting good—rediscover the real purpose and direction of our existence, we shall not be free. Our society will not be free. And between a chaotic, selfish, indifferent, commercial society and the iron discipline of the Communist world, I would not like to predict the outcome. Outer tyranny with purpose may well triumph over the inner, purposeless tyranny of a confused and aimless way of life.

I doubt if any society in history has faced so great a moral challenge as ours, or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest source of courage and responsibility. Ours is the first human community in which resources are so abundant that almost no policies lie beyond our capacity for purely physical reasons. What we decide to do, we can do. The inhibitions of poverty—lack of resources, lack of capital, lack of power—do not hold us back. We can accomplish what we aim at. Thus, perhaps for the first time in

the world, choice, not means, ends, not instruments, are decisive.

Then again we have proved—drably and dangerously—over the last decade that defensiveness is not a sufficient reason for action. All the policies we have pursued in self-defense have left us still on the defensive. But if we do not act from fear, we must find some other motivation. In free society there is no other alternative but to tap the vigor, faith, and imagination of the people themselves. We must find out once more who we are, as the psychologists say. And I would earnestly appeal especially to the women of America to organize an Operation Wisdom and to lead the way to a new self-examination and self-discipline.

But perhaps the most urgent reason why the quality of our moral response has become the decisive issue in politics is quite simply that most of the major problems of our day present themselves in moral terms, and are probably insoluble without some stirring of generosity, some measure of vision. Let me give you three instances. In the wealthiest nation in the world, at least 5 million families still live in squalid but remediable poverty. They are a minority. They don't have the votes to force the issue of their misfortune into the front rank of public issues. They depend, for remedies, upon the alert conscience of the majority. But how do we keep the conscience sensitive and alert? By concentrating on our own concerns and adding the dishwasher to the television set to the air conditioner? By griping over taxes and attacking that great bogey we call the welfare state? By closing our minds every time our shiny car takes us through a slum? No, we shall have the dedication and drive to wipe poverty out of this rich land only if the well-to-do majority of today do not repeat the selfish indifference which, in many communities, has been the epitaph of yesterday's wealthy elite.

Or take the issue of the rights and status of our colored citizens. This is our small share of a worldwide problem. The 400 years' dominance of men of white skin is ending. The vast colored majority of mankind are seeking the opportunity and the respect which white people have been lucky enough to enjoy for so long—sometimes at the colored people's expense. But, within this worldwide crisis, we in America, with our colored minority, have a major role to play—for good or evil. The unfinished work which Lincoln left us, of creating a society in which all men can hold up their heads as equals and self-respecting citizens, can never be accomplished unless there are enough white men and women who resist in the core of their being the moral evil of treating any of God's children as essentially inferior.

Nor is this simply a question of our own national community. I come back to the painful fact that the Communists show a worldwide concern which is largely lacking among the men of the West. The whole human race is their horizon. Their brotherhood is materialist, collectivist, atheist, and we dislike it, but it embraces everybody, and it is the framework of policies which take the missionaries of their new order to the ends of the earth. I say with all the emphasis I can command that we have no corresponding commitment to our fellow men. For hundreds of years, we have preached the Christian promise of brotherhood, but today, when vanishing space and scientific revolution have turned our planet into a single neighborhood, the ideal means little in terms of concern or conviction, in terms of policy or action.

Here we are in the Atlantic world, 16 percent of the world's peoples consuming 70 percent of the world's wealth. We cannot be indifferent to the moral implications of this gap. I do not know how we can gain a new perspective about the narrow world of

plenty and poverty in which we live unless moral insights of justice and compassion stir us to understand the privileged position in which we live.

We are not going to be stirred to action by our own needs. We are the cushioned, protected, fortunate minority. It is not the measure of our morals or the lesson of our history to be spurred on only by fear of Russian encroachments. What we have done has largely had this motivation, and it has left us on the defensive. Our hope is to accept the implications of our own faith, make concrete the image of brotherhood which we profess, and set to work to express our dedication in whatever effort or sacrifice the world's needs may dictate. And, if we must always think in terms of contest with the Soviets, the ability to create the good life for the greatest number will be decisive.

This age has been defined in many ways—as a time of conflict in ideology, as a time of ferment in technology, as a period of revolution in science, as an era when at last the means lie at hand to free mankind from the ancient shackles of pain and hunger. It is all these things, but I believe the true crisis of our times lies at a deeper level. We have indeed conquered means and resources unknown to earlier ages. We have had thrown open to us frontiers of choice which would leave earlier ages stupefied by their scale and scope.

But all this freedom and elbow room only thrusts onto us with more force the fundamental issue of the faith that is in us. We can use our wealth and capacity for some vision of truth, some ideal of brotherhood, or we can imprison ourselves within the selfishness of our own concerns and the limitations of a narrow nationhood. This is the dimension of our crisis.

You may argue that these qualities—of dedication and selflessness—are pretty remote from the realities of politics. They are all very well for private life, but what part can they play in the rough and tumble of partisanship, of primaries, conventions, and election campaigns? Ambition, drive, material interests, political skills, the art of maneuver—all these, you say, have their part, but do not let us pretend that the democratic process is primarily a school of virtue or an arena of moral combat.

And yet, I wonder. It has been the view of great philosophers and great statesmen that our system of free government depends in the first instance upon the virtue of its citizens. Montesquieu made virtue the condition of republican government; Washington declared that it could not survive without it. We have had 175 years of it since their time and no one can deny that the system has survived a remarkable amount of skulduggery. In fact, it is probably a tougher system than its founders imagined. Yet I believe they are right. For no democratic system can survive without at least a large and active leaven of citizens in whom dedication and selflessness are not confined to private life but are the fundamental principles of their activity in the public sphere.

Naked interest and naked ambition will carry a lot of people naturally and inevitably into politics. We do not need societies for the promotion of lobbies. Interests, good and bad, will promote themselves. Nor, in any generation do we lack politicians whose only principle of action is the advancement of their own career—the starry-eyed opportunists and all the other eager men in a hurry to the top. But into what state must politics degenerate if that is all we find active in the political arena? That any sectional interests played upon by personal ambitions? There have been such periods—the roaring nineties, the time from Harding to the Wall Street crash—but our democratic

system survived because such epochs were followed and cleansed by periods of disinterested reform.

But there has never been any disinterested reform without disinterested reformers. And here we come to the essential contribution made by dedication and selflessness to the public good. No one ever did any good in politics without readiness for endless hard work, for the grinding, boring, tedious work, as well as the glamorous, high sounding, headline-biting work. The painstaking hours collecting the facts, the hours in committee and conference, the hours in persuasion and argument, the hours of defeat and disappointment, the hours of disgust and revulsion at the darker sides of human behavior—these cannot be supported without energy and devotion. No reforms come easy; even the most obvious will have its entrenched enemies. Each one is carried to us on the bent and weary backs of patient, dedicated men and women.

They are not only dedicated in their readiness to give energy and hard work to the cause; they must also have sufficiently clear sight and open minds and hearts to see the need for reform in the first place. But clear sight and an open heart for others' needs is again something that hardly comes naturally. We have so many needs of our own; our families, our jobs, our homes, and fortunes, our prospects. We are hemmed in with needs and interests, weighty, urgent, honorable, human needs and interests, even if they are exclusively our own. It takes an extra dimension of vision to see beyond our inner circle of interest. Most people, most of the time, do not possess it—which is one reason why self-regarding interests make up so much of the stuff of politics. And this, I suppose, is why the men and women of genuine, imperturbable public spirit seem so few and far between.

I sometimes think there is a danger of this element of vision vanishing almost wholly from our political life. In the main we are so comfortable; so many evils of the past have shrunk in size and almost out of sight. At the same time, people marry much younger, have larger families, and are profoundly involved in earning a living, making careers, and safeguarding the future of their children. It is more difficult, they say, to give time to public affairs when private life is so urgent and absorbing.

Yet is it, I wonder, more urgent and absorbing than a hundred years ago when young men not only married young, had large families, and built up careers, but also opened up the new frontiers, created new cities from the wilderness, and gave to new States and communities the framework of active political life?

If one reads the life of young Abe Lincoln, it is hard to believe that his struggles as a young lawyer and his difficulties as a young parent were less than those of young men today. Yet there was no time when the deepest issues of the day did not occupy his mind or the call of statecraft make itself heard above the claims and clamor of everyday life. Nor was he alone or exceptional. Stephen A. Douglas' life was no different. The prairie towns were filled with earnest, active citizens deeply, profoundly concerned with the great issues of a nation "half slave, half free." When the multitudes gathered, a hundred years ago, to listen in rapt attention for hours to the Lincoln-Douglas debates, had they fewer responsibilities and duties than the citizens of today to many of whom the great issues of politics seem to be most usefully conveyed in 15-second television flashes of subliminal advertising?

It is not possible that the pressures of personal responsibilities are not greater but that the dedication and selflessness needed to discern and influence public issues have

shrunk? In a century in which so many of the mentors of the public mind—from the psychiatrists to the admen—speak to us in terms of what we owe to ourselves, may there not indeed have been a slackening of devotion compared with those days, not so long distant, when what man owes to God and his neighbor was a common theme of public discourse?

If so, this is a dangerous hour for our politics and for government by consent of the governed. For at no time have so many of the great issues of the day demanded clear, real moral vision to bring them into focus—the vision of A. Powell Davies, who loved the truth and believed in man's capacity and right to govern himself.

Visit to the Senate by Students From Ursuline Academy, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, one of the first groups of students to visit the Nation's Capitol during 1959 was a group from the city of New Orleans, La., representing the Ursuline Academy. This group took advantage of their presence here to further their studies on government and to learn many of the procedures which are followed by the Nation's lawmakers in handling the many complex problems that face us today.

The Ursuline Academy, which is staffed by an order of Roman Catholic nuns that was founded in 1535 for the purpose of the education of young girls, was established in New Orleans in 1727 and has enjoyed through the years the unique distinction of being the oldest educational institution for the education of girls within the present limits of the United States.

The Ursuline Academy has been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools since 1926. At present, 822 students attend the school. This is the largest enrollment in its history. The graduating class will number 96 this year. Two of the girls who visited the Capitol, Peggy Hanemann and Linda Teijelo, are merit scholarship winners.

The Ursuline nuns are very closely connected with the history of New Orleans and hold a very important place in the development of the city. A great many of the fine young women graduates have records of splendid achievement down through the long history of the school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the names of the students of Ursuline Academy and their chaperons who visited Washington.

There being no objection, the names of the students of Ursuline Academy and their chaperons were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chaperons: Miss Irma Smart, Miss Ann Corbin, Mother Mary deLourdes Bindel,

O.S.U., Mother Vera Marie Wingerter, O.S.U., and Mrs. A. Wingerter.

Students: Judy Alexander, Nancy Amato, Mary Lynn Bologna, Kathleen Brown, Kay Calongne, Kay Cambre, Carroll Campbell, Catherine Cassagne, Rose Lynn Cicero, Elise Cornay, Mary Ann Cutler, Deanne Derbes, Mary Doyle, Catherine Ferrara, Adele Gaudet, Sandra Gells, Flora Gennaro, Barbara Gilbert, Linda Haase, Peggy Hanemann, Karen Kelly, Carol Kramer, Janet Lala, Brenda Levy, Betty Jane Murtes, Catherine Richaud, Cleo Riecke, Charlotte Sanchez, Audrey Satterlee, Madeline Simmons, Kathryn Stewart, Artemise Tallon, Linda Teijelo, Ann Van Geffen, Carol Virgilio, Diana Wick, Margaret Williams, and Leanne Willoz.

Rural Electrification Benefits City as Well as Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 8, 1959, the Courier-Wedge at Durand, Wis., printed an excellent summary on what rural electrification has meant to the farmers of this country and to the American economy as a whole. In the editorial, Editor William Ender noted that the REA program has provided an extra market for \$12 billion worth of city products in addition to raising the standard of living of our farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Editor Ender's editorial in the Record:

GROWTH WITH PUBLIC POWER

As 1958 drew to a close, Dairyland Power Cooperative issued a report which showed gains in almost all categories of operation. Twenty-six electric firms that draw from Dairyland generators marketed 735 million kilowatts of power last year, an increase of 7.6 percent. The average farmer now burns 545 kilowatts of electricity a year, almost twice as much as the average city dweller.

Cooperatives, which have about a quarter century of service behind them, deserve praise for expanding electricity into sparsely settled rural regions of America. Studies show that the rural consumer spends about \$4 for each dollar his company pays to build lines to his place. Over the years, this means our rural electrification program has provided an extra market for \$12 billion worth of city products.

The \$12-billion expansion has been a tremendous stimulant to the American economy. Workers who manufactured equipment bought cars, rugs, houses, and boats, which helped employees in other industries as well. President Eisenhower recognized the importance of rural electrification by urging systems to step up expansion when a mild recession struck the country early in 1958.

People who watch rural electrification closely point to many intangible benefits it produces. Once a rural home has power, the standard of living for a family rises sharply. Houses and barns get new coats of paint. Before long the living room has new furniture. How can a person describe the human benefits of indoor plumbing, of hot water, of refrigeration, of electric cooking, of radio, television, and just light itself?

The rural electrification program has many critics. Yet, Government loans are repaid to Federal authorities with interest. Farmers have not been griping about direct multi-million-dollar Federal grants that help only a city resident—for public housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal. Chronic critics of REA power should think of those angles, too.

In this area, the economy is being stimulated by a \$12,500,000 expansion project of Dairyland Power Cooperative facilities at Alma. An 80,000 kilowatt turbogenerator is being installed, which will raise the capacity of the Alma plant to 315,000 kilowatts on 5 units. All that work will lead to new transmission lines, new substations, new customers, new appliance sales.

Dairyland sells power on a wholesale basis to the Buffalo Electric Cooperative, the Dunn County Electric Cooperative, the Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative, the Eau Claire Electric Cooperative, and other concerns which are linked directly to farmers. In all, 97,000 farmers are benefiting directly because Dairyland and its associates were created.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have reproduced in the Appendix of the Record the inaugural address of the Honorable Buford Ellington, the dynamic, young, new Governor of the State of Tennessee, delivered at the capitol in Nashville, Monday, January 19, 1959.

The address follows:

HUMAN BETTERMENT IS THE PRINCIPAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOVERNMENT

Governor Clement, Governor Coleman, Governor Chandler, Governor Blair, Mr. Speaker Baird, Mr. Speaker Bomar, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, justices of the supreme court, members of congress, distinguished guests, friends and fellow Tennesseans, this is naturally an hour of great personal happiness as I prepare, here in the presence of my family and friends, to take the oath of office as the 42d Governor of Tennessee.

But the factor that transcends all personal considerations is whether this shall also be an hour of value and happiness for all the people of Tennessee.

Long ago in our history a small band of Tennesseans on Kings Mountain gave to America the sparkling inspiration to cling tightly to freedom, independence and resourcefulness.

That spirit dominates us here today.

Great names in our history are associated with the office of Governor first held by John Sevier; and I am humble here within the shadow of the capitol as I join the ranks of chief executives of the State of Tennessee.

No other ambition possesses me except to serve the people of Tennessee in the most considerate and efficient manner of which I am capable.

Human betterment is the principal justification for the existence of government.

The welfare of all the people must dominate every thought, every plan, every action of a State administration.

The end of one administration, and the beginning of another, is an appropriate time for a look into the past and for an examination of the future. The transition from one administration to another must be accomplished with the least disruption of the normal functions of government, and with the greatest protection of our people.

Tennessee's future is normally planned and described by the actions of government on capitol hill in Nashville, but there is no planning and no action that can successfully be accomplished unless they spring from the hearts of our people in the vast and resourceful stretches of our State.

We are in a certain sense three great States in one. Each of our grand divisions possesses within itself all the human and natural resources to be a sovereign State of its own. But never from the beginning of our history has there been a division of our destiny.

We are a most unified sort of people. And that is one of the reasons we can face the long future, and that part of the future which is circumscribed by the next 4 years, with the resolute assurance that we shall make vast strides toward an economic, agricultural, industrial, civic, patriotic, and personal day of greatness far surpassing anything which we have been privileged to know in the past.

We especially want our young men and young women to put their ideas to work in the making of a greater Tennessee and thereby a greater America. We want them to roam the wide fields of their gifted imaginations. They live in a time when mankind's future seemingly is dependent upon the daring of the human mind. We must provide them with the tools and the surroundings to advance their natural gifts.

That means attention to the greatest possible advancement every hour of the future of the educational resources of Tennessee. A good State, like a good individual, is always seeking the right and opportunity of self-improvement. We shall vigorously seek new advantages for Tennessee. We shall give new industry not just an invitation—but justification for coming here. Yet in our zeal for industrial progress, we shall cling with equal fervor to the fact that our farmlands and our farm people still constitute the basic resource of our vastly expanding State.

There's no war of the scales between agriculture and industry in Tennessee. The balancing of agriculture and industry in one broad economic endeavor for the general betterment of the State is a matter of mutual desire.

Obviously we face certain financial limitations in State government in Tennessee, if we are to go into this administration without new taxation, as we are determined to do. But these limitations are not shackles. Actually, they are opportunities—opportunities for better management of your tax dollar—opportunities for wiser uses of it—opportunities for curtailing certain services of lesser critical status in favor of expanding those services of higher ranking importance to the majority of our people.

An era of readjustment in the light of our existing tax resources is upon us. Rather than fear it, I think we welcome it. A relief from new taxation is the most important contribution that the new administration can make to your welfare.

I hope that it may be said of me, 4 years from now when I stand here again as the one departing from the gubernatorial scene, that Buford Ellington kept the faith with all the people; and that of special privileges there were none.

Now, in conclusion, I have but this one simple statement to make:

The controlling ambition of my administration was embedded in me as a child when I, like so many hundreds of thousands of

other farm youth in this country, came under the influence of the distinguished agricultural leader "Corn Club" Smith, the founder of the 4-H Clubs of America, whose inspiration I carry with me today in meeting my responsibilities to the people of Tennessee.

Therefore I say to you now that my sincere desire is that my heart shall always be loyally dedicated to your service; that my hands shall labor faithfully for you; that my head shall not be turned from the tasks that lie ahead; and that it shall be my good fortune to possess the good health to serve you with vigor, and that my feet shall always be planted firmly on the ground.

Mr. Chief Justice, I am now ready to take the oath of office.

Dedication of Bell Hall at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1959, it was my privilege to attend the dedication ceremony at Fort Leavenworth for Bell Hall. This is a new academic building for the Army Command and General Staff College.

Not only is this new \$6 million structure a valuable and necessary improvement in the training of career officers, it provides needed additional space so that the regular class can be increased from 500 to possibly 750. It is estimated that 75 percent of the senior staff officers and commanders of World War II and Korea were graduates of the College. Several Members of the House also have graduated from this school during their military service.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, specifically requested that I express to you the sincere appreciation of himself and the Chief of Staff of the Army for the authorization and appropriation that made this new building possible. Representing the congressional district in which Fort Leavenworth is located, I, too, want to express my appreciation to you and the House for this important new installation. It is recognition of a continuing challenge to a changing world and a symbol of our determination to maintain the highest degree of efficiency possible in our officer-training program for the U.S. Army.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. LIONEL C. MCGARR, COMMANDANT OF THE U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AND COMMANDING GENERAL, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY FOR JAMES FRANKLIN BELL HALL, JANUARY 14, 1959

Secretary Brucker, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege this morning to welcome you to Fort Leavenworth, home of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Here today we join in dedicating this modern academic building as a fitting symbol of the spirit of improvement and progress which characterizes today's Army.

As current commandant, I feel it appropriate I say a few words on this important and symbolic occasion. Although proud of recent accomplishments, I am acutely and humbly aware of the contribution of my illustrious predecessors in making the college what it is today.

In this tension-laden era, conditioned by the deadly clash of opposing ideologies, we remain dedicated without complacency or compromise to educating and improving the minds of the Army's future leaders. This requires changing their thought processes by increasing their ability to reason objectively, decide logically and operate efficiently in the application of the all important principles of warfare. Only by so developing flexibility of mind can the inspired leadership necessary for success on future battlefields be developed. This is our mission. There is no easy way.

It has been so truly said, that war is an art based on scholastic foundation and resting on a free and creative activity. Warfare is an art, one whose very heart and soul is service and sacrifice to the ideals of our country. The overall competence and sacrifice required of the professional military leader can be even more demanding than that required of other important professions. For the combat leader's success is not measured purely in material accomplishments such as wealth, power, and prestige, but rather in terms of victory at the least possible cost in human life and the ultimate survival of the Nation. And remember, the soldier cannot actively practice his art before he must apply it for record on the battlefield.

Realizing this significant restriction, the college is convinced that in the future, as in the past, an important part of America's preparation for war must be in the classrooms of our military schools and colleges. It is equally convinced that the protracted warfare now being waged by international communism, although not fought with bombs and bullets, is all the more deadly because it is fought with ideologies, with ideas which threaten our very way of life, and its objective is the primary objective of all autocratic rules—the minds of men. We must counter this ideology which is completely opposed to ours in religious, political, and ethical concept. We must counter it with the practical application of the ideas and ideals of humanity and the dignity of man—which, after all, are based on the simple truths of service and sacrifice our Saviour taught.

The strength of any nation lies in the moral and intellectual strength of its people. This applies with equal force to the Armed Forces. Character and a sound moral code of ethical values have always been the hallmark of the dedicated professional officer. One of the principal elements of the new college curriculum is strong emphasis on the importance of the educational intangibles—the psychological and moral factors which improve combat effectiveness. The student is taught that it is normal and realistic to integrate the intangible moral and ethical aspects of command into the more tangible tactical and administrative aspects, in his decision making and problem solving. This is because we believe the only motivations which can sustain men under the stress of battle are those of a spiritual and moral nature. Here in the Army's senior tactical school we strive to build into our students the character, integrity and intelligence required by the destructiveness and reliability which the fast-moving pace of technology is building into our weapons systems. This requires the urgent development of the full human potentialities of our students, because men properly trained, motivated and led will always remain the constant factor in success on the battlefield.

We are fortunate to be living in a most exciting era in history—when the frontiers

of science and technology are advancing at a pace beyond our boldest dreams. This advance is forcing a cosmic awakening in which it is becoming more and more evident that what the mind of man can conceive, he can develop. And, as his imagination leaps out beyond the stars, we must realize that what man can invent he can control—if he so desires. It is important that our mental processes not be dulled by automation, or be dominated by the purely technical aspects of this sweep of science. They must be geared to leading and guiding technology along purposeful lines in the resolution of our many military problems and, equally as important, in constructive human progress. This chance for progress, possibly even our very hope of survival, lies in molding the minds of our leaders in the direction of progress.

The dedication of this building as Bell Hall is a tribute to a great American, a great military educator and former Commandant—General James Franklin Bell. At the turn of the century he assisted Secretary of War Elihu Root, the father of the U.S. Army General Staff and military school systems, in establishing the basis of our modern army educational structure. General Bell's concept of relating instruction to education in the broad principles of war, rather than to specific techniques, is still valid. He believed in appealing to the intelligence, reason and patriotism of the individual soldier and his progressive thinking is shown by this famous remark, "I earnestly pray that the idea of our old Army, that a soldier was not expected to think, only to obey, has had its day and will forever be left to repose upon the scrap heap of other discarded military notions."

Our Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower, aptly described the college purpose in the following words: "In Leavenworth the tradition is hard work—hard work at the most serious of all military tasks—that of preserving American interests against aggressive force. In its classrooms war is reduced to fundamentals learned so exhaustively by the student that they become second nature. So equipped in battle, the graduate is free for the fullest exercise of inspirational leadership in shaping armies of the free world that may some day stand as civilization's last, but sure, defense." This is so because warfare is not merely a pattern of mechanical energies and nuclear forces but one of human beings, their sense of values, and their reactions under varying conditions.

True, our Nation's military forces and the professional leaders trained here have one final measure of success in war—victory on the battlefield. However, it should be kept in mind that although this is a military college, it also has the broader mission of training and educating leaders to help win the peace. In this respect, our Allied Officers' Program, training officers from approximately 43 countries of the free world, contributes significantly to the solidarity of the free world.

With the addition of Bell Hall, the college now combines the most modern equipment with a reoriented, modernized curriculum based on improved instructional methods and a forward-looking educational philosophy. However, like technology this fine building and its most advanced instructional aids are of limited value if not properly oriented toward one definite objective—the security of our Nation.

In accomplishing this objective the United States Army Command and General Staff College pledges itself to educating and re-educating its students in the ideals of service and sacrifice—ideals which are the very wellsprings of the greatness of our country.

And now, it is most fitting and appropriate that we are again honored by the presence of the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary

of the Army, who will make the dedicatory address. It is appropriate, not only because he is a decorated combat leader of World War I, a former Governor of the State of Michigan, and an eminent member of the legal profession, but also because he is a forward-looking, dedicated civil leader, without whose interest and support Bell Hall would not have been possible. It is my pleasure and honor to present the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, DEDICATION OF ACADEMIC BUILDING, COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., JANUARY 14, 1959

The dedication of this splendid new academic building designed to further the mission of the United States Army Command and General Staff College, is an event of great significance. It marks a noteworthy forward stride in the development of military education fully measuring up to the tremendous responsibilities resting upon the United States Army as a major bulwark of our country in these critical years of peril. The entire Army and the Nation at large will be the beneficiaries of this building named in honor of Maj. Gen. J. Franklin Bell, "father of the modern Army school system."

For years it was a matter of deep concern within the Army that its senior tactical school should lack adequate college facilities, and must carry out its vital educational program in a converted riding hall and stables. Efforts to remedy the situation dated back far into World War II, but actual construction of proper facilities did not get underway until November 5, 1956, shortly after the college celebrated its 75th anniversary. For those who labored so long and so well with antiquated tools, it must be gratifying indeed to see their hopes brought to fruition in a modern structure consistent with the great traditions of Leavenworth.

Bell Hall, with its twenty-four 50-man classrooms, auditoriums, faculty briefing room, conference rooms, library, archives, and staff and faculty offices, will permit the consolidation of all resident instructional facilities under one roof. It will contribute immeasurably to the ability of Leavenworth to meet the stirring challenge of the future.

The impact of technological advances, the rapid changes in organizational and operational concepts, and the worldwide multiplication of Army commitments for joint and combined staff and operational personnel are factors which necessitate the creation of as broad as possible a base of highly trained career officers.

As our senior commanders in this country and overseas have found their tasks becoming ever more complex and exacting, they have placed increasing emphasis upon Leavenworth training as a principal prerequisite in the selection of their staff officers. It has become imperative to increase attendance at this College without in any way sacrificing quality for quantity. This can now be done. Completion of this new building, and concurrent enlargement of the staff and faculty, will make it possible in the years to come for a far greater proportion of our officers to attain the stature which the Command and General Staff College confers upon its graduates. Increases in both the regular and associate courses will become effective for classes starting in September of this year.

Through the years, the Command and General Staff College has achieved an enviable standing within the United States Army School System, and among military training establishments around the world. However, there is no thought here of resting upon the hard-won laurels of the past. Leavenworth, like the entire Army, is constantly on the march toward new heights of accomplishment. I sense the stirring of a dynamic new spirit, a new perception of urgency, of which

this fine academic building is a material symbol.

The dedicated staff and faculty of the college work with unremitting zeal to adopt its program to the impact upon the Army of new weapons systems and similar developments, the reorganization of the Army in accordance with the Pentomic concept, and the necessity for constant reorientation of instruction to support, under fluid conditions, the Army's functions in any kind of war—general or limited, atomic or nonatomic—as an indispensable member of our great land, sea, and air defense team.

In line with the events of recent years and the expectations for tomorrow, the curriculum was entirely rewritten for the 1957-58 academic year. In support of this revision, a major reorganization of departments along functional lines has been completed. Significant changes have been made in educational philosophy and academic methods. The college has demonstrated a keen awareness of the necessity for establishing a proper balance between the intensive training in techniques, tactics, and procedures which characterized the short courses during World War II, and the marked subsequent trend toward major emphasis upon fundamental principles as applied in the solution of problems. Instruction is designed to prepare students for their role as military problem solvers by teaching them to think, rather than merely to memorize facts and formulas. In this fashion the college equips officers to cope with the drastic reduction in battlefield reaction and decision time resulting from the new tactics of nuclear warfare. Today's tactical doctrine imposes more responsibility upon junior commanders than was borne by many senior commanders of World War II. Decisions which in the past might have waited upon a staff conference, in any future war will have to be made within minutes, and on the spot.

In its courses of instruction, this college properly gives primacy to the philosophy that we must never allow ourselves to be so preoccupied by our array of new tools of war—missiles, vehicles, electronic marvels, and all the rest science has placed in our hands—that we forget the overriding importance of men, of human mastery over material things. It would be tragic if we allowed the pressures of technology to derogate the qualities of mind and spirit which are fundamental to our national strength.

In recognition of this, the college proceeds on the conviction that the Army, if it is to fulfill its responsibilities to the Nation, must revitalize and reemphasize time-honored moral principles and standards, particularly through the personal example of those in authority at all levels of command.

The dynamic response being made by this forward-thinking, forward-moving college to the challenge of the future is in consonance with trends throughout our Army today. Modern technology demands that we continue to raise human standards all along the line, and we have started at the foundation by developing a program designed to obtain and retain high caliber men, men with a sense of responsibility who are capable of handling complicated materiel as well as complex problems. The Army's new enlisted management program contributes to this end through appropriate financial reward, prestige, and inspiring opportunities for advancement. This program was made possible to a large degree by legislation recently passed by the Congress, notably legislation which authorized the President to modify standards of induction.

By means of preinduction screening, we have been enabled to reject individuals at the outset who do not demonstrate a suitable capability for modern military training. This has resulted in a significant saving of time which would have been fruitlessly expended in attempting to train these individuals, and

of the costs involved in their eventual elimination from the service. Last year, prior to the implementation of this authority, we discharged 72,000 ineffective men with resultant improvement in the level of training, job performance, behavior, and elementary education participation. Of these, 34,000 were separated prior to the completion of their basic training.

Concurrently, we moved to put into effect the provisions of the military pay legislation passed last May. The first proficiency payments were made in November to soldiers selected by their commanders as being most proficient in critical skills. Beginning this month, our soldiers begin competing for proficiency payments against armywide standards established by our new enlisted evaluation system, which allows us to measure the capabilities of our men by a combination of written proficiency tests and commanders' evaluation reports.

Recognition of the Army's enlisted personnel who carry heavy responsibilities has been enhanced by the addition of two new pay grades at the top of the enlisted pay structure, and promotion to these grades as well as to other enlisted grades eventually will be related to the enlisted evaluation system. The Army plans to advance at least 14,500 to the two top grades during the next 4 years.

Another aim of the Army enlisted management program is to aid in the development of promising enlisted men by further training and education. Upon entering the Army, the volunteer, beginning this month, will have the opportunity of enlisting for a particular occupation of his choosing in which he can show sufficient aptitude. In addition to the many service schools available, career-motivated soldiers may now also apply for college level training in technical, scientific, and managerial areas at Government expense.

Many similar steps have been and will be taken to insure high caliber in our officer corps.

For example, new tests have been developed to identify the best possible talent for training at the United States Military Academy.

We have a program to increase the number of officers developing foreign linguistic skill in order to prepare them more effectively for vital assignments around the world.

A special program is in operation for the temporary promotion of captains, majors, and lieutenant colonels ahead of the time they would normally be eligible for consideration.

The best-qualified method of selection has been put into effect this year for all commissioned grades above captain for both temporary and permanent promotion.

In order to increase the retention of highly qualified officers, we have also provided for greater stabilization of duty tours, and extended opportunities for specialization to include a number of new career fields.

A major review of our officer education and training program was completed this year by a board of distinguished officers. This comprehensive review was conducted to determine the adequacy of the present system to meet the needs of the Army from the present to 1970. The results of this review will be announced in the very near future. I can tell you now, however, that adjustments and refinements to make our system entirely equal to the tasks ahead are already underway. A modern pattern for officer development is emerging which fully recognizes the indispensable part played by the well-trained and dedicated Army officer in building and maintaining the defenses of our Nation, both spiritual and military, in these momentous times.

Atomic weapons, guided missiles, and air transport have revolutionized strategic and tactical concepts. Their impact upon the art of war has not even yet been fully assessed. But this we do know—that the

highest professional competence and the soundest possible judgment on the part of leaders charged with responsibility for the lives of men in battle, and the success of our mission, are of even more vital importance than they have been at any time in the whole past.

The Army needs, above all, leaders possessed of great imagination, mental mobility, psychological stability, and moral stamina. The best career development policy or program which might be conceived could not produce such leaders in the absence of individual initiative and interest on the part of the officers themselves. The successful Army officer today is a well-rounded person, who keeps up to date in every aspect of his profession. He has an inquiring, imaginative mind, and a great thirst for opportunities to improve his professional ability. Attitudes are tremendously important in life, and particularly so in the military service. We need healthy, positive, forward-looking attitudes which contribute to the on-going of the Army.

One of the great virtues of the courses here at the Command and General Staff College is that they are designed to stimulate creative thought. Your curriculum inspires an enthusiasm for discovering new and better solutions to old problems, and helps to develop the habit of considering every aspect of command in the light of future requirements rather than past performance. This habit is one of the most important any officer can nurture.

Because science and technology play such an increasingly important part in shaping military doctrine and operations all along the line, it behooves every officer to dig in and acquire at least a rudimentary knowledge of scientific and technological principles and applications. For example, regardless of his immediate duties, he should learn all he can about guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, and similar matters of vital concern to our modern Army. Only by the fullest interchange of informed thought at all levels can the problems in this field be successfully solved. Furthermore, a reasonably thorough grounding in basic science and technology will make an officer of greater value in any assignment, and may in the course of his career open up whole new vistas of opportunity for constructive and satisfying service.

Every officer should develop a fundamental understanding, appreciation, and acceptance of the interdependence of each of our Armed Forces, and the forces of our allies, in the attainment of success either in the deterrence of aggression or the winning of any war. No longer can an Army officer at any level afford to compartmentalize his thinking, and consider only his own branch, his own service, or even the forces of his own Nation. The effectiveness of joint and combined operations stems not so much from carefully worked out plans as from a habit of mind. It is necessary that in every case we visualize the military picture as a whole, not just our particular part of it, and with that vision act in complete harmony with all concerned to achieve a single, positive result.

Students here at the Command and General Staff College are especially fortunate because they are able to attend classes side by side with outstanding officers of 44 foreign nations. Every student ought to make the most of these contacts in order to develop to the fullest degree that mutual understanding and respect which is the only solid foundation for effective mutual security.

In addition to leadership for war, leadership for peace has become a major concern of the military officer. Within the last 20 years, the soldier has evolved into the soldier-statesman. Many officers at the top levels of the Army have contributed immensely to

our national security, and the realization of our national objectives, by brilliant accomplishments not only in the strictly military sphere, but also in the field of international diplomacy. During the course of your careers, many in this audience will undoubtedly be called upon to participate in high councils by means of which the nations of the world will seek some practical resolution of differences which stand in the way of enduring peace. The well-rounded officer will conscientiously prepare himself in every possible way for this great responsibility.

The necessity for good management in the Army cannot be overemphasized. Any waste or inefficiency in the employment of money, material, or manpower is directly reflected in reduced combat power—and combat power is the root and branch of the Army's ability to carry out its historic responsibilities for national security. To have the strength needed to see us through any future emergency, we must make the best possible use of every resource entrusted to us. We must also bear it firmly in mind that the Army must have the full confidence and support of the American people. These are essential to its continued effectiveness as a military instrument. To gain and maintain public confidence and support we must conscientiously apply the best management principles all along the line to insure a maximum return in defense for every dollar expended and every American boy called to the colors. However prosaic it may seem, every officer must adjust his vision to the importance of good management in every sphere, and put its precepts into practice wherever he wields authority or influence.

The truly effective Army officer will be a vocal advocate of the Army. In all his contacts with the other segments of the American community, he will endeavor to contribute in a positive way to the enlightenment of public opinion. He will seek to enhance public understanding of the vital role of the Army as a member of our defense team, and stimulate public realization of its accomplishments. The highlights of progress the Army has made during the past year alone are indeed impressive.

All active Army divisions were reorganized as pentomic divisions to insure that they will be fully capable of successful combat operation on any battlefield—conventional or nuclear.

We deployed overseas two missile commands and several separate missile battalions.

We increased the effectiveness of Nike Ajax battalions on constant guard in the United States against air attack, and also sent Nike Ajax battalions to Europe to defend depots, air bases, and vital bridges.

We began the systematic conversion of Nike Ajax battalions in the continental United States to the longer range and more powerful Nike Hercules. Hercules battalions are now deployed and operational in Taiwan, Okinawa, and Greenland.

With the addition of the Hawk to our air defense arsenal we will be able to cover the whole span of altitudes from the treetops to the highest flown by planes, and every type of aircraft now in operational use at any known speed.

The formation of STRAC, the Army's Strategic Army Corps, added immensely to our deterrent capability.

In the field of space exploration, we are tremendously proud of having placed in orbit the free world's first earth satellite, the Explorer on January 31, 1958. Then on March 26, Explorer III went up, and on July 26, Explorer IV. The coded information about space which has poured down to earth from these man-made "moons," particularly concerning high-level radiation, has proved to be of tremendous value. The latest Army achievement in this field was the instru-

mentation of the Atlas missile which the Air Force put into orbit last December 18. Intricate electronic relay equipment developed by the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth, N.J., broadcast from the orbiting missile the voice of President Eisenhower delivering a Christmas message. This was the first time a human voice had ever come to us from outer space.

We should all look upon each achievement not as a goal reached, but as a milestone on the path of progress toward maximum strength for peace and security. What has been accomplished so far is only a beginning. The brightest pages of our Army's history are still unwritten—of this I am sure. What the hand of time will eventually inscribe upon them depends in large measure upon the ingenuity, the determination, the vigor, and the devotion above and beyond the call of duty each of us brings to the tasks which lie before us.

As America marches forward with courage, conviction, and confidence to meet the future, an increasing burden of responsibility is laid upon this great college as a major source of education—and, above all, of inspiration—for our Nation's military leadership. Its influence during the long years past has redounded to the tremendous benefit of our country, yet I am certain that its greatest achievements, like those of the Army as a whole, lie ahead. It is in that faith that I now dedicate, on behalf of the U.S. Army, this new building—the J. Franklin Bell Hall.

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record editorials entitled "The Talmadge Farm Bill," from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal; "Talmadge Reoffers His New Look Farm Bill," from the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger; "Deserves a Second Look," from the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News; "Farm Equalization Has a Chance," from the Moultrie (Ga.) Observer; and a telegram from Lester J. Crane, president of the Wharton County Farmers Union, of El Campo, Tex.

There being no objection, the editorials and telegram were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Jan. 15, 1959]

THE TALMADGE FARM BILL

The Nation's farmers for several years now have been caught in an impossible crossfire between the radical policies of Ezra Taft Benson and periodic piecemeal legislation by the Congress.

To say the least, it has been an unsatisfactory situation. The farmer, especially here in the Southeast, has suffered greatly. Many men of the soil have been forced to move to another field for livelihood. And as the farmer has been hurt, so has the Nation's economy.

A bill providing for a major overhaul of existing farm policies has been laid before the Congress by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. It deserves careful consideration.

The Talmadge proposal is relatively simple. It would allow the farmer to grow as much of any basic commodity as he wishes. The Government would pay him the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

The plan has the virtue of giving the farmer a respectable measure of free enterprise, and at the same time according him safeguards similar to those extended other segments of the economy.

It is further unique in the fact that its acceptability to all sections of the country is about as great as any farm bill can be.

Agricultural experts viewed the Talmadge proposal with favor last year. The urgency accrued through another year of deteriorating farm conditions puts an even brighter glow on it now.

There has been much speculation as to what attitude this Congress would take on farm problems. But who knows, farm legislation just might be a meeting ground for the liberal and conservative wings. And the Talmadge bill could possibly be the instrument to achieve such an agreement.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, Jan. 16, 1959]

TALMADGE REOFFERS HIS NEW LOOK FARM BILL

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE has reintroduced in Congress a farm bill which he described as designed to let the farmer farm and at the same time give him about the same degree of protection that labor enjoys through the minimum wage and industry has in the tariff.

The measure, the Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1959, is the same which the Georgia Senator placed before the 2d session of the 85th Congress but which never was acted upon.

Senator TALMADGE's bill, if enacted, would eliminate acreage controls and Government loans. The Senator said, as he introduced the measure, that the present national program, based on controls and loans is a failure.

In place of the controls and loans, TALMADGE's farm plan would assign each grower of basic commodities—cotton, tobacco, peanuts, rice, wheat, and corn—a quota which he could produce for sale on the open domestic market.

The quota would be computed from a comparison of his production record for the past 5 years with the national consumption.

When the farmer harvested his crop, he could sell it on the open market, either domestic or foreign, at the current nonsupported price. He could then present bills for the part of his crop sold on the domestic market to which he was entitled to supports to his county agriculture committee.

The committee would notify the Government and a check would be mailed to the farmer for the difference between what he was paid on the open market and 100 percent of parity. No farmer could have more than \$25,000 in sales support, however. He would get no supports for the amounts above the quotas he sold or for that sold on the foreign market.

Mr. TALMADGE told the Senate the cost of his plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the basic commodities, but in any event would be considerably less than of the present program. He also advised the Senate his plan would assure that every farm-program dollar went into the pockets of the American farmers which, he said, decidedly is not the case today.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the present costly national farm program and many, particularly farmers, will agree with the Georgia Senator that it is a failure, or very near it.

Senator TALMADGE's plan drew considerable support when he introduced it in 1958. That,

he told the Senate, was why he was presenting it again for consideration.

The bill, although it is a radical departure from the present program, should receive careful consideration of Congress. If the lawmakers are convinced it will return the farmer to a free enterprise economy, protect his interests and reduce surpluses, it should be enacted without delay.

[From the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News, Jan. 15, 1959]

DESERVES A SECOND LOOK

(By Bill Knight)

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, has proposed legislation that would abolish present Federal farm programs and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output.

The proposal, probably one of the most sweeping pieces of farm legislation offered in recent years, kicked off a fight that probably will last into 1960.

The Georgia Senator estimated his plan would cost between \$1,500 million and \$2,500 million a year. The estimated cost of the present price support in the current fiscal year is set at more than \$5 billion.

Should the Talmadge proposal work itself through the congressional maze and come out looking something like it did at the start, it very likely would help cut into national deficit spending, though only slightly.

Senator TALMADGE is no stranger to the problems of farmers. He knows their needs from firsthand experience.

Any plan that will help to lighten the backbreaking taxload without cutting into merited and needed Federal aid, deserves a second look.

Some Democratic leaders have indicated that although the administration farm program should be tossed out, it will not be practical to write a new program until next year.

But by 1960 it may be too late to save the Talmadge proposal from being trampled in the stampede to woo the farm vote.

[From the Moultrie (Ga.) Observer]

FARM EQUALIZATION HAS A CHANCE

The year 1959 may witness the passage of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE's Agricultural Income Equalization Act.

Very similar to the one which was proposed by the Georgian last summer, the 1959 version appears to have a better chance for passage than that dropped in the hopper previously. The farmers, in their decision to take corn out from under controls, gave notice that they want adequate protection in their farming gamble but at the same time want less interference from the Federal Government.

The measure which Senator TALMADGE proposes would accomplish this desired freedom by degrees. Under its provisions, the excessive and burdensome controls would be eliminated, providing for a more sound, free-enterprise type of farming while retaining the supports necessary to guarantee the growers against failures.

The first farm equalization plan died for lack of final action, but a stronger Democratic Congress may look with more favor upon the proposal in 1959.

EL CAMPO, TEX., January 16, 1959.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At the Wharton County Farmers Union meeting January 15, 1959, 200 members resolved to commend you on your proposed bill for direct support payment to farmers at 100 percent parity price and maintenance of parity principle.

LESTER J. CRANEK,
President.

Hawaiian Statehood Would Help United States To Win Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hawaiian Statehood Would Help United States To Win Asians," which was published in the May 1956 issue of Freedom and Union magazine.

Written by Mr. George Lehleitner, a New Orleans businessman, this article is even more pertinent now than when it was written.

It is my hope and expectation that this Congress will act favorably on S. 50, cosponsored by more than half the Members of this body, which would grant statehood to Hawaii.

I concur with Mr. Lehleitner's conclusion that "Statehood for Hawaii is most decidedly in keeping with the best interests of Hawaii, the United States, and of freemen everywhere."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD WOULD HELP UNITED STATES TO WIN ASIANS

(By George Lehleitner)

I have long believed that the gravest danger of Soviet world conquest stems not from its military potency but rather from the efficacy of its international machinery for the pursuit of ideological warfare. Even in those instances (China and Vietnam) where we are inclined to attribute their conquests to the sword, is it not true that the primary conquest was ideological? First, the Chinese and Vietnamese who constituted their armies had to be sold communism. And did not the military collapse of the opposed Chinese—and, recently, the Vietnamese—come about largely because the virus of communism had infected and weakened them to the point where they lost the will to resist?

Is not, then, the ideological power of communism its real warhead? It has been aptly said: "You can shoot Communists—but not communism."

AGAINST COMMONWEALTH STATUS

If this is true, why, then, should we deliberately provide Communist ideology with soil in which to root itself, in Hawaii, by forcing upon the proud and competent Hawaiians a political form—commonwealth—they do not want, and, in the process deny them that form—statehood—which they have clearly shown they do want, are qualified for, and were promised?

What manner of insanity afflicts us when, with one hand, we lavishly spend billions in a frenzied effort to tie foreign nations, with doubtful loyalties, more closely to us, while we use the other hand to slap the faces of a half million of our own loyal citizens, who ask nothing except that they be permitted to tie themselves to us indissolubly, and share our common responsibilities and perils?

To those who doubt that Hawaii could ever go Communist because of its high standard of living, I point to Czechoslovakia, which enjoyed one of Europe's highest. The West pushed the Czechs into the Communist orbit. Not in 1948, when it became a final reality in fact, but 10 years earlier when, in the dis-

grace that was Munich, the West reneged on its moral obligations and gave the Czechs to a rapacious Hitler in an attempt to buy peace in our time.

Are we so rich in resources, and in people, that we can afford to turn our backs upon a half million Americans, and literally invite Communist ideology to make the most of our wanton failure to accord them that basic entitlement of all Americans: the right to participate in their government at both local and national levels? Is not any measure which alleviates only part of this abuse inadequate, precisely because it still leaves communism with ground to stand on? Why should we give our mortal enemy any ground, when it is completely within our power to deny it to him?

But I believe the danger—and the opportunity—represented by Hawaii extends far beyond the borders of those lovely islands.

THREE-FOURTHS NON-WESTERN

How can we best impress the uncommitted leaders of mass opinion in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that our way is the best way for them to follow, if they would give their peoples both the material things and the dignity they seek? Especially the latter benefit, for it is that which they crave with greatest intensity.

Can this be done by impressing upon Hawaii's people—three-fourths of whom are of Oriental or Polynesian descent—an inferior and debasing political form which they have clearly shown they do not want?

Or could we better sell them our way by giving the Hawaiians the equality—and hence the dignity—possible only in statehood.

Or, to put it more positively, what single act within our power of immediate commission would create such a profoundly favorable impression upon the entire world as that of admitting to full membership in the American Union an area populated principally by men bearing names like Nomura, Kaleo, and Ching?

Anyone inclined to question the deep impression such an action would have upon the leadership of other areas need only ask returning travelers of discernment about the impact of the Supreme Court decision outlawing public school segregation. Is it not in battles such as these that the ideological war will, in Lincoln's word, "be nobly won—or meanly lost?"

Nor would the benefits to America cease with Hawaii's admission. In time, men with Oriental and Polynesian names and faces would, rightfully, occupy Senate and House seats. And each time such men took the floor to debate the issues of the day, they would, by their very presence there, testify to the truth that our way was a way all men could follow with dignity—and that neither the color of one's skin, nor the country of one's ancestors, was an impenetrable barrier to full American citizenship in fact.

TO CONTINUE U.S. REVOLUTION

And whenever such men distinguished themselves in service to the Nation—as I am confident they would—we would earn yet another dividend on our investment: their accomplishments would help us mainland Americans understand that whereas God had chosen to give them names and faces dissimilar to our own, He did not differentiate when He gave them their minds and their hearts. Thus would Hawaii help us draw a step closer to the Kingdom of God on Earth.

I have been greatly impressed with yet another report brought back from the Orient by studious travelers. Two prominent men of letters, recently returned, tell me that a reservoir of good will toward America and its institutions yet remains, despite our many blunders of recent years. I was surprised to learn that the writings of Paine, Franklin, Madison, Jefferson and Lincoln

are still widely read and revered by the Orient's leaders who have not yet succumbed to communism. Yes, the American political beliefs which inspired Lafayette, Bolivar and San Martin are still valid—if only we Americans would have the faith to stand by the principles which gave initial vitality to our own Nation.

May our eyes be opened to the realization that it was Americans—not Russians—who first set into motion the great political revolution the world is still undergoing. Ours preceded theirs by almost 150 years, and we have but permitted them to seize the initiative by our own default.

May we also have the vision to see that we, and our kind of civilization, will survive only if we conduct our affairs in keeping with God's laws. Is it not mockery for us to pretend to be good Christians—or Jews—and to openly defy those laws governing the brotherhood of man?

On the face of the great seal of Hawaii there is this inscription: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono." Translated, it reads: "The life of a land and its people is preserved by righteousness." These words were those of Hawaii's Kamehameha III, in 1843. Yet there are some Americans today who have the effrontery to call the Hawaiians primitive.

WHO IS THE DREAMER?

Because I share with Clarence Streit his conviction that neither armament, nor armies, nor treaties, nor dollars can provide us with enduring security from communism, I also hold his view that our own salvation and that of other freemen lies in Federal political and economic amalgamation with those who share our fundamental traditions and political beliefs.

Over the years friends to whom I have expressed these views sometimes smiled and said: "You are an idealist, a dreamer." Perhaps I am. But I don't think so. Rather am I persuaded that they are dreamers who continue to place their faith in such things as treaties, pacts, and armies—which all history shows have never been adequate to preserve the peace—or a nation.

Nor need we look beyond our own lifetime to realize the complete ineffectuality of anything less than union with those who subscribe to, and practice, our fundamental political and moral philosophies. The roads which lead to every major war are littered with the wreckage of treaties which were honored only so long as they appeared to serve the best interests of their several signatories. For that matter, need we look beyond the Korean war?

Have we considered the possibility—to cite but one—that Germany, once the aged Adenauer passes on, could well come under the control of irresponsible leaders who might transfer the allegiance of that new army to the Soviets, in payment for the reunification of all Germany—the prize all Germans want most passionately?

Ten years ago—and less—we believed the atomic bomb would give us security. Today the conviction is dawning that, instead, we may have created a Frankenstein. I do not mean to say that we should not have done so—for under the circumstances then prevailing we probably had no choice but to proceed with its development; I merely wish to point out our growing disillusionment in it as a vehicle which will guarantee our security.

And even the most sanguine no longer expect the United Nations to accomplish this for us. It cannot, for the reason that only we can provide for our own security—and this we can do only by keeping ourselves morally, as well as physically, strong, in addition to recognizing that necessity (wholly aside from wisdom) requires that we grow.

It is, I believe, tragically unfortunate that most Americans look upon our national growth cycle as having been completed, now that we span the continent. This cannot

be—for then the natural order of things would ordain that we have already begun to die. What a great pity that most living Americans have never stopped to consider the extent to which our national greatness is due to our forefathers' recognition of the wisdom of providing for an ever-expanding nation. For it is a fundamental natural law that all things that have attained their ultimate ripeness have, in reality, begun to die.

I do not pretend to know the date of the point of no return—when Communist expansion will have progressed to that degree after which it would be futile for us to try to effect an amalgamation with other peoples who think and live as we do. It may be 50 or 25 years hence; perhaps it only 10—or less. But of this I am sure:

When the deadline for such action does arrive it is essential that the American mind shall, in the interim, have been conditioned to see the practicability of consolidating with lands and peoples who, though separated from us by thousands of miles of ocean, do share our essential beliefs.

What better way to accomplish this indoctrination than by the example of a successfully functioning State of Hawaii?

ATLANTIC UNION HERALD

If Hawaii, though separated from its sister States by 2,000 miles of ocean and populated largely by a people descended from different racial stocks than those who people our continental States, presents at the time of decision—a record of successful integration with our mainland States, how, then, can there remain reasonable doubt about the feasibility of political union with Canadians, Australians, Britons, or, for that matter, with any freeman who believes in—and practice—the same basic freedoms we hold dear?

I have always considered the Hawaiian bill one of the most vital pieces of legislation ever to come before Congress. The real significance of little Hawaii—to the United States and to the entire free world—is out of all proportion to its actual size. Statehood will become a reality only when Hawaii's friends fight for it with an uncompromising zeal which exceeds that which its opponents have thus far expended. Statehood for Hawaii is most decidedly in keeping with the best interests of Hawaii, the United States, and of freemen everywhere.

What Will Congress Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, at Lawrence, Mass., on January 16, 1959:

WHAT WILL CONGRESS DO?

(Preview of 1st sess., 86th Cong., for Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Friday, January 16, 1959, Yankee Doodle Restaurant)

Greetings, the 1st session of the 86th Congress went to work on January 7. Thousands of bills will be introduced.

Within the next 6 or 7 months, about 1,000 will be enacted into law. Some will affect, directly or indirectly, every inhabitant of the United States and its Territories. A few will have some influence on the economies and the peoples of other nations.

A hundred or more private bills concerning immigration cases and claims against the Government will touch upon the lives of separate individuals.

The Congress is composed of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives. On some issues, their views will coincide; on others they will differ. Within each Chamber, and within each political party, there are different attitudes on social and economic problems. Out of this representative variety, the final bill that is enacted into law usually reflects adjustment and compromise.

In trying to estimate what Congress is likely to do, I shall restrict myself to the House of Representatives and the influence of its sizable Democratic majority.

In that context, I expect somewhat larger appropriations than those recommended by the President in his budget for the fiscal year of 1960 that begins on July 1, 1959.

Last year at this time, the Congress was worried by the deepening recession, and by the scientific breakthroughs achieved by Soviet Russia with their serious military, economic, and psychological challenge to the security of the free world.

The legislation passed in 1958 was shaped by our efforts to overcome these problems.

All of us are encouraged by the fact that the recession is largely over, but there is no letup in the Communist drive to master the space that surrounds the earth.

Although we have been roused from our complacency, and are making efforts to achieve leadership in the space age, there is widespread concern that the administration is not putting enough emphasis on this program.

The latest success of the Russians is a sober reminder that we are up against the most formidable competition; in education, industrial production, international trade, and in scientific progress.

We are trying to close the "missile gap"—which means that the Russians are presently ahead of us on this crucial frontier.

The plain fact is that if it comes to a choice between a balanced budget or an unbalanced budget that will not curtail our defense needs, there is no choice. We cannot afford to fall behind.

Not that the health and soundness of our domestic economy can be ignored. This is the foundation upon which all else depends. But economic activity is on the rise which means that Federal revenues will increase. If, during the fiscal year that starts on July 1, we realize a prosperity greater than we anticipate at the moment, expenditures somewhat larger than those recommended by the President can be met by the increase in Federal revenues. Even if this should not happen, we cannot gamble with national defense just for the sake of a balanced budget.

Some changes in the present tax laws are probable.

Among these are faster depreciation on capital investment to offset increasing obsolescence and inflation; revision of the rules on corporate distributions and adjustments, estates and trusts, and partnerships. There will be a move to establish a higher tax formula for life insurance companies. Other Congressmen will push legislation permitting deductions for funds put aside by the self-employed for their retirement.

Powerful lobbies will block the proposed reduction in the 27.5 oil and gas depletion allowance.

There will be proposals to raise personal income tax exemptions and to hike parcel post rates. Only the latter is apt to go through.

There is much work to be done in plugging tax loopholes and in spreading the burden in a more equitable manner, but it does not seem possible that any general revision of the Internal Revenue Code can become effective before 1961.

Some Congressmen want lower interest rates on FHA and VA housing. Others believe that an increase of interest rates on mortgages insured under Government programs is needed in order to make these mortgages more appealing to investors. The President, through his veto power, may be the determining factor on this issue.

It is likely that the administration and the Congress will both approve a higher minimum wage, and some extension of social security. Although a formula to provide hospital and medical care for those on old-age pension will be enacted into law at some future date, I doubt if a satisfactory plan can be worked out at this session.

In the area of labor legislation, the Kennedy-Ives bill to require financial accounting by unions, and the free election of union officers, is almost certain to prevail.

The problem of transportation, especially the transportation of people, is becoming more difficult every day. It is not simply the question of enabling people to travel from their homes to their places of employment in the morning, and to return in the late afternoon. In our complex society, transportation is the circulation system that sustains the life of a modern economy.

The impact of the automobile is greater than we realize, forcing crowded cities to accommodate themselves to it, and having a profound effect upon other modes of transportation.

I think all of us have been startled sooner or later by the personal observation that there are more cars on the streets than there are pedestrians on the sidewalks.

Railroads and bus lines and the merchants on our main streets have been hurt by this explosive development in the numbers and in the use of the private automobile with its resulting complications.

Responding to these pressures, a previous Congress had authorized a Federal program to relieve traffic congestion by the construction of an expanded interstate highway system.

Due to rising costs, Congress may reluctantly approve some but not all of the 1½-cent increase in the gasoline tax to be requested by the President.

Further aid to railroads, steamship subsidies, and more money for airport improvements are necessary because our economy cannot grow without a modern and efficient transportation system, public as well as private, to meet its demands. In the background but looming large is the need of facilities-in-being for emergency service to national security and civil defense.

One of the paradoxes of our national life is the farm problem or what to do with our agricultural surpluses. Various experiments over a whole generation have failed to solve it. We want to keep the farmers in business because we have to. That means we cannot dump their surpluses on the market to send the prices they receive for their products so low that they cannot earn a living by farming. At the same time, we will not jack up the price of food through extreme price supports for the farmers at the expense of the consumers. This is a very complex problem but I expect that this session of the Congress will be moderate in designing a farm aid program.

On the domestic issues that do not involve spending, the struggle over civil rights is most controversial.

This is an emotional issue on both sides. Where force will not achieve the understanding, and the cooperation, that are necessary for a solution. A law to make church and school bombings a Federal crime will be passed, for no self-respecting American, North or South, no matter what his religious faith or his racial origin, will stand for such vicious opposition to the rights of others. Steps will be taken to protect the voting rights of Negroes and other minority

groups. Congress, however, will not insist on school integration, leaving to the States the responsibility of working out the gradual adjustments under the stimulus of an enlightened public opinion.

Different sections of our country have economic interests which are of major importance to them, but not to other areas. The Middle West believes that aid to agriculture should have top priority. The Rocky Mountain States, and their representatives, work hard to assist the mining industry. Texas, Oklahoma, and California are alert in promoting legislation that will benefit the development of their oil resources.

We, in New England, are mainly concerned with the problems of our textile and fishing industries, striving to protect them from the increasing dangers of foreign competition.

Although we believe in the principle of reciprocal trade, knowing that an increase in commerce among the nations on a fairly competitive basis results in shared progress, we are aware that our textile and fishing industries are being priced out of the domestic market by low-cost imports from abroad. This is not reciprocal trade in the genuine meaning of the term. It is a form of ruthless horsetrading to open up foreign markets for selected American industries, while opening up American markets to foreign products by sacrificing a few of our basic industries.

The increasing imports of foreign textiles and foreign fish products is a threat to the New England economy, and particularly that of Massachusetts.

In the present session of the Congress, the New England delegation will have to fight persistently, against formidable odds, to win some measure of protection for these embattled industries. But we must not stop with defensive measures. A positive and affirmative program of aid to these industries, is also required to improve their competitive position.

The decline of the once dominant New England textile industry has left a gap which has been hard to fill.

The depressed areas, or labor-surplus areas, have made valiant efforts to attract new and diversified industries as replacements for the ones they have lost.

They have accomplished much, but it is apparent that they cannot do the whole job on their own.

Those of us who first proposed Federal legislation to assist in the solution of this new problem which will arise time and again in our changing economy, were opposed by those who resist any idea that is new simply because it is new.

But the public has been in a more receptive mood toward those proposals which are designed to meet problems instead of avoiding them.

At the risk of injecting a political note, I would remind you of the Senator who was defeated last year and who blamed the President's veto of the area redevelopment bill for the switch in voter sentiment.

With the influx of new Congressmen, reflecting public discontent with standpoint policies, I believe that a bill that will provide Federal loans and minor grants to help redevelop labor-surplus areas will be passed this year, even if it should have to overcome another veto.

Related to this, and to slum clearance and urban renewal, and housing, is legislation to help local governments in the development of community facilities such as water systems, sewers, streets, and schools. With the dislocations resulting from industrial, military, and population shifts many communities are finding it difficult to provide or maintain adequate facilities. The President is certain to oppose this type of legislation. I would say that its prospects are no better than 50-50.

The United States is spending substantial sums in the development of atomic weapons.

For reasons of security, the details are not made available to the public.

But nuclear energy, applied to peaceful purposes, holds great promise for progress in many fields. In the 13 years since the discovery of this vast potential, the Congress has repeatedly asked why greater progress in the application of atomic power to generate electricity for industrial and household use has not been realized.

This is an important issue, and a sensitive one, that will not make the headlines.

In the background, however, is the fear on the part of the private utilities that the Government may dominate development of the atom.

At last they are making a concerted effort to prove that they can do the job better than the Government. In the last 4 years they have invested more than \$500 million on atomic projects.

The Congress believes that more can and should be done, either through Government assistance or through pilot plants built and operated by the Government. The former method is preferred. The Congress is determined to spur the development of atomic power for peaceful purposes and will appropriate funds for that objective.

The technical problems to be solved before atomic energy can compete with the fossil fuels are difficult, but the advantages to be reaped are even greater. Congress wants to accelerate the program.

The economic recovery of Western Europe is an encouraging fact that has helped to strengthen the free world's position. This has been accomplished, in part, by the assistance we have given to them. Now that their need is much less, economic aid to them will be reduced. Some of our South American neighbors, however, are having difficulties, and it may be necessary to bolster their economies.

Under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, Congress recognized the special problems which handicap small- and medium-sized firms. Under the Johnson-Patman Act it is setting up a system whereby they will be able to obtain equity and long-term debt financing, heretofore unavailable, from any governmental lending authority, or through financial institutions.

As Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, co-author of the bill, told the House, this legislation has two goals:

"First, the individual investment decisions should not be made by a bureau in Washington, but by local businessmen who will be backing their decisions with substantial amounts of their own money.

"The second goal of the system is that it should provide for private capital to come in and take over complete ownership and operation of the system."

The Small Business Committee, and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House will make investigations and studies of further practical aids to small business. It is possible that an expanded aid program, moderate in scale, may come up for a vote at this session.

There are indications that the administration will try to curtail the program of veterans' benefits, but I am certain that it will not succeed.

There are sincere differences of opinion within the Congress. To draw the line between that which is necessary for the Nation and that which is merely desirable is not as easy as it may sound. In making up our minds, we cannot ignore political considerations, or the necessity of being guided by an informed public opinion.

There is no official within the administration, and no Member of Congress who can accurately foresee what the situation will be, as we come up to the presidential and congressional campaigns of 1960.

The administration is shaping its policies in the belief that a balanced budget will in-

sure prosperity and peace, and will be approved by the electorate in 1960.

The Congress, that is, a majority of its Members, is not against a balanced budget. After taking stock of conditions, both at home and abroad, most Members will agree that we cannot afford the risk of a near budget that would cramp our progress and imperil our security.

Lip service to education is not enough.

When our survival depends more and more on scientific and technological skills, what was good enough in the past is not sufficient today.

A major effort is required to expand and improve our educational system.

New classrooms, laboratories, research facilities, and scholarships must be provided. We must raise the prestige, the incentives, and the rewards for the teaching profession commensurate with our country's urgent need for the very best.

Congress means business on this compelling issue.

Dozens of bills have already been introduced dealing exclusively with aids to education. We are disturbed by the fact that many American high school students would probably flunk a Russian high school examination in mathematics, and in the sciences. We intend to stimulate and assist in the building of an improved educational system that will not only develop the mental capacities of our youth, but will teach them to appreciate as never before, the rights and responsibilities of freedom.

There are no escalators to progress and security.

In this fast changing world, individuals as well as nations need ever more knowledge and better equipment to prevail over the deadly challenge of communism.

Last year we were facing up to the economic recession and to the serious fact that we were behind the Russians in missile development.

We are leaving the recession behind us as there are definite signs of economic recovery in January 1959.

But we are still behind the Soviet in rocket technology and in space exploration.

As a people we have always stressed the value of competition, but in this critical area we do not seem to realize what is at stake.

One or two or six months from now we will be thrilled by the news of a U.S. success in the pioneering of space, and we will bask in self-satisfaction until the Russians rocket a man into space far beyond the earth and bring him back.

Then we will look for someone to blame.

Not realizing that complacency is our worst enemy.

We cannot stand still, content with the familiar routines because neither life nor history will mark time.

We have only to look at the experience of our own community to learn that we must keep up with progress. For generations, textiles was the dominant industry. We had become so adjusted to it that we could not foresee the day when the economic base of greater Lawrence would be entirely different, yet within a few years the pattern has been completely altered. The old textile giants have gone; and are being replaced by young and vigorous and growing industries.

It is so with our Nation.

The population and its needs are expanding.

And our responsibilities as the leader of the free world are increasing.

To meet these the attitudes, the instruments, and the yardsticks of 1939—or 1929—are obsolete.

The great virtue of freedom is its flexibility.

We have seen this at work in American industry which is never content with things as they are.

In 1940, nuclear energy was only a mathematical equation on the blackboards of the scientists.

In 1956, Americans would laugh at the suggestion that man would soon be able to send rockets hundreds of thousands of miles into space.

In 1959 both are accomplished facts.

It is my opinion that the administration is reluctant to make the hard decisions, and to exert the leadership that is required to provide for genuine progress and security.

This is human but unrealistic.

I would like to tell you that the budget is going to be slashed by billions, and that a generous tax reduction will be approved soon, and overwhelmingly. This is the news that we would prefer to hear.

But, to quote the President himself in his recent state of the Union message, we are confronted with a question which is "as old as history," whether a government based upon liberty can endure when it is ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship with growing economic and military power.

The Congress is not satisfied with the current rate of development in our missile and space exploration programs.

There is widespread feeling among the members that we are not doing enough.

Therefore, on this issue which will overshadow all others, the Congress will vote larger appropriations than the President deems necessary, and will insist on a major and sustained program that will regain and hold the lead for the United States.

Even though there are many new and liberal Members in the House of Representatives, I do not anticipate a runaway spending spree. Under the knowing and experienced guidance of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and Majority Leader JOHN McCORMACK, I believe that the first session will legislate a program that will basically suit the Nation's needs.

It will not be a timid session nor a reckless one.

But the Congress will, in the year of 1959—and to the best of its ability—do those things which must be done under the mandate calling for the up-to-date programs and the courageous leadership that it received from the people last November.

For it is aware that a big, and growing, and changing nation like ours must not fall behind the pace of history as it is being made today.

Honoring Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tasks and services performed by persons in the civil service of the United States are many and varied and are quite often taken for granted. They should not be.

Civil service workers, the vast majority of them with real dedication, perform vital services for this country—both at home and abroad—in fields varying from standardizing weights and measures to atomic energy programs to teaching the children of our service men and women.

Before civil service, Government employment was a jumble of jobs under the spoils system. With each change of administration, many thousands of new,

inexperienced, and frequently inefficient, people went on Government payrolls by political pull and pressure, and not by performance. Many of them had no real ability or concern for doing a good job. But civil service changed that deplorable situation almost overnight. Good service and qualifications to do the job have replaced cunning political pull as the criterion for Government employment.

This year, the Federal civil service begins its 76th year. This means a history of 75 years of devoted service to our Nation. These people seldom come to public attention. They are the workers who make it possible for our Government to function, they are the voices on the radio who speak from control towers and radar trailers to guide our aircraft traffic safely to the destination, they are the people who provide weather information which all of us use.

Others develop flood control measures and research into the natural sciences. They perform a great many services which make our Nation the finest place in which to live on this globe.

Before they can even qualify for a job, civil service workers must pass a difficult examination.

As an indication of esteem and appreciation for these people who perform so many needed jobs with so little recognition, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Randolph J. Jouno which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for Friday, January 2, 1959, under the heading "Civil Service Marks 75-Year Devoted Job."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE MARKS 75-YEAR DEVOTED JOB (By Randolph J. Jouno)

The Federal civil service in 1958 celebrated its 75th year. Civic groups held luncheons, dinners, banquets, and receptions in many communities. Sixty outstanding Federal employees were named Civil Servants of the Year. Twenty-six governors and hundreds of mayors issued anniversary proclamations. Congress and many State legislatures commemorated the occasion.

Jobs in the Federal service run the occupational index from accountant to zoologist. It has the same kinds of positions that exist in private industry and the professions and a few others peculiar to government.

Federal employees carry the mail, print the mint money, control narcotics, regulate immigration, collect taxes, conserve and renew land, forecast the weather, maintain national parks and forests, insure orderly interstate commerce, prevent adulteration of food and drugs, prevent the sale of contaminated meat, maintain public health services, and protect the rights of inventors and authors.

DIVERSE DUTIES

The Federal workers operate the social security and atomic energy programs, standardize weights and measures, prevent false advertising, develop flood-control measures, engage in research in the natural sciences, and do hundreds of other services demanded by the American people.

It is an old American custom to berate Federal employees, but strangely enough the scoffer when questioned is usually unable to identify specific individuals with whom he finds fault. His friends and neighbors

in the Federal service are found intelligent and capable.

Federal employees have chosen Government employment in much the same way employees in private industry have chosen their careers. The major difference is that the Federal employee has to take a stiff examination to prove his efficiency. Furthermore, he must be among the highest in the examination results. Many Federal employees have been attracted to Government service because of the objectivity in selection—solely on merit without regard to politics, race, creed, or religion.

Many Government employees see in the public nature of their employment a genuine opportunity to serve their fellow man. Their idealism is sometimes similar to that of those in the ministry or teaching. Salary often is a secondary consideration.

SALARY FROM TAXES

The civil service employee, receives his salary from taxes. If only from a selfish point of view, the taxpayer should be vitally concerned in seeing that the Government gets its fair share of the best available workers.

The merit system does not end with appointments. To maintain an efficient, satisfied work force, the Federal Government needs to give its employees the benefits of modern personnel administration, that is fair salaries, an equitable promotion system, training for improvement, protection against unjust removals, incentive awards, and reasonable retirement benefits.

In addition to providing stability of Government and continuity of functions, Federal employees are constantly on the lookout for opportunities to save money for the taxpayer. Last year Federal employees saved the taxpayer \$169,885,140. The total number of suggestions offered was 322,000, of which 86,000 were adopted.

SPOILS SYSTEM TRAGEDY

The assassination of a President jolted the Nation into establishing a merit system. The murder on July 2, 1881, of President Garfield, by Charles Guiteau, a disappointed office-seeker, focused public attention on the evils of the political spoils system, then practically the sole basis for selection to Federal jobs at all levels. Under this system appointments were given those who had contributed the most service to the victorious political party.

The spoils system had not always been the vogue. Washington insisted upon appointment by merit, although he had no formal machinery to insure appointment of the best qualified. The Four-Year Tenure of Office Act passed in 1820 limited the terms of certain officers like district attorneys and customs collectors and added impetus to the growing acceptance of the concept.

Civil service agitation after the Civil War prompted Congress and President Grant to set up in 1871 the first Civil Service Commission. Unfortunately it lapsed in 1875 due to lack of funds. Civil service reform was an issue in the fall elections of 1882, the first election after Garfield's assassination. In a number of congressional districts this issue alone decided the outcome. As soon as Congress met, civil service reform was given priority. Senator George H. Pendleton, of Ohio, wrote the law under which the Federal Civil Service now operates. President Arthur signed the bill January 16, 1883.

MERIT SYSTEM ACCENTED

Then the law covered only 10 percent of the jobs in the Federal Government. Now 86 percent of all Federal employees are in competitive civil service. Of those employees located in continental United States, 91 percent are classified.

Now practically no one seriously questions the civil service principle. The American public takes the system for granted. President Theodore Roosevelt expressed it this

way: "I am inclined more and more to feel that the observance in letter and spirit of the civil service law is the first requisite in obtaining clean, decent, efficient Government service in any branch or bureau of the Government."

President Eisenhower said, "Nowhere in the world have I met more efficiency, more dedication, more readiness to put in hours without counting them on the clock * * * than I have among the civil service."

ROLLS GEARED TO NEED

Elected and politically appointed officials are grateful too for the relief they enjoy from the lessening of patronage pressure. Top businessmen called into the high policy posts of Government, such as heads of departments, soon become impressed with the integrity, loyalty, and ability of the career civil servants who must carry the brunt of the day-to-day work of the Government while political heads come and go. Many of them have issued public statements of praise.

The number of employees varies with the amount of work the Government has to do. During World War II, Government employment rose to 3,780,000. After the war it dropped to fewer than 2 million. Korea caused another increase. Now there are 2,339,000. Big government is the product of international unrest, enormous and continuing increases in population, an increasingly complex economy, and the demand of the public for services.

It sometimes is said that it is impossible to separate a civil service employee. The number of separations last year for cause, 13,000, belies that statement. Actually, Federal employees to hold their jobs must adhere to very high standards of conduct. Like the physician with his Hippocratic oath, the Federal employee has his creed of service:

"We as members of the civil service accept our obligation and our opportunity to serve the American people well and in full measure, doing our best to further the free and democratic institutions of our country. We believe it our duty to carry out loyally the will of the people as expressed in our laws; serve the public with fairness, courtesy, integrity, and understanding; help improve the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of our work; and thus do our part in performing the great services of the Government."

McCormack Predicts Strong Program by Democratic Congress and Democratic Sweep in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, when interviewed by John Harris, of the Boston Globe, expressed complete confidence that the big Democratic majority in the 86th Congress will legislate a sound and progressive program. With this record, the party will go before the people from a stronger position than ever before. Actually, the wealth of available talent to choose from is unprecedented. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is the leading contender. In any case, the Democrats are sure to elect their

standard bearer to the Presidency in 1960.

Mr. MCCORMACK, whose knowledge of major issues and keen sense of public opinion trends command respectful attention, believes that the people are with the Democrats all the way.

Summing up, the "field general" of the House Democrats said:

I look for an outstanding record, and look forward to 1960 to a complete Democratic victory, including the White House and Congress.

As the 1st session of the 86th Congress faces up to its responsibilities, I believe that we should read the views of our majority leader. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following article from the January 4, 1959, issue of the Boston Sunday Globe:

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE LEADER MCCORMACK'S PREDICTIONS—WHAT NEXT 2 YEARS WILL BEING: NO SPLIT IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY; MRS. ROOSEVELT'S ROADBLOCK WON'T STOP KENNEDY; NIXON TO GET NOMINATION, LOSE ELECTION

(By John Harris)

The topheavy 2-to-1 majority the Democrats have won in the new Congress will not lead to unwieldiness, said Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, but will mean Speaker RAYBURN and I will have a workable majority with no worry, as in the past, about coalitions between Republican and 25 to 40 Democrats, mostly from the South.

The veteran lawmaker, majority leader in the National House of Representatives, made these other highlight observations in the course of an interview on the incoming Congress, its relations with the White House and potential effect on the 1960 election:

"Of the presidential candidates, I think Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is in the best position at the present time. The best evidence is that Mrs. Roosevelt's recent statement was an attempt to throw a roadblock in his way, but I do not think that was accomplished."

"The Berlin situation is very disturbing because of the geographical location of Berlin, isolated from the rest of the free world. But I do not conceive of the Kremlin being willing to go to general war over Berlin."

"The new Democrats elected to Congress are practically all of them progressive-minded. So the results of the last election were a good thing for the country, which is stronger and our people best served when progressive leadership is in control of the Government."

Does Congressman MCCORMACK feel that the Democratic Party will be split in 1960's national convention by the civil rights issues which have become prominent, tangles in the new Congress, with the Senate divided over the filibuster rule change, and the House confronted with the disputed seating of a segregationist from Little Rock?

"I don't expect," said MCCORMACK, "that there will be any severe difficulty or tension in the 1960 National Democratic Convention because there is a civil rights bill on the statute books."

"It is more difficult to create a split when there is a law on the statute books than when there is not. The civil rights bill was passed by the 85th Congress, a Democratically controlled Congress, the first time any such legislation passed in about 90 years."

"Even with the division in the Democratic Party on this question, a Democratic Congress did pass this historic bill. It is interesting to note that only six years ago we had a Republican Congress and President Eisenhower, a Republican, was in the White House, and the Republicans did not

even report a civil rights bill out of committee in either House."

"This makes the achievement of the 85th Democratic Congress all the more significant."

"Having been chairman of the platform committee at three of the last four National Democratic Conventions, I think by hard experience I'm in a position to form an opinion on this matter."

"I do not look for any trouble—or party split—in the 1960 convention. There'll be some talk about third party and an impending split, but it will only be interesting reading in the newspapers."

"In my opinion there is no such danger. The Democratic Party will go into the 1960 election united."

With the increased progressive membership from the northern section of the nation, and particularly from the West, what legislation does Congressman MCCORMACK foresee the new Congress will enact?

"There will be housing legislation, a depressed area bill, an increase in minimum wages anywhere up to \$1.25 an hour, an acceleration of the interstate highway program, modernization of airports to make them safer for passengers in the coming jet age, further consideration of amendments to the Social Security Act such as increasing the amount that can be earned after retirement, and, if the recession grows worse, there will be legislation of an antirecession nature."

"The Democratic Party above all stands for strong national defense and a firm foreign policy. We must recognize that the Communist challenge of world revolution and domination is stronger than in the past and we must be as determined as ever. We can never permit ourselves to get in a position where we lose our retaliatory power."

Will the Democratically controlled Congress exceed the pared down \$77 billion budget proposed by President Eisenhower?

"If we feel it is in the interest of national security we will do so as in the 85th Congress. Then the President wanted an Army of 870,000 and we appropriated for an Army of 900,000."

"He requested 175,000 marines; we appropriated for 200,000. The President was for reducing the Armed Forces."

"The Democratic Congress felt in the world today that was too great a risk to take. I still feel that way."

What can the Congress do about a strong foreign policy?

"The important thing is that we do not have a shifting from day to day, week to week on foreign policy because that is a sign of weakness and uncertain leadership. The only thing the Congress can do is to mold public opinion. We've certainly done that in the past. We intend to do so in the future."

"Congress, under the Constitution, cannot make foreign policy. The President is the sole repository in the field of foreign policy as he is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. But Congress can criticize and propose, and the Democrat Congress will do this."

"Congress will also cooperate on a bipartisan basis with the President although there has been little evidence of real bipartisan action on the part of President Eisenhower because the Democratic leadership in Congress has not been consulted before policy is made."

"In the interest of the country, the President would be following a wise course if he consulted Democratic leadership before major decisions are made. This does not mean he has to accept our opinion, but on the other hand we might be able to make excellent contributions and it would have a marked effect on our people and the world, for the world, free and Communist, would know there is real unity."

What about cooperation between the White House and Capitol Hill, now that the Democrats rule the Congress by a 2-to-1 margin?

"No difficulty on real cooperation on the part of the Democrats, because we've been giving cooperation to President Eisenhower under painful conditions.

"The matter of real cooperation rests with President Eisenhower and the Republicans. The interest of the country is greater than any political party."

Looking forward to 1960, McCormack said: "From the Democratic angle the issues of the 1960 election will be made by the 85th Democratically controlled Congress. It will be the basis for us going before the people. I look for an outstanding record, and look forward to 1960 to a complete Democratic victory, including the White House and Congress."

On the subject of presidential contenders: "There are a number: Senator KENNEDY, Senator SYMINGTON, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator JOHNSON, Governor Williams, Governor Meyner, Gov. Pat Brown if he has the thought in mind, Adlai Stevenson, several others.

"The Democrats have a wide field of qualified candidates to pick from.

"The Republican Party is in the opposite position. In the first place they are badly split on basic questions. The old guard Republicans are groping out of the underground and they have great strength in their national convention.

"The Republicans have only Vice President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller.

"I do not think Vice President Nixon will make a strong candidate on the voter level. He has powerful opposition in his own party and has lost prestige with the people.

"He's trying to flirt with both progressives and standpatters. That's difficult to do, particularly on the presidential level.

"The progressive-minded people do not like his policies.

"On the other hand the standpatters do not like Rockefeller. There is a bad schism in the Republican Party right across the board. This does not exist in the Democratic Party. Furthermore, President Eisenhower's influence is waning, and his strength has been personal rather than political. He has shown inability to transmit his strength to other Republicans.

"In my opinion NIXON will get the nomination because he has practical control of the party machinery, and the Republicans have no one else to select.

"I think Rockefeller is too smart to be a candidate in 1960 with the political conditions existing then, and he'll wait for a later date."

applied for REA loan funds to serve this area. Approval has been long delayed. The people need light and power now.

The Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County has passed a resolution requesting that all parties responsible for the granting of REA loans be urged to hasten the approval of this application. I would like to add my voice to theirs.

The splendid accomplishments of the REA are widely known. It is my belief that these vital electrical services should be made available to this area as soon as possible.

Mr. President, in support of my statement, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution passed by the Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County on January 12, 1959, at Sierra Blanca, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas a large section of Hudspeth County, Tex., is without electric power, which is greatly needed for pumping wells, operating power tools, and many other uses including household needs; and

"Whereas application has been made to the Rural Electrification Administration for a loan to provide this section with the much needed electric power; and

"Whereas approval of this loan has been delayed on the above-mentioned section, which is section B, due to the small number of users and the distances involved: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Commissioner's Court of Hudspeth County, assembled in regular session this 12th day of January A.D. 1959, That all parties responsible for the granting of loans under the Rural Electrification Administration be urged to hasten the approval of the above-mentioned loan so that the residents of this section may be served with the much needed electric power as soon as possible."

I, Tom H. Neely, county judge of Hudspeth County, Tex., hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed and approved in open commissioner's court on Monday, January 12, 1959.

TOM H. NEELY,

County Judge, Hudspeth County, Tex.

Attest:

BERNICE M. ELDER,

County Clerk, Hudspeth County, Tex.

Horror in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report from Cuba by Mr. Dale Francis, columnist for Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic Action weekly. Mr. Francis' report appears in the January 25, 1959, edition of the newspaper.

HORROR IN CUBA

(By Dale Francis)

The story I must tell you is a story that will chill your blood with horror. It is a story that rivals the worst of the atrocity stories to come from Nazi Germany, the

worst of the tales of horror to come from behind the Iron Curtain—and it happened at the very doorstep of the United States on the island of Cuba.

I must tell this story because the truth must be known. The truth must be known so that Americans can understand why the trials and executions going on now in free Cuba are necessary, why in justice criminals must be punished. It is a story that must be told so that Americans can understand why it is that Cubans were sickened by our State Department's closed eyes while murder was going on before their very eyes, why it is that an ambassador who played golf while torturers slashed the living bodies of men and women only a few miles away became a symbol of American stupidity.

This is not just a story told to me by the victorious rebel leaders. It is a story I have heard firsthand from an archbishop, from priests who have seen mutilated bodies, from people I know speak the truth.

How many have been murdered in Cuba? It is difficult to make an estimate. Only yesterday a mass grave was discovered with more than 100 bodies. But I have been told by Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes of Santiago de Cuba that in his Province alone the murdered have already certainly totaled more than 5,000.

Understand, I am not talking about casualties in war. I am talking about cold-blooded murders of men and women, murders that have been preceded by the cruelest of tortures. Men and women who have been picked up on the street, pulled from their homes. And these 5,000 murders are only the murders in 1 of the 6 Provinces of Cuba, and even that number is but an estimate that is being raised each day as new graves are discovered.

How did you spend December 23? It was, on the church calendar, the Day of Martyrs. In Cuba for five young men of the Catholic Action it was the day of their martyrdom.

They were members of Agrupacion Catolica de Universario in Habana. We told you about this group of young men when we lived in Cuba. They came to our village to help instruct the people, pass out pamphlets; one reads the Gospel aloud in Spanish at mass during the 40 hours. There are only a few members in this select Catholic Action group.

These five were seized by the secret police after Christmas. That was the last time they were seen alive. A few days ago a priest who knew them well searched through a stack of more than 60 bodies for them. They were difficult to identify, for they had been tortured brutally. This morning mass was celebrated for these martyrs of the new Cuban freedom.

I will tell you more about these young men, their names, what they were like, in the stories to come, but now—so you will never forget it—let me tell you the story their bodies told. It is not a very different story; it was repeated thousands of times during these last 2 years in Cuba.

They were shot first of all in the arm, not once but many times, rising up from their wrists. Bullets tore through their body in nonvital places, the ears, the chin, the cheeks. Their bodies were slashed with knives in a manner too horrible to detail. And then, when they could be tortured no longer, they were given the sweet release of a bullet in the temple.

This is not something out of fiction; this is not something from behind the Iron Curtain, not a belated story from Hitler's Germany. It is the truth about Batista's Cuba, and just a few short days ago it happened.

This story is cabled from Habana. I am still gathering the truth about what has happened these last terrible years. They are things that have not yet been reported in the newspapers and magazines of the United States and they are things the people must know.

A Large Section of Hudspeth County, Tex., Is Blacked Out—It Needs Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a large section of Hudspeth County, Tex., has no electric power. These families must still rely on the methods of lighting in use before Edison invented the incandescent lamp. These people have great need of electrical power for the variety of services it performs on the farm and in the home.

The Rio Grande Electric Cooperative, Inc., located at Brackettsville, Tex., has

I have talked with hundreds of soldiers—country boys for the first time in Habana, conquerors who do not swagger, who are polite and quiet, who want only that there should be peace and freedom in Cuba.

I have talked with leaders of the revolution. I spent an afternoon and evening in the private office of Fidel Castro. I not only talked with him but, more enlightening, watched him talk with others, watching the parade of people coming to the hero of Cuba as he works his way through the mass of complications that come with a new government.

I have talked with the other leaders of the revolution—men like Camilo Cienfuegos, another of the Barbudos, the bearded ones, who now heads up the air, sea, land, and police forces of Habana.

I have talked with the 24-year-old youngster who is the new civilian administrator of Santiago de Cuba and I have seen in his eyes he is very old—old enough to remember the group of 34 youngsters who met to discuss ways of ending tyranny, old enough to remember not a 1 of the 34 alive but himself.

Soon I will go to Oriente. There I am going to visit scenes of the atrocities. Archbishop Enrique Perez de Arce is going to take me. One place we will go is to the village of Maffo. Every home in Maffo was leveled by Batista's henchmen.

In articles to come I must detail some of the horrors. I do not like to do this but if I do not then you will never know why it is military courts are sentencing men to die in Cuba and you might be misled, as many Americans already have been misled, into believing justice is not being done.

That justice is being done and done in a reasonable and orderly manner I can testify by one incident I witnessed a few minutes before I sat down to write this article.

I was coming from Castro's headquarters with Father Francisco Guzman, a 6-foot-3 husky, bearded, Jesuit who served as chaplain with the rebels, when two young men came rushing to him. They started thanking him for what he had done for them, telling him how right he had been.

They were four young men who joined the rebels when their brother was murdered by the secret police. They fought because they wanted to avenge their brother's death. A few days ago one of the brothers captured the man who had murdered his brother.

He did nothing to the murderer. He brought him in a prisoner for trial because he knew that a revenge murder would be wrong. The man was sentenced to death, not alone for this murder but for others, and the four brothers asked to be a part of the firing squad.

"It is not right," Father Guzman told them. "You must not ask revenge, only justice."

And so he talked them out of being on the firing squad, let the death of the murderer be a death of justice, not revenge. Now the young men were thanking him, they were deeply grateful. "You were right," one of them said, "we must not ask for anything but justice."

And in Cuba justice is at last coming. It will be a hard process and many prayers and much work is needed, but it is coming.

the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 8 edition of the Palm Beach Daily News.

This article, written by former U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia, David E. Kaufman, is a thoughtful and timely comment upon our Latin American relations.

While I have some views not wholly parallel with the author's, I believe that Mr. Kaufman's article warrants wider attention.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER AMBASSADOR DAVID E. KAUFMAN
SUGGESTS ANSWER

(By David E. Kaufman)

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower has made some excellent suggestions in his report to the President, his brother, on his trip to Central America, which followed a similar tour of South America.

Because of the recent overthrow in Cuba of President Fulgencio Batista, one of the hemisphere's few remaining dictators, that part of Dr. Eisenhower's report urging a distinction in U.S. official attitude toward dictators and democratic leaders has naturally been given wide attention.

Actually, this recommendation does not go very far. It merely urges that in dealing with the heads of Latin American countries, we have an embrace for democratic leaders and a formal handshake for dictators. In other words, warmer relations toward one than toward the other.

But this appears a rather trifling alteration in U.S. policy in Latin America when it is considered that there are now only three countries in that region ruled by dictators: Paraguay, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

And Dr. Eisenhower is careful to qualify his statements by emphatically opposing any nonrecognition on our part of Latin American governments that happen to be ruled by dictators.

One of the basic Latin American policies is the principle of nonintervention. If we interfered, as we did some years ago, in the government of any of the Latin American countries, just because we decided that we did not like the current president or dictator, we would be inviting trouble.

Dr. Eisenhower points out rightly that nonrecognition and noncooperation will not help another nation to achieve democracy. Cooperating with a nation's people, even through dictators, allows the United States to keep open the lines of communication.

It might be added that we have recognized plenty of dictators in other parts of the world, some on our side and some against us. That does not mean that we like them personally or their kind or rule. We are merely being practical.

Underlining the unsatisfactory state of U.S. relations with most Latin American countries are two factors: our own indifference toward that area and Latin American misunderstanding of U.S. aims and policy. The second is largely an outgrowth of the first.

The Eisenhower report recognizes these faults. The United States, he says, does not comprehend the problems of Latin America. And Latin America mistakenly assumes that our economic capacity is unlimited and that the United States fixes prices on Latin American raw material exports. Many Latin Americans think the United States is spending too much on foreign aid in Europe and Asia, while neglecting its neighbors to the south. And the charge is frequently made in South and Central America that the United States treasures freedom for itself but is indifferent to dictatorial rule in Latin America.

Dr. Eisenhower sets all these things down as misunderstandings. They are largely so,

although it is not easy to convince Latin America.

To eliminate policies dangerous to European and Asiatic nations, and penny-pinching in our grants to Latin America.

To eradicate misunderstandings, Dr. Eisenhower would have each nation in the hemisphere set up a commission of distinguished citizens to work out a program under the Organization of American States; each nation assume responsibility for promoting understanding by its people; the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in Latin America increased; and the exchange of persons cultural program expanded.

These are good suggestions, but to expect that all of them, or even part of them, be speedily adopted, would be naive.

It is my own opinion, based on experience as U.S. Minister to a Latin American nation—Bolivia—and on knowledge gained since in United Nations agencies dealing with Latin American affairs, that a much simpler means is available to promote better understanding between the Americas.

That is by improved conduct of our relations with Latin American countries on the embassy level.

Our ambassadors and ministers and the members of their staffs in all the capitals of Central and South American countries should have personal knowledge of what goes on in their respective countries. They should have contact with people in and out of government. They should be able to clear up misapprehensions about our policies and promote better understanding.

The trouble is that in many cases our embassies are too far above the common level to know, or care, what is going on in the various countries. The staff members talk to each other, to attachés at other foreign embassies, to government officials and the upper classes. It does not occur to some of them ever to get close to the ordinary people or to acquaint themselves with the political opposition.

The result is the deplorable lack of information furnished by our embassies, as shown especially in the case of the countries where our Vice President was subjected to stoning and calumny.

Strong embassy staffs, acquainted with the people of the country to which they are accredited, and able and willing to work for improved relations between them and the United States, could do more good in a few months than all the commissions could accomplish in years.

Roger W. Jones, an Outstanding Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend President Eisenhower for nominating to membership on the Civil Service Commission one of the outstanding career civil servants of our time, Roger W. Jones.

In the span of three-quarters of a century since the establishment of the Civil Service Commission, there have been few commissioners better qualified by training and temperament than Roger Jones. He will bring to his new job a deep dedication, broad knowledge of governmental problems, and a certain zest for accomplishment.

Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

Nearly 20 years ago I first met Roger Jones while he was serving as administrative officer of the Bureau of the Budget in Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. There were several qualities which immediately stood out in his approach to his work. As a public servant in the highest sense of the word, he worked by the simple code of making the engines of bureaucracy carry out the public will.

There was a phrase which Franklin D. Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management used in 1939 which best describes Jones, "high competence, great physical vigor and a passion for anonymity." Working in high positions for Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, he displayed a remarkable ability to serve the institution of the Presidency without regard to political considerations. His respect for and understanding of the Presidency have been invaluable assets.

Roger Jones knows how to cultivate the best and reject the worst in the wonderland of bureaucracy. He can give direction and cohesiveness to a program which might otherwise get tangled in the molasses of the redtape sea. He has an instinct for the jugular.

I do not ever remember seeing Roger Jones when his eyes were not sparkling. When vast quantities of paper moved across his desk, he always seemed to have a freshness of approach to each new problem. He was never bogged down with work and always kept those sparkling eyes on the forest while he was chopping down or replanting the trees.

In the Civil Service Commission, he will have a much tougher job which will demand greater energy and leadership than his previous tasks. Will he be able to measure up? I have watched him also in the role of teacher, and here he has shown that he also has the necessary talents to make him a great educator.

Down through the years there have been great and mediocre members of the Civil Service Commission. The mediocre ones have been those who have tilted their swivel chairs slightly backward and allowed the vast Federal bureaucracy to run them. I do not think Roger Jones will be that kind of Commissioner. I believe he will grasp the reins of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a West Virginia Democrat I rise to pay tribute to this Connecticut Republican. The career service and the country are fortunate to have a man like Roger W. Jones to head the Civil Service Commission.

Waste of Helium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I

wish to include the following article from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Denver Post on the important subject of helium gas, by Roscoe Fleming:

WASTE OF HELIUM (By Roscoe Fleming)

Once there was a man who paid no attention to a cut blood vessel—because it didn't bother him much, at first. He is no longer with us.

There are times when your Uncle Samuel's policies as to natural resources remind one of that foolish man. Particularly does this seem true—and more serious by the hour—as to helium, the magic gas of the atomic age.

Our country has a world monopoly of this gas, indispensable for defense and for material development of the Nation and of the planet. Further, 90 percent of our supply is wasting. Yet, nowhere on earth, so far as we know, is there any more outside our own midcontinent gas fields. Almost all of our potential supply wastes into the air through our gas burners.

Does that make sense? Is that the long-range economic and conservation thinking which our Nation must ultimately do for survival? Are we the world prototype of the man who said "It ain't rainin' now" when asked why he didn't fix the roof?

The hard fact is that when our present supply of helium is gone, we shall not be able to find more save by straining it from the atmosphere at hundreds of thousands of times the cost we would incur by saving and storing it now.

How long, O Lord, for the people and the Congress to wake up? Will the new Congress do any better than the old? How many more chances shall we have?

A year ago an interagency committee headed by Colorado's own Hatfield Chilson made a report that should have had the ear of every American.

It said that when our midcontinent natural gas is gone, the world's helium is gone, save for a very little that the Government has been able to lay aside. It put the date for this as not beyond 1980-85.

It recommended a dozen extraction plants to be perched astride the pipelines leading from the richer helium fields.

One unit out of 12 proposed is underway. The Interior Department is building a new helium-extraction plant in the Oklahoma Panhandle, to join 4 now operative. But it will barely keep up with demand, providing no helium for storage.

This particular situation is, however, so specialized and the people have heard so little about it, that it is hard to see how a great fuss can be made. But it ought to be.

Wasting irreplaceable natural treasure is a national tragedy.

Veterans of World War I in Massachusetts Opposed to Closing of South Boston Naval Annex, Navy Regional Accounts Office, and Hingham Ammunition Depot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement issued to the Massachusetts delegation in Congress by Department Cmdr. Melvin D. Eddy

in support of the protest registered by Cmdr. Anthony D. Tieso of Barracks No. 1240, of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

The statement follows:

VETERANS OF
WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A.,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
January 8, 1959.
The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

At our regular executive meeting held on Sunday, December 28, 1958, at the Aurora Hotel, Worcester, Mass., a strong protest against the proposed closing of the South Boston Naval Annex, the Navy Regional Accounts Office, and the Hingham Ammunition Depot was registered by Cmdr. Anthony D. Tieso, of barracks No. 1240. He was joined in his protest by other barracks commanders.

Speaking in behalf of barracks No. 1240, which is composed of Veterans of World War I who are employed in the Boston Naval Shipyard, Commander Tieso stated: "The proposed closing of these facilities will result in the loss of approximately 2,000 Government jobs and will weaken the defense of the New England area. It does not seem to be good business thus to increase unemployment in Massachusetts by, for example, reassigning a vessel from Boston Naval Shipyard to another yard, where skilled labor might not be readily available; nor does it seem to be good business to transfer work from the shipyard to private industry, at higher cost. We, as employees of Boston Naval Shipyard, and as taxpayers, are strongly opposed to any needless Government spending, and we are firmly committed to the policy of 'greater value for least cost.' Presently available at Boston Naval Shipyard and the South Boston Annex are all the facilities and skills necessary and desirable to undertake the building, conversion, alteration, repair, and drydocking of any ship in the fleet, with the exception of the USS *Forrestal*—and for the latter, improvements to existing facilities are awaiting approval. Should the facilities of the 1,100-foot drydock at South Boston Annex be lost, work would have to be allocated to another shipyard, or to a private shipyard, and the consequence to Boston Naval Shipyard would be a reduction in force. Boston is aware that the proposed closing of facilities is not due to inferior workmanship, inasmuch as we have been commended on the quality of our work; nor is it due to excessive costs based on value received—in this regard, we welcome comparison with other shipyards."

The executive committee of the department voted unanimously to go on record in registering a strong protest at the proposed closing of South Boston Annex, Navy Regional Accounts Office, and Hingham Ammunition Depot. Therefore, the department strongly urges all of you, our Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts, to afford this serious situation your prompt and complete attention and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN D. EDDY,
Department Commander.
BELMONT, MASS.

The Forty-ninth Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, now that Alaska has officially been proclaimed a

State, the American flag gets its 49th star. Just a century ago, the flag was getting its 33d star, as Oregon became the northwestern boundary of the United States.

The star symbolizes a State of immense natural wealth, breathtaking scenery, unrivaled fishing and hunting, vast mineral resources, and big tracts of farmland. The young and adventurous people of the United States have a new frontier to conquer.

To commemorate this historic event, one of my constituents has written a poem, which in sincere and simple style reflects the feeling of millions of Americans.

THE FORTY-NINTH STAR
(By Mrs. Louise Liebenow)

A 49th star in a field of blue
With bars of red and white,
A pledge of allegiance to a noble flag,
A dream of a State come true.

May we always be proud of the 49th star
As it waves in our field of blue,
United for mankind near and far
Alaska, our trust is in you.

The Saving Grace of Self-Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Presbyterian denomination, although far from being the largest religious organization in the Nation, has provided many Presidents and other high officials of our Government, and therefore it is interesting to know what is being preached from its pulpits concerning our political life. On January 4, 1959, Dr. Theophilus M. Taylor, moderator of the newly consolidated United Presbyterian Church in the United States, speaking in the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, emphasized the ideological nature of the struggle in which we are engaged, as De Gaulle is now doing in France. He considered the Soviet Government's attack on Pasternak for his critical work, "Dr. Zhivago," and the high praise and ready acceptance of the similarly critical work, "The Ugly American," by our officialdom as indicating the comparative health and strength of our Nation. True to the Protestant heritage, he recognizes that self-criticism and the acceptance of criticism by our leaders, as distinguished from the attitude of the Kremlin dictators, prevents festering sores, the infection of which continues to increase until at least major surgery or death ensues to the political system.

The moderator dispels misgivings which arose last summer, resulting from the unfavorable press construction of a certain resolution, adopted by Presbyterian Church leaders as being pro-Communist. What was then considered as an attack upon our anti-Soviet policy of the past decade, and a recommenda-

tion for peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Communist dictatorship, can hardly be attributed to the present leader of that denomination. For Dr. Taylor's address is aimed at the Soviet Government, not its people. It is common knowledge that self-criticism by the Soviet people is encouraged, even to the point of being forced from them. It is the Communist Party leadership which insists that the totalitarian state set up by it can do no wrong; it is the dictatorship of that state which permits no criticism, by Pasternak or any other citizen or nation. So, also, Dr. Taylor is eulogizing the officials of this country when he speaks of their receptive attitude toward the American counterpart of "Dr. Zhivago."

THE SAVING GRACE OF SELF-CRITICISM

(Scripture: Romans 12: 3: "I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment.")

In the ideological conflict now raging between the East and the West, that factor which in the end will be decisive is the saving grace of self-criticism. This has been signaled recently by the publication and public reception in their native lands of two books, "Dr. Zhivago" and "The Ugly American." The two books do not belong in the same category at all by literary standards, for according to such standards "Dr. Zhivago" probably deserves to be ranked among the great epics of all time. However, the two books are similar in this respect—each is openly critical of the cultural and political milieu out of which it has come. Both books represent a healthy self-criticism by loyal citizens who love their native lands dearly. It is for this reason that they write as frankly as they do. In each case the authors are attempting to call the attention of their fellow citizens to weaknesses within their own systems and to the obvious need for reform at these points.

It is the reaction of the governments and of the general public in each case which is significant. In Russia where self-criticism cannot be tolerated, Louis Pasternak has been forced by none-too-subtle pressures to reject a well-deserved Nobel prize for his book, and he has been vilified in the public press, by party-inspired critics, as a traitor. In the United States "The Ugly American" has been widely and thoughtfully read by Americans in all walks of life. On a recent trip through the Far East and southern Asia I found Americans, both in and out of Government services, devouring it in its serialized form, and discussing it appreciatively even though they did not agree with what it is trying to say in every detail.

There is something fundamentally weak about any system, or individual, that cannot endure the bright light of criticism, whether it emanates from without or from within—from others or from oneself. Any social, economic, or political system that will neither criticize itself, nor permit itself to be criticized, is like a festering sore swathed in filthy rags in which the infection continues to increase until at last either major surgery, or death, ensues. In the same way, the unwillingness on the part of individuals to accept criticism is a fundamental weakness in personality which will ultimately prove to be their nemesis. It requires a magnanimous and healthy personality to stand up to, and benefit from, the vigorous criticism of others. Likewise it is a magnanimous and socially healthy nation that will accept and benefit from the criticism of its sister nations. But the test of a truly mature personality is that of rigorous self-criticism; and one can never become self-critical in

the best sense until one has learned to accept the candid criticism of others.

A nation's ability to be self-critical must never be superficially confused with retrospective evaluations of a 5-year plan, nor with considered estimates of success, or non-success, in winning friends and influencing people at the international level. Any national self-criticism worthy of the name must be free to investigate the moral, ethical, and spiritual foundations upon which the entire system rests. Communist nations today are rushing headlong into a blind alley at this point because they are unwilling to accept any criticism of their life at its roots, whether from within, or without. We in America dare not make the same mistake.

Here, upon the threshold of a new year, it is particularly appropriate that our attention should be called again to one of the most urgent admonitions of the apostle Paul: "I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment." With these words the apostle invites the Christians at Rome to sober self-criticism. This is good advice psychologically for anyone; but it is mandatory for the Christian.

While Paul certainly thinks of the Christian as living inescapably in the presence of God, he never thinks of him as living on a spiritual vacuum alone with God. Rather Paul always sees the Christian living in a fellowship with all other Christians, and he also sees him living inescapably in the midst of a non-Christian world. In this situation the Christian knows himself to be God's agent for the reconciliation of all mankind. These factors determine the context in which the Christian is to exercise self-criticism and self-discipline. He must judge himself soberly (1) as an individual responsible primarily to God; (2) as a member of the church which is the body of Christ; and (3) as a citizen of this world in which God has been pleased to place him.

I. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS INDIVIDUALS UNDER GOD

First of all we are called as Christians to examine our lives in terms of our personal relationship to God. This must logically come first, as in our Lord's summary of the law: "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God, . . . and [then] thy neighbor as thyself." Only when a right relationship is established between ourselves and God, can we be expected to have a right relationship to our fellowmen.

The question we should ask ourselves here at the beginning of a new year is, "Am I a better Christian—a more faithful and obedient Christian—than I was a year ago? Am I really living closer to God? Am I more consistently and more fully living in the center of His will for me?"

Our Christian faith has from the beginning recognized and emphasized the sanctity of the individual—his rights, privileges, and responsibilities. The gospel of the kingdom is addressed to individuals—"whosoever will, let him come." God calls individuals into his service. While it is true that God is concerned for all men, he is concerned for them as individuals, and not en masse. Moreover, when men and women become Christ's men and women they do not lose their individual identity. They are not poured into the same mold. Rather their individuality is enhanced. It is brought to full fruition. It's potentialities are more fully realized than ever before.

The Christian life in fundamentally a life of movement, of growth, of prayers and improvement, not only in this life, but in the life to come. It is a life of continuing fulfillment. Life in which this element of growth is missing cannot be Christian life in the proper sense. Paul speaks of Christ as the very image, or likeness, of God (II Corinthians 4: 4); and says that the Christian is

being changed into the same image, or likeness, from one degree of glory to another (II Corinthians 3: 18). He speaks of a man's old nature, the outer man, wasting away, while his new nature, the inner man, is going through a continual process of renewal (II Corinthians 4: 16). Thus it becomes impossible for the Christian to stand still, or to mark time. If he is truly Christian he must be in a process of growth, always moving in the direction of being changed into the likeness of Christ, who in turn bears the likeness of God.

Now what does Paul really mean when he says that the Christian is being "changed into His likeness from one degree of glory to another?" It means essentially that God-likeness, which is Christ-likeness, is demanded of us; and that it ought to be measurably greater in the Christian today than it was yesterday, a week ago, a month ago, this time last year. Jesus, himself, had a few things to say on this subject: "I say to you, love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be the sons of your Father who is in heaven." This agrees well with Paul's understanding of the nature of God. It was by virtue of the fact that Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, that God demonstrated, confirmed, and commended His love for mankind (Romans 5: 8). This kind of love—God-like love for men in spite of their sin—must be increasingly characteristic of the Christian. Indeed, we can say that the degree to which we genuinely love those who sin against us, those who are unlovely and unloving, will be a measure of how much the love of God has invaded our lives. Jesus also said, "If you love (only) those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even (sinners) do the same?" If we are to be pleasing to God, if we are to grow in God-likeness, if we are really being changed into His image from one degree of glory to another, then this will surely be reflected in our attitude toward other men.

Yet, one more thing more needs to be said in this connection. The improvement or growth which takes place in one Christian life is not to be measured by the growth in the lives of other Christians. Rather, it is to be measured over against itself. There should be competition in the Christian's life, but it is always competition with oneself. This is true expressly because no two Christians are alike in their natural abilities, in their spiritual endowments, in their education and experience, in the tasks to which God has called them. Thus, as we apply self-criticism, the sober judgment for which Paul calls, to ourselves, we do so in terms of what we have been, and what progress we ourselves have made. Our self-criticism must eventuate in self-discipline, or it will fall short of its goal.

II. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS MEMBERS OF THE BODY OF CHRIST

In the second place we are called as Christians to examine our lives in terms of our relationship to other Christians, to the other members of the body of Christ. After urging Christians to consider themselves with sober judgment, Paul continues: "For as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we though many are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another" (Romans 12: 4, 5).

While it is true that the life of Christ is, and should be, incarnate in the life of each one of us, as an individual Christian, the life of Christ will best be seen by the world as a composite picture of the best in all Christians, for He dwells by His spirit in the church, which is made up of all its members.

The church can only be self-critical through the spiritual sensitivity of all its members. It is self-critical as we, its individual members, are critical of our parts in

its corporate life, and of its corporate life as a whole.

We must remember that the great Protestant reformation of the church arose from a rediscovery of this principle—the saving grace of self-criticism. The Protestant reformation began as an attempt by men, like Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Knox, to reform an existing institution. But existing institutions, whether political or ecclesiastical, usually resist reform. There is a general principle, it seems, which is at work in all human institutions, namely; that the longer an institution exists and the more developed and involved its traditions become, the more likely it is to resist attempts at reformation, the more inflexible it becomes. It is just as bad when a church becomes rigid and inflexible, as when a political state, like Russia, does so.

It is the glory of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches that they have learned to combat this natural tendency in human institutions, by insisting upon being self-critical. We speak of our United Presbyterian Church as "reformed according to the word of God." A Presbyterian or Reformed Church is true to its heritage and its genius only when it is a continually reforming church. Reformation never ends. As individual Presbyterians, we are true to our great heritage, only when we continue to examine ourselves as members of the body of Christ—the one holy, apostolic, and catholic church which we profess in the creeds. We must continually seek to relate ourselves to that great church.

As we apply this self-criticism to ourselves at this level, we must ask, since all the members do not have the same function, whether we have, as individuals, found that particular place and function in the body which God expects us to fill, and to fulfill. We must also ask how genuinely we know ourselves as individually members one of another. In the Corinthians letter, where Paul discusses the church as the body of Christ, he points out that "if one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together" (I Corinthians 12: 26). We can, therefore, measure our growth at this point by determining how sincerely we are disturbed by the misfortune and persecution of fellow Christians anywhere in the world. And the reality and sincerity of our sympathy may be very well measured by whether we do anything about it in the way of relief, and by whether their calamity causes us to remember them importunately in our prayers.

III. OUR SELF-CRITICISM AS CITIZENS OF THE WORLD

The third area in which we are called to think soberly of ourselves—to be self-critical, is at the point of our relationship to all men. Paul wrote earlier in the Roman letter that he counted himself a debtor, "under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish." Here in the 12th chapter he urges the Roman Christians, "Repay no one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all (men). If possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all (men)." (Romans 12: 17, 18). But it was not enough to feel oneself obligated to all men; to refrain from retaliation, and to endeavor to live peaceably with all men, for God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself, has given us the ministry of reconciliation for all men. "We are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal (to all men) through us" (II Corinthians 5: 18, 20). These were Paul's words, addressed not alone to ministers and missionaries, but to anyone who is a new creature in Christ.

Late in the second century an unknown Christian addressed a letter to a man by the name of Diognetus. In that letter he said,

"What the soul is in the body, that Christians are in the world." There is no mistaking the fact that he had here laid hold of a great spiritual truth. Thus the church serves as the conscience of society and of all social institutions, as it seeks to lift them through its own active participation in the life of the world to their highest levels of service. And it is we Christians, as individuals inescapably involved in the social, economic, and political life of our times, who must be the voice of that conscience to humanity.

Here again we must apply a vigorous self-criticism to ourselves. The questions we must answer at this point are, first, whether we have grown as ambassadors for Christ, as holders of the ministry, and bearers of the message of reconciliation to men—"that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself"; and, second, whether we have been, by our daily behavior and testimony, that soul and conscience which Christians are meant to be in the world. Or we can frame this question in another way: As we think of ourselves with sober judgment, have we influenced the world for good, or have we allowed the world to influence us for evil?

Paul began his exhortation this way: "I appeal to you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good, and acceptable, and perfect."

"For by the grace given to me I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think (of himself) with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him."

Let us, then recapture and maintain for ourselves, our church, and our Nation, the saving grace of self-criticism.

Beer Cans to Moon Are Fine, but Wiser Choice Is Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 10, 1959, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard. Dr. Ray Ellickson, head of the University of Oregon's department of physics, is outstanding in his field. In a recent speech before members of the Oregon Association of Nurserymen, Dr. Ellickson cited his reasons for the need for pure research rather than spectacular stunts such as shooting a beer can to the moon. It made a lot of sense to me. The article by reporter Don Brown follows:

BEER CANS TO MOON ARE FINE, BUT WISER CHOICE IS RESEARCH
(By Don Brown)

Pure research, rather than spectacular stunts such as shooting a beer can to the moon is needed in the United States, a University of Oregon physics professor said in a talk in Eugene Friday.

Ray Ellickson, head of the University of Oregon Physics Department, addressed a noon luncheon attended by about 150

Oregon nurserymen and their wives. The members attended a 2-day meeting of the Oregon Association of Nurserymen here Thursday and Friday.

Too many Americans have lost their perspective since Russia's achievements in space, Ellickson said. There is too much of a keeping up with Russia complex he told the nurserymen.

It would cost the United States about \$2 billion to send a missile the size of a beer can to the moon, he said. And, Ellickson asked, what would it accomplish?

If the Government put the \$2 billion into education, he said, about 200 colleges the size and caliber of Reed College in Portland could be endowed.

Since Russia sent the first satellite into orbit around the earth, he said, Americans have lost their former contempt for Russians' ability to progress in science. Prior to Sputnik, he added, Americans believed Russians could not do anything on their own hook.

It is typical of Americans, Ellickson believes, that they have a unique ability to swing rather violently from one end of the pendulum to the other. This applies to favoring or disfavoring football coaches, according to the coach's win-loss record—and it applies to American attitudes toward foreign powers.

Ellickson said that he is concerned with the attitude which Americans now have toward keeping up with Russian developments. For example: Russia has shot a rocket to within 5,000 miles of the moon.

POPULAR CRY

This feat has resulted in a popular cry among Americans for their Government to shoot a U.S. rocket to within at least 1,000 miles of the moon, he said. Next will come the attempt to hit the moon, and possibly to land a beer can there—at least figuratively speaking.

Perhaps it would cost the United States \$2 billion to send a can-sized missile to the moon, the scientist said. But, he asked, what will have been achieved if this is done? All this competition, he said, is much like television commercials boasting of fountain pens which will write on butter or on the bottom of a bathtub filled with water. How practical are such tests? he asked.

TRADITIONALLY DIFFICULT

It has been traditionally difficult in America to get public interest aroused in research, the physicist reported. This problem prevailed at the time scientists were trying to arouse Federal officials in researching the A-bomb possibilities. Finally, after other efforts failed, he said, the late Albert Einstein prevailed on President Franklin D. Roosevelt to see what F.D.R. could do to help science and the Nation to win World War II. F.D.R. was able to obtain only \$7,500 for A-bomb research, he said.

This was due to very few persons being able even to guess what might lie ahead in atomic research.

Ellickson also cited dandelion research as once being a little-known factor. A study was undertaken on sunflowers, he said, to determine why they turned their heads to the sun. It was found that a chemical was secreted on the back of the flowers in the absence of sunlight. This led to further study which resulted in discovering dandelion-killing 2-4-D.

CALLED FOOLISH

Research on why sunflowers turn their heads, Ellickson suggested, was termed foolish by persons who did not know the tie-in. But if the sunflower study had not been undertaken, there would have been no 2-4-D. With the development of the weed killer, he said, farmers, nurserymen, and others have saved hundreds of millions of dollars by being able to kill many other weeds.

Tremendous benefits always accrue through this kind of research, Ellickson told nurserymen. At first there may be no notion by the investigator that his study will result in applications to special problems.

He criticized too much secrecy on the part of the Federal Government in research work, also. Again he cited an example: During World War II Ellickson worked on a secret infrared ray project which permitted military men to see in the dark without the enemy's knowing it.

NAVY JOB?

This, he said, started as a naval research job. Laboratory men were sworn to secrecy through fear by Navy men that the Japanese, Germans and the U.S. Army would learn about the infrared light, he added.

Yet, when the project was perfected, it developed that the Army was able to use it to better advantage, through its troops, than the Navy. The lights were used, therefore, by the very agency which the Navy had tried to keep its secret from, the physicist emphasized.

The 2-day event, the first of its kind ever held in Eugene by the 26-year-old OAN, ended Friday night with a president's banquet and ball, to honor past presidents of the OAN.

Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) State Times on January 11, 1959, written by its distinguished editor, Hon. Oliver Emmerich. It follows: No, My FRIEND, MISSISSIPPI IS NOT SLOWLY DYING

(By Oliver Emmerich)

The State Times is in receipt of the following message, a product of the campaign of hate waged in the East against the people of the South.

"Happy 1959, Mississippi. You are losing population. I hope you will die more slowly in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, etc., than you have been dying up to now. Please, Mississippi, die slowly."

Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, "Prayer is dominant desire." We feel sorry for any individual whose desire stems from hate. What spiritual foundation other than hate could wish slow death to a whole State?

The savagery of the dark ages aroused such vicious feeling that men were often condemned to the excruciating pain of slow death. Once a King of England decreed that two robbers be skinned alive. Their skins were tacked to the outer walls of Westminster Abbey.

In this more enlightened age it is tragic to find any person, whose vision is so blurred and whose understanding is so blighted, as to pray for a return of the spirit of the dark ages.

Any individual who wishes slow death for Mississippi will find disappointment in the revitalized spirit of this State. Here is the true story of Mississippi.

One hundred years ago Mississippi was the fifth richest State in the Union. Then came the devastation of war, the exploitation of Reconstruction, and finally the resurrection of a triumphant faith which now is

sweeping this State to new plateaus of progress and glory.

Slow death? Let's check the industrial life of Mississippi. Twenty years ago Mississippi had only 843 factories, 47,890 industrial workers and a total industrial output of only \$175,000,000.

Last year the new industrial life of Mississippi had increased our industries to 2,041, our industrial workers to 113,800 and our total industrial output to \$1,605,000,000, an increase of 850 percent.

No signs of rigor mortis here.

Slow death? Let's look at Mississippi's financial progress. Twenty years ago—in 1938—Mississippi banks had on deposit \$195,008,000. Last year the total deposits were \$1,153,157,000. We are very much alive in this category as it is easy to see.

Die slowly? Take a peep at Mississippi's agriculture. Total cash farm sales in 1938 were \$134,964,000. In 1956, the total was more than 400 percent greater—\$596,065,000.

Mississippi dying? Let's look at the educational picture. In 1938 Mississippi spent \$24.55 per pupil in elementary schools or a total of \$12,000,000. Last year Mississippi spent \$81,500,000 on elementary education or \$181 per school child.

Mississippi also is in the midst of a \$120 million building program for new elementary and high school buildings, seeking to equalize the school facilities of the two races. This program was voluntary. It was enacted in 1953 before the U.S. Supreme Court's school segregation decision.

In addition our State has budgeted \$21 million for higher education, plus \$7 million for university and college buildings.

The State of Mississippi is second from the top among the States in the percentage of total tax budget spent for education. A State with this concept of learning is very much alive, forward looking, and on the march.

What's the racial situation? The answer is that racially, Mississippi is up-and-coming. This State has more Negro college presidents than all of the New England States combined; more Negro schoolteachers (7,217) than all of the Mid-Atlantic States. These teachers meet the same regulations and enjoy the same salary scale as white teachers.

Of the nearly \$40 million spent annually in Mississippi for old-age assistance, aid for the blind, dependent children, and total and permanent disabilities, Negroes who represent 45 percent of the population receive 60 percent of the total. White people, representing 55 percent of the population, receive 40 percent.

Eighty percent of public health funds spent for combating venereal diseases go to Negro residents. Of the total expenditures for public health, our Negro people get a rightful share. This applies to our charity hospitals as well.

What about bombings? Unlike situations in Boston, Peoria, and some parts of the Southland, no churches or other buildings have been bombed in Mississippi. There have been no incidents of racial violence. The two races live here as friends in this, the hospitality State of America.

What about public health? In the past 20 years death from communicable diseases has been reduced more than 85 percent. Twenty years ago Mississippi suffered from widespread effects of malaria and typhoid fever. In 1957, there was not a single death from either of these diseases in Mississippi.

Other communicable diseases are being blotted out. Mississippi is a place to live long, for this is a State where good health prevails. There's nothing deathlike, slow or fast, in this progressive State.

Now what is the truth about Mississippi's population? The U.S. census figures for January 1, 1959, reveal that Mississippi is gaining population. She lost 4,882 in

population between 1940 and 1950. But what mossback of the past wants to apply 1940 population figures in the year of our Lord 1959?

Mississippi had no large municipalities a few decades ago. Jackson, our capital, went from 43,282 in 1930 to 128,000 in 1959.

In the same period Hattiesburg jumped from 13,691 to 35,891; Biloxi from 14,850 to over 45,000; Greenville from 22,943 to 44,574; Pascagoula from 4,339 to more than 25,000; Natchez from 13,422 to 25,195.

This is the population trend today in Mississippi. In the next quarter of a century America will see happening in Mississippi what has happened in California during the last quarter of a century.

Remember this, friends, everywhere: The last half of the 20th century belongs to the South—and Mississippi intends to claim and acquire her share of it.

Slow death? How could any description fit less the revitalized and triumphantly growing State of Mississippi?

The Hub of the Universe and the Birthplace of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on the historical city of Boston, Mass., which was part of the souvenir program of the 30th national convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks held in Boston, August 24-30, 1958:

THE HUB OF THE UNIVERSE AND THE BIRTHPLACE OF FREEDOM

One afternoon in November just a few years ago a world-famous author strolled across Boston Common. He has said that to him no place in the United States can have associations quite so stirring. A young naval ensign stopped him and said, "What place is this, sir?"

"Boston Common," was the reply.

"What is that, sir?"

"Where we all come from, in a way."

Indeed much of what America has become had its beginnings in this city of ours. We hope that you will think of it as yours also. Many of these single sentences in this short chronology have been the subjects of chapters and often entire books of history. We have set them down here in this simple fashion for easy reading and to attempt to recreate some of the atmosphere and background so that you may better enjoy the many historic shrines scattered about Boston. As you walk our streets you may also get the feeling, as countless others have, that our city's glorious present owes much to its courageous past.

In 1629 John Winthrop had been elected Governor of Massachusetts Bay and had been given a charter for the colony. He and about 700 followers sailed to America in 1630; after a long and arduous passage they made their landfall at Salem. They left there after a stay of only a few weeks, having found that small colony with its limited resources and shortage of food unable to cope with any additional problems.

They moved on to Charles Town across the Charles River, becoming neighbors of Mr. Thomas Walford, a blacksmith who had set up his forge on the slope of Bunker Hill.

Though they erected here a great house for the Governor and other types of dwellings for the others of the colony, there was still much dissatisfaction. The most acute need was an adequate supply of good water.

Mr. William Blaxton (Blackstone) lived alone on the other side of the river at a place that the Indians called Shawmut. It was also called Trimontaine because it was actually a three-hilled peninsula. Blaxton called on the Governor and told him of the existence of an excellent spring on his side of the river and invited the Governor to relocate his colony nearby. The invitation was quickly accepted; the frame of the Governor's house was carried over and the people made the transfer as quickly as they were able. The removal to Shawmut progressed so rapidly that by the 7th day of September a court of assistants was held and it was ordered that the name of the settlement should be Boston.

Two years after being established it became the capital of the colony; the town meeting form of government was adopted and was used until Boston became a city in 1822.

In the 13 years of the great migration (1630-42) Boston added to its population many of the nearly 20,000 Englishmen who settled in and around the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Boston now comprises the greater portion of Suffolk County and extends its jurisdiction over an area of 47.81 square miles. Much of this was acquired by the reclamation of the area known as the Back Bay and by the annexation of East Boston in 1637; South Boston, including Dorchester Heights in 1804; the cities of Roxbury in 1868, and Charlestown in 1874; also in 1874 the towns of Dorchester, Brighton, and West Roxbury; and in 1912 Hyde Park from Norfolk County.

On August 30, 1630, Governor Winthrop and his court of assistants held their first session in Charles Town and one of their first acts was to legislate a 2-shillings a day wage ceiling on building trades.

On October 3, 1632, the Massachusetts Bay General Court forbade the public use of tobacco.

Massachusetts Bay Colony established a representative form of government on May 14, 1634.

On April 16, 1635, the Public Latin School was established on what is today the site of the pulpit and chancel of King's Chapel. It was thus that School Street got its name. Philemon Pormont was the first schoolmaster.

By March 3 of 1636 the Massachusetts Bay General Court had enacted laws permitting establishment of new churches only with the consent of the court. On October 28 of that year Harvard College was founded by vote of the court and an appropriation of 400 pounds.

On November 4, 1637, Rev. John Wheelwright was banished from Boston for preaching seditious sermons. His sister-in-law, Anne Hutchinson, was likewise banished a short time later for antinomian heresy.

The first printing press in the colonies was set up at Cambridge late in 1638 by Stephen Daye. He and his son, Matthew, continued to print until 1649.

In 1639 the first post office was established in Boston in the home of Richard Fairbanks. On the wall of the Boston Globe building in Newspaper Row there is a plaque with the inscription: "Rich'd Fairbanks his house in Boston is the place appointed for all letters—and hee is to take care that they be delivered or sent according to their directions." Order of the General Court, November 5, 1639. Placed by the City of Boston, 1924.

Also in 1639 each Massachusetts Bay town was ordered by the general court to construct roadways connecting it with the next town.

In the year 1640 Stephen Daye published the "Bay Psalm Book," the first book to be published in America. By this time the estimated population of the English colonies was 28,000 and New England represented about 22,500 of that figure.

In June 1641 the General Court of Massachusetts granted the towns power to regulate wages and prices of commodities.

On November 13, 1644, the general court ordered banishment of all Baptists from the colony and the same day ordered all county courts to have instructed in the worship of God all Indians in their jurisdictions.

In the year 1648 Boston coopers and shoemakers were granted charters by the general court which were very like those of the ancient guilds.

By 1650 the population of the colonies was estimated as being approximately 52,000.

In 1652 Boston's first bookstore opened for business. Also in May of this year the general court established a mint in Boston where pine tree shillings were coined. It lasted until 1684.

In the year 1656 a library in which the public may read was opened in Boston.

The year 1660 saw the Scots' Charitable Society of Boston established. Its function was to be the relief of the poor.

One Michael Wigglesworth in 1662 published in Cambridge a work entitled "The Day of Doom." That year also saw adopted and published by the Massachusetts General Court the "Halfway Covenant." This permitted baptized persons of good character, though not church members, to present their children to be baptized. The court also appointed that year two licensers of printing presses who had final approval of everything to be printed. This same year the English Parliament passed a law allowing justices of the peace to send to the colonies rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars.

In 1665 the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts was established at Charlestown.

Massachusetts Bay Colony on October 11, 1666, refused to send to England representatives to answer charges brought by the royal commissioners for annulment of the colony's charter.

John Eliot in 1669 published the "Indian Primer" in Cambridge and Michael Wigglesworth published, also in Cambridge, "Meat Out of the Eater," a discussion of the necessity of afflictions being visited upon the children of the Lord.

In May 1674 the Massachusetts Bay General Court, after granting that there may be a printing press elsewhere than at Cambridge, for its better regulation ordered that Increase Mather be one of two additional licensers of the press. In the diary of Increase Mather is the following entry: "December 25 (1674) Marmaduke Johnson the printer died in Boston. He has just fitted his press to go to work. Mr. John Foster bought the press intending to set up printing in Boston."

John Foster was the earliest engraver in what is now the United States. He was a native of Dorchester; was born there in 1648 and was graduated from Harvard in 1667. He first appeared as a printer in Boston at the beginning of the year 1675 and the earliest specimens of his imprints bear that date. In 1678 he appears to have procured a new font of long primer; after which his handsomest work was done.

On June 10, of 1676 Edward Randolph arrived in Boston to investigate the Massachusetts Bay colony. He reported that the colony was unduly independent of British authority and he recommended that its status be changed to that of royal province.

In 1677 the first medical work printed in America was a pamphlet by Thomas Thacher and it was called "To Guide the Common People of New England How To Order Themselves in the Small Pocks."

Increase Mather in 1683 organized in Boston the first scientific society in the colonies.

to effect improvements in philosophy and addition to the stores of natural history.

October 23, 1684, brought the annulment of the Massachusetts charter in chancery court and with it went the requirement of church membership in order to vote.

By 1686 there were eight book shops doing business in Boston. On June 15, 1686, Anglican church worship was first set up in Boston. On December 20, Sir Edmund Andros arrived in Boston with the title of Governor-General of the Dominion of New England. He was soon to become one of the most hated men in the colonies.

The year 1689 saw Cotton Mather publish in Boston his "Memorable Providences." On April 18 the Boston inhabitants overthrew Governor Andros. On May 24 Massachusetts reestablished its government according to the old charter.

By 1690 the estimated population of Boston had reached 7,000, that of Newport 2,600, New York 3,900, Philadelphia 4,000, and Charleston, 1,100. About this time the "New England Primer" was printed in Boston. On September 25, 1690, "Public Occurrences," first American newspaper came out in Boston. It was immediately suppressed and there was no second issue. In December of this year Massachusetts issued its first paper currency to pay soldiers returning from the expedition to Quebec.

The year 1691 saw emerge the first native artist of real ability in the person of Jeremiah Dummer of Boston who had done portraits of his wife and of himself.

In 1694 Massachusetts passed a law requiring tavern keepers to sell no liquors to "person whose names appeared on a list of common tipplers."

On June 29, 1699, Massachusetts passed a law designed to prevent the spread of infectious diseases and on July 6 of the same year pirate Captain Kidd was seized in Boston and sent to England to be hanged.

In the year 1700 the population of the colonies reached 262,000. On June 24, 1700, Joseph Seward published in Boston a tract "The Selling of Joseph" which condemned the holding of slaves.

April 24, 1704, the Boston News-Letter began publication. This was the first regularly issued newspaper in America and it was to continue publication until the Revolution.

In 1709 the Quakers built a meetinghouse in Boston and in the town that year was published a "Short Introduction to Latin Tongue—Accidence Abridged," its author was Ezekiel Cheever, a colonial schoolmaster.

Cotton Mather the next year published in Boston his "Bonifacius, or Essays to Do Good"; and by the following year, 1711, town records of Boston show a complaint of too much Latin and Greek in the free schools of Boston. On July 30, 1711, a British fleet with colonial troops left Boston to take Quebec. The expedition met with failure due chiefly to the incompetence of its officers.

King's Chapel in Boston received as a gift from Thomas Brattle in 1714 the first organ to be installed in New England.

In 1716 Boston's famed lighthouse was built, the first one in America. The general court had passed an act on July 23, 1715, for building and maintaining a lighthouse, giving as a reason that the lack of a lighthouse "hath been a great discouragement to navigation by the loss of the lives and estates of several of His Majesty's subjects."

The year 1721 brought an epidemic of smallpox to Boston. Dr. Zabdiel Boylston and Cotton Mather that year introduced inoculation to combat smallpox in America. On August 7 of that year James Franklin published the first issue of the New England Courant. Also in 1721 the general court abolished the Governor's censorship of publications.

In 1722 Benjamin Franklin published anonymously "Silence Dogood Papers" in his

brother's New England Courant. The following year he left Boston for Philadelphia.

In the year 1725 Nathaniel Ames, a physician and maker of almanacs began publication in Boston of his "Astronomical Diary and Almanac" (1725-1775). The following year someone in the town published anonymously something called "Hoop Petticoats, Arraigned and Condemned by the Light of Nature and the Law of God."

Prof. Isaac Greenwood, of Harvard, published in Boston in 1729 the first textbook on arithmetic by an American.

"The Vade Mecum for America" by Thomas Prince, was published in Boston in 1732. It was the first guidebook in America.

The year 1735 brought to New England a severe epidemic of scarlet fever, and in 1736 Dr. William Douglass published the earliest clinical description of scarlet fever. It was published in Boston and was called "The Practical History of a New Epidemical Eruptive Military Fever, in Boston, 1735 and 1736." Also that year, in Boston, Rev. Thomas Prince published a "Chronological History of New England."

Seventeen hundred and forty-two brought the completion of Faneuil Hall, a gift to Boston from Peter Faneuil, Boston merchant. Jeremiah Gridley was editor of the American Magazine and Historical Chronicle, which began publication in 1743 in Boston. It was the third magazine in the colonies and lasted for 3 years.

New England, on November 18, 1755, was shaken by an earthquake, and on the 20th day of March in 1760, Boston was swept by a disastrous fire. Boston had fires before, but this was the worst to date. Lacking an adequate water system for fighting a fire, it roared on, leaving thousands homeless and blowing up the Battery. In the laws that were subsequently passed for the rebuilding of the town were provisions that roofs were to be of tile or slate thereafter.

On February 24, 1761, James Otis delivered a fiery address before the superior court, protesting against use of writs of assistance by British customs officers. In May he was elected to the general court.

In February of 1768, the Massachusetts House of Representatives adopted a circular letter proposed by Samuel Adams to be sent to the other colonial assemblies for the purpose of uniting in opposition to Britain by petition and discussion. On the 10th of June, riot followed the seizure of John Hancock's sloop *Liberty* in Boston Harbor; it had been charged with wine smuggling by customs officials. On July 18, John Dickinson's patriotic ballad, "The Liberty Song," was published in the Boston Gazette. Delegates from 26 towns in Massachusetts convened in Faneuil Hall on September 22 after call by Boston selectmen to draw up a statement of grievances. The 1st day of October two British regiments landed in Boston to enforce customs laws.

On the 5th of March in 1770, the Boston Massacre occurred, with three persons killed, two mortally wounded, and six injured. In October, Captain Preston and the British soldiers involved in the so-called massacre were acquitted in jury trial. They had been represented in court by John Adams and Josiah Quincy.

December 16, 1773, was the date of the Boston Tea Party when citizens dressed as Indians boarded ships in the harbor belonging to the East India Co. and dumped their cargoes of tea overboard.

On March 31, 1774, the Boston Port Act, first of several coercive acts by the British Parliament received royal assent. On May 12, Boston Committee on Correspondence recommended that all colonies suspend trade with Great Britain. May 13 saw the arrival of General Gage to replace Hutchinson as governor and to command troops. Four regiments quickly followed. By June 1,

Boston Harbor was closed to export and import. On September 1, General Gage seized Massachusetts powder supply at Charlestown.

April 18-19, 1775, Paul Revere and William Dawes made celebrated midnight ride to warn of British move to capture supplies in Lexington and Concord. Siege of British in Boston began. On May 25, British Generals Howe, Clinton, and Burgoyne arrived in Boston with troops.

Battle of Bunker Hill was fought on June 17 on Breeds Hill in Charlestown with a British victory though they had the heaviest losses by far. Colonial Gen. Joseph Warren was killed in the battle.

On March 4, 1776, Washington set up fortifications on Dorchester Heights. By the 17th of March the situation of Howe and his troops in Boston had worsened to the point that he evacuated Boston that day with his army and 900 loyalists.

In 1780 the American Academy of Arts and Sciences was organized in Boston.

In 1782 King's Chapel in Boston declared for unitarianism.

On August 9, 1790, *The Columbia* with Robert Gray as captain landed in Boston—the first American ship to circumnavigate the earth.

On May 11, 1792, Captain Gray with his ship entered the Columbia River which he named for his ship.

In 1795 the first commercial paper was published in Boston, called Boston Prices Current and Marine Intelligence.

On October 21, 1797, "Old Ironsides," the frigate *Constitution* was launched at the Boston Navy Yard.

The year 1800 saw the completion of the statehouse in Boston. Its designer was Charles Bulfinch. In 1801 Paul Revere succeeded in producing the first cold-rolled copper in America. It was much needed by the Navy to cover the bottoms of ships. The dome of the statehouse was about the first place Revere's new sheet copper was used. "Old Ironsides" was also soon returned to drydock and had her bottom covered with Revere sheet copper.

Boston in 1804 helped form the Coonskin Library in Marietta, Ohio, when a group of settlers sent coonskins to Boston in exchange for books.

In 1805 Frederic Tudor of Boston was first to experiment in shipping ice to hot countries by sending cargo to Martinique.

In 1812 the word "gerrymandering" first appeared when Massachusetts with Elbridge Gerry as governor passed a bill manipulating election districts, a device to affect vote in senate contests.

William Tudor in 1815 founded the North American Review in Boston.

The Boston Recorder, first religious newspaper, was published in 1816, and in the same year the Boston Provident Institution for Savings was founded, the first savings bank in the United States.

Harvard established its law school in 1817. Boston's Charles Bulfinch in 1818 was placed in charge of the work on the national Capitol.

English Classical School, the first high school in the United States, was established in Boston in 1821. It is known today as English High School. Also, in this year Catholics were allowed to hold office in Massachusetts for the first time.

In 1822 Boston capitalists founded the town of Lowell on the Merrimack and set up a new cotton factory.

June 17, 1825, Lafayette laid cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument and Daniel Webster delivered the oration.

In 1826 a high school for girls opened in Boston. It closed in 2 years. It was far too popular.

The American Society for Encouraging Settlement of Oregon Territory was founded in Boston, 1829.

William Lloyd Garrison, editor, began publication of *The Liberator* in Boston on the first day of 1831.

Boston in 1832 was the scene of the opening of the Perkins Institute for the Blind. Samuel Gridley Howe was the first superintendent of this remarkable institution which is still doing noble work among the sightless.

In 1835 Samuel F. B. Morse, who was born in the Charlestown section of Boston, invented the wireless telegraph.

He was also an internationally famous artist. He was a founder of the National Academy of Design and a founder of Vassar College. He aided in introducing the daguerrotype into the United States.

On April 19, 1938, a Massachusetts law was passed prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors at retail except in quantities of 15 gallons; and the next year a man named William Harnden began a railroad express service between Boston and New York, carrying parcels in a carpet bag.

In 1842 Chief Justice Lemuel Shaw of Massachusetts ruled in *Commonwealth v. Hunt* that a trade union is a lawful organization, is not responsible for illegal acts of individuals and that a strike for a closed shop is legal.

On February 28, 1955, a right to work bill which was introduced to the Massachusetts Legislature received a thumping defeat. Much of the credit for the defeat of this vicious bill must go to the big turnout of organized labor and its friends who were present at the statehouse that day in a protest demonstration.

Massachusetts passed an act on March 3, 1842, requiring a minimum of education for every child and preventing a child under 12 from working more than 10 hours a day in a factory.

In 1843 Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes delivered a lecture before the Boston Society for Medical Improvement in which he contended that puerperal fever could be prevented by cleanliness. On June 17 of that year Daniel Webster delivered the oration at the dedication of the Bunker Hill Monument.

Dr. William Thomas Green Morton on October 16, 1846, performed the first public surgical operation using ether for anesthesia at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston.

The Boston Public Library opened its first facilities on Mason Street in the year 1854. It was the first free public library in any American city. One of the greatest aids in its beginning came from a wealthy London banker named Joshua Bates who contributed \$50,000 in cash plus an equal value in books. He had been born in America and as a poor boy had lived in Boston. Bates Hall in the present magnificent structure in Copley Square is an impressive tribute to his memory; being a mecca through the years of countless serious students bent on research.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the world's finest technical and engineering schools, was incorporated in Boston in 1861. The first blood shed in the Civil War was Boston blood, when, on April 19, 1861 the 6th Massachusetts Regiment was attacked by a mob while passing through Baltimore.

In February of 1862 Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic" appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*. The following year the *Atlantic* published Edward Everett Hale's "Man Without a Country."

The New England Conservatory of Music was founded in Boston in 1867. The first reading in America by Charles Dickens took place in Boston on December 2, 1867, at Tremont Temple. He had a large and enthusiastic audience, which included such notables as Longfellow, Holmes, Lowell, and Quincy.

The first invention to be patented by Thomas A. Edison was made into an operative model in Boston in 1868. It was a vote recorded intended to be used in the

House of Representatives in Washington to speed up the counting of the Members' votes. Though it was practical and ingenious, it was not approved.

In 1869 Massachusetts established the first State board of health in the United States. The same year the State also established a bureau of labor statistics.

In 1870 the Museum of Fine Arts was incorporated in Boston. It was opened to the public on the 4th of July 1876.

On November 9, 1872, Boston suffered another disastrous fire with a property loss of \$73 million.

On Beacon Hill May 8, 1874, the Massachusetts Legislature enacted the first effective 10-hour-day law for women workers.

The first club in the United States for the exploration of mountains was formed in Boston in 1877. It was called the Appalachian Mountain Club and its purposes have been scientific research and outdoor recreation.

In Boston in 1877 was formed the first sewing workroom for handicapped women. Known today as the Community Workshops, it is still doing excellent work rehabilitating and giving sheltered shop employment to handicapped men and women. The Gilchrist Brothers hired in 1877 the first woman clerk for their Washington Street department store. It was so bold a step for the time that a newspaper commented "Passers-by came in to view the curiosity of a young lady who was not busy with domestic, social or teaching responsibilities." Also in 1877 the first women's exchange in this country was founded in Boston. Known as the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, it provides a market place for goods made by women at home.

The first bicycle club in the United States was formed in Boston in 1878 by 14 cycle enthusiasts. By 1886, the Boston Bicycle Club had a membership of over 200 members.

The first vaudeville performance was given in 1883 in Boston when B. F. Keith opened his Gaiety Museum, and called his entertainment vaudeville. His chief attraction was Baby Alice, a midget.

In 1884 the first long-distance telephone service was inaugurated between Boston and New York.

The First Church of Christ Scientist, opened in Boston in 1895 as mother church of the Christian Scientists; that same year the Boston Public Library opened in Copley Square.

The first life-saving station of its kind in the United States for salt water service was anchored one-half mile offshore in Dorchester Bay in 1896. Two naphtha launches and later a steam-driven one were kept in its unique enclosed harbor.

Boston's subway was completed in 1897, the first in the United States. The first Society of Arts and Crafts in America was founded in Boston in 1897. It became the parent of the handicraft movement in this country.

The first automobile insurance policy written in the United States to cover a car as property was issued in Boston in 1902. Its primary protection was fire risk—\$950 on the car and \$50 on the tools, implements and personal effects. The State authorities ruled it marine insurance. Also in 1902 was founded in Boston the first lipreading school for adults in this country. The founder was Martha E. Bruhn. The Boston Guild for the Hard of Hearing was established by teachers and pupils in this school.

Boston was the first city in the United States to use an automobile as a police cruiser. It was placed in service at station 16 in July 1903 and covered about 60 miles a day through the Back Bay District. It was driven by a chauffeur and a uniformed officer rode on a seat high enough to allow him to look over the back fences.

Britain's Grahame-White flew around Boston Light twice, 33 miles nonstop, to

win \$10,000 in the first international aviation meet held in America in 1910. Called the Harvard-Boston meet, it was the first time in New England when more than one plane was seen in the air at once.

In 1912 at the statehouse on Beacon Hill the legislature adopted a bill establishing minimum wages for women and children, the first legislation of this type in the United States.

In 1926 Boston Drs. George R. Minot and William P. Murphy discovered the value of using liver in the treatment of pernicious anemia, for which they received the Nobel prize in 1934.

The Boston Tercentenary Celebration held in 1930 was a program of considerable proportions. The opening address was given on Boston Common by the Right Honorable H. A. L. Fisher, warden of New College, Oxford. Perhaps a few of the professor's words are worth repeating here. "Little did the founders reckon," said Professor Fisher, "that a time would come when * * * in the fullness of years, their New England would be followed by a new Ireland, a new Italy, a new Germany, a new Poland, and a new Greece, all destined to be merged into a great and harmonious Commonwealth."

Boston is still the Boston of the Lodges, the Lowells, and the Cabots, but much of its vigor, its color, and its hope for the future derives from the newer stocks that now make up a large part of its population.

Since its tercentenary celebration Boston has marched one-quarter of the way into another century. Another Yankee division went off to another World War; other men of Boston sailed off in other ships to help win that war. Faster, larger, and more powerful ships, to be sure, but the same types of courageous men made up the crews. If there was any difference it was only that we had a greater number of nationalities now represented, but sturdy Americans all.

The port of Boston was the scene of great activity during World War II, as it had been 24 years earlier in the First World War. With its fine harbor and docking facilities and its being 200 miles nearer to Europe than any other American port, it was a very important shipping center.

The great concentration of scientific, engineering, and mathematical personnel in this area was responsible for so much of the development of new techniques, devices, and materials which helped immeasurably to shorten those wars. Those techniques and developments have given the impetus for the creation of the many new and diversified industries whose plants we see springing up all around us in the Boston metropolitan area.

This is a much more healthy condition than formerly when the closing down or relocation of the one industry in a community brought so much misery and distress to the inhabitants.

Boston has often been called the Hub of the Universe and the Birthplace of Freedom. Today, however, in earning the title of "Medical Center of the World" it may well be that our city has made its most enduring contribution to humanity.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the threat of psychopolitics, as practiced by

the Soviet Union, has been the subject of penetrating study by George Todt, able columnist for the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times. Mr. Todt's work in this field has attracted the attention and praise of patriots throughout the Nation. I commend it to the Members of this body.

I. MOSCOW'S PLAN TO WIN AMERICANS

"Religion is the opium of the people,"—Karl Marx in "A Criticism of Hegelian Philosophy."

What is psychopolitics?

According to the official Russian handbook, it is the art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, and bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through mental healing.

From July 28-August 2 of this year, I wrote a series of six articles on this subject, all of which were subsequently inserted into the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and may be found in the Appendix on pages A7286, A7287, A7356, A7357, A7576, and A7577.

That is the background for this article. Now let's go on into the matter further along the same pathway we used before.

Previously, I had quoted chapter 14 "The Smashing of Religious Groups" and chapter 15 "Proposals Which Must Be Avoided" from the Russian textbook on psychopolitics, as well as the infamous address of Beria to American quislings at Lenin University prior to the Second World War.

Nothing Adolf Hitler ever devised could have been more deadly to the Republic of the United States than the Bolshevik proposals to turn the American people into a herd of cattle.

Today we shall consider chapter 11 of the official textbook. It is called "The Use of Psychopolitics in Spreading Communism."

Here is the verbatim transcript:

"Reactionary nations are of such a composition that they attack a word without understanding it. As the conquest of a nation by communism depends upon imbuing its population with Communistic tenets, it is not necessary that the term 'communism' be applied at first to the educative measures employed.

"As an example, in the United States we have been able to alter the works of William James, and others, into a more acceptable pattern, and to place the tenets of Karl Marx, Pavlov, Lamarck, and the data of Dialectic Materialism into the textbooks of psychology, to such a degree that anyone thoroughly studying psychology becomes at once a candidate to accept the reasonableness of communism.

"As every chair of psychology in the United States is occupied by persons in our connection, or who can be influenced by persons in our connection, the consistent employment of such texts is guaranteed. They are given the authoritative ring and they are carefully taught.

"Constant pressures in the legislatures of the United States can bring about legislation to the effect that every student attending a high school or university must have classes in psychology.

"Educating broadly the educated strata of the populace into the tenets of communism is thus rendered tentatively easy, and when the choice is given them whether to continue in a capitalist or a communistic condition, they will see, suddenly, in communism, much more reasonably than in capitalism, which will now be of our own definition."

Those who would like to see the complete synthesis of the Russian textbook on psychopolitics may obtain it by writing directly to Rev. Kenneth Goff at Englewood, Colo., and enclosing \$1 in check or money order form. It is an eye-opener, a real shocker.

I met the 45-year-old Goff in Los Angeles last week and found him to be a dedicated fighter against communism. He is particularly interesting in this connection because 20 years ago he had been a member of the Communist Party of the United States for a period of 3 years. Then he saw the error of his ways, repented, and came out of the party to testify concerning it before the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities. I always admire the sinner who truly repents and works hard to redeem himself later. I asked Goff why he had once upon a time embraced the Reds?

"It was because of the economic lure," he told me. "On paper, socialism and its bastard child, communism, can be made to appear good. But it doesn't work out the way it is so glibly drawn for its intended victims. Those who are not hypnotized soon recognize it as fool's gold."

II. PSYCHOPOLITICS IN RUSSIANS' WORDS

"Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of 'mental healing.'—Beria, "Address to American Quislings, Lenin University, 1936.

"Have you read chapter 12 of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics?" was the question put to me last week by Rev. Kenneth Goff. He is but one of several sources from which comes this monstrous document for the public to read for themselves. Copies may be obtained by writing to Goff at Englewood, Colo., and enclosing \$1 in check or money order form.

I told him that I had indeed read it.

"Why not reprint it for your readers and let them see what the Reds have in store for them?"

"Not a bad idea," was my reply. "Chapter 12, which deals with violent remedies speaks for itself."

Try this on for size:

"As populaces, in general, understand that violence is necessary in the handling of the insane, violent remedies seem to be reasonable. Starting from a relatively low level of violence, such as straitjackets and other restraints, it is relatively easy to encroach upon the public diffidence for violence by adding more and more cruelty into the treatment of the insane.

"By increasing the brutality of treatment, the public expectation of such treatment will be assisted, and the protest of the individual to whom the treatment is given is impossible, since immediately after the treatment he is incapable. The family of the individual under treatment is suspected for having had in its midst, already, an insane person. The family's protest would be discredited.

"The more violent the treatment, the more command value the psychopolitician will accumulate. Brain operations should become standard and commonplace. While the figures of actual deaths should be repressed wherever possible, nevertheless, it is of no great concern to the psychopolitician that many deaths do occur.

"Gradually, the public should be educated into electric shock, first by believing that it is very therapeutic, then by believing that it is quieting, then by being informed that electric shock usually injures the spine and teeth, and finally, that it often kills or at least breaks the spine and removes, violently, the teeth of the patient.

"It is very doubtful if anyone from the lay levels of the public could tolerate the observation of a single electric shock treatment. Certainly they could not tolerate witnessing a prefrontal lobotomy or trans-orbital leucotomy. However, they should be brought up to a level where this is possible, where it is the expected treatment, and where the details of the treatment it-

self can be made known, thus to the increase of psychopolitical prestige.

"The more violent the treatment, the more hopeless insanity will seem to be.

"The society should be worked up to the level where every recalcitrant young man can be brought into court and assigned to a psychopolitician, be given electric shocks, and reduced into unimaginative docility for the remainder of his days.

"By continuous and increasing advertisement of the violence of treatment, the public will at last come to tolerate the creation of zombie conditions to such a degree that they will probably employ zombies, if given to them. Thus a large strata of society, particularly that which was rebellious, can be reduced to the service of the psychopolitician.

"By various means, a public must be convinced, at least, that insanity can only be met by shock, torture, deprivation, defamation, discretion, violence, maiming, death, punishment in all its forms. The society, at the same time, must be educated into the belief, of increasing insanity within its ranks. This creates an emergency, and places the psychopolitician in a savior role, and places him, at length, in charge of the society."

Remember Jane Wyman's prize-winning picture "The Snake Pit" a few years back? What is a lobotomy? A leucotomy? Do we know?

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Reminds Us of Plight of Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a letter from Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. The Ukrainians are a patient, hard working people and I have the honor to have some of them as my neighbors near my ranch in southwestern North Dakota. In their homeland Ukrainians have suffered, endured unspeakable hardships, and are still suffering today as one of the captive nations under the Communist yoke. I think it is fitting that we regain some of the perspective that some Americans seem to have lost under the impact of the Mikoyan visit. Mr. Dobriansky's letter follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 14, 1959

The Honorable Don L. Short,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: On Thursday, January 22, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. In the profound faith that Moscow's deceitful campaign of "smiles and trade" could never cause you to forget the aspirations of the captive nations and their fundamental importance to the security of our Nation, we respectfully ask that you join with us in this observance.

Today, more so than in years past, your statement in the RECORD commemorating this event, will help enormously to keep

the spirit of freedom alive in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians. Your message in behalf of this captive nation will serve notice, too, of your sustained faith in the eventual liberation of all nations enslaved by Imperialist Moscow. It will also clearly demonstrate to the Mensheviks, Mikoyans, and Khrushchevs that American memories of their crimes and our standards of civilized decency and justice cannot be erased by their calculated genteel antics or by spurious promises of trade.

The reception given Mr. Mikoyan by some of our wealthy Americans is food for serious thought. It indicates the spiritual climate in some quarters. Twenty years ago, the Nazi, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, was completely ignored for what he represented. Today, despite his personal crimes, the Armenian quailing is widely feted. The thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Don and Kuban Cossacks who were annihilated by his orders in 1917-21; the millions of Ukrainians who starved to death in the manmade famine of the 30's while Mikoyan shipped grains abroad; the role he played in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots—these and other facts no longer seem to bestir the consciences of some of us. Only two months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, Mikoyan delivered a violent anti-American speech; today, without self-respect, some accept him as a deliverer of peace.

Your message on the captive nation of Ukraine will be greatly appreciated as a message with an American conscience, not to say one of political sagacity. We shall be most grateful for it and, in gratitude, shall deliver to you this Friday an interesting brochure of Ukraine's quest for freedom.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Self-Employed Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the passage of time is beginning to afford the basis for more accurate estimates of the fiscal effects of any program for the establishment of restricted retirement funds for the self-employed. Several years ago a somewhat similar plan was established in Great Britain. The experience since the inauguration of the plan in 1956 reveals that the actual effect on the revenues has been between one-sixth and one-tenth of the original estimates. This is supported by the following letter received by Dr. Frank C. Dickinson, formerly of the American Medical Association, from R. G. Burch, director of statistics and intelligence, Inland Revenue, London:

INLAND REVENUE,

London, December 11, 1958.

Dr. FRANK C. DICKINSON,
American Medical Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DR. DICKINSON: Your letter of the 26th September addressed to the Right Honorable R. A. Butler was passed to me for reply. I regret that it is only now that we have received the results of our annual survey of the tax assessments of self-employed

people which enables us to make a reasonably firm estimate of the amount of the relief for premiums for retirement annuities.

In the April 1956 budget estimates the cost of the relief was given as £7 million in 1956-57, and £30-£50 million in a full year, but there was a footnote against both estimates to the effect that the cost of this relief will depend on the extent to which those eligible take advantage of it. In the event these policies were taken out much more slowly than expected, and it is clear that the cost will not rise in the foreseeable future to anything like the level quoted. The amount of relief in the first year 1956-57 was under £1 million. The annual rate for 1957-58 is likely to be nearly £5 million, but new policies are still being taken out and it is clear that the amount of tax relief will continue to grow. It is difficult to forecast the level at which the relief is likely to settle down, but it is probable that this will be under £10 million.

Yours faithfully,

R. G. BURCH.

Most People Saw Through Mikoyan's Mission—He Wanted Us To Help in Our Own Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the Washington Star, appearing in its issue of January 4, 1958.

So many have asked what were the real objectives of Mr. Mikoyan's visit to the United States. This letter from a man who saw the Communist conspiracy first hand during his life in the Baltic States before coming to the United States diagnosed those purposes before the visit of the Soviet's professional revolutionary. Events while Mikoyan was here made clear the correctness of Mr. Kalnins' analysis. Furthermore, the negative reaction of almost all Americans except a few businessmen to Mr. Mikoyan's rather transparent blandishments and obvious evasions demonstrated in a heartening way the fundamental soundness of our people. No clever words unsupported by deeds, and no proffered profits, can mislead our rank and file into thinking falsehood is truth or evil is good. Maybe some benefit after all may come out of Mikoyan's visit, through the rejection of his shoddy offerings by the mass of our people despite the ballyhoo and fawning on him by a few.

Mr. Kalnins' letter follows:

BEWARE OF MIKOYAN

Russia's current long-range strategy centers around taking over the remaining countries of the free world by means of economic competition—another kind of a war against capitalism, but on a different level, and at present more promising for the Communists.

The real purpose of Mikoyan's visit to our country is intended to shorten the period of America's planned transition from capital-

ism to communism. Khrushchev has expressed confidence that our grandchildren will live under communism. The leading Soviet theoretician, Suslov, declared that the historical change will take place in less than 20 years. The turning point is now considered to be 1965, when, after completion of the new 7-year plan period, the Soviet Union will have outdistanced the United States in per capita industrial and agricultural production. The Soviets just need time, which they believe works for them. In addition, they certainly would appreciate it if the capitalists, by providing the Soviet economy with the needed machinery and other equipment, would aid in shortening this period of transition.

On two previous occasions America helped the Soviet Union to get out of a dead end. Our technical and material aid helped build up Soviet heavy industry, which now has become the backbone of communism construction and expansion. Then America saved the Soviet Union from military defeat during World War II by a timely massive supply of war materials and food. American taxpayers sacrificed over \$10 billion to this end, and were not even thanked for it. Now, when Khrushchev experiences mounting difficulties with inner opposition, he hopes America—against her own interest—will be kind enough to help the Soviet Union again.

Mikoyan is going to talk trade. He will promise most profitable transactions to our business world. Lenin taught that capitalists, once offered economic concessions, are reluctant to fight the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev could not find a better man to cope with the problem.

Mikoyan is a resolute man. Once he played the leading role in communizing and Sovietizing the Caucasus. He worked for years in the underground, organizing party activities against the Azerbaijan national government. He prepared the occupation of that country by the Red army in 1920, after provoking a Communist revolt in Baku. Later he crushed the uprising of anti-Communists in Nizhni Novgorod (now Gorky). From 1922 to 1926, together with Voroshilov, Mikoyan led the purges among the party organizations in the Don, Kban, and Terek River regions. In 1926, he was rewarded with an administrative post within the U.S.S.R. Government. Then trade became his new specialty. In this field he knows how to use trade monopoly to fight capitalism.

Mikoyan is shrewd. Let our Government beware.

KARLIS KALNINS.

Can India Do It Democratically?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Mr. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, contained some excellent information concerning the problems facing India.

Mr. Stringer's column also pinpoints a problem which Americans are wont to overlook, namely, that India's problems are also the problems of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article as follows:

CAN INDIA DO IT DEMOCRATICALLY?

(By William H. Stringer)

NEW DELHI.—Drive from here to the Himalaya foothills and see the huge Bhakra Dam abuilding and you say to yourself, "This is good." Impounded monsoon waters will irrigate 10 million acres and sluice hydroelectric power to new chemical, cement, and aluminum plants.

Then drive about the new oil refineries at Bombay and the new factories there and you conclude, "India's industrial base is coming along."

But then you thread through bullock-cart traffic on northern roads, and you hear how densely populated is southern India, including the state of Kerala, where a Communist government was elected to power. And you learn that India still has a chronic food grain shortage of 1.5 million tons annually—and you finally ask:

"Can India really make it?"

Can India indeed prove that industrial modernization and agricultural reform and the whole colossal task of moving an unwieldy peasant-based state into the 20th century will be accomplished by democratic methods? Communist China is moving ahead by police state, drastically authoritarian techniques. Can India do it while preserving civil liberties?

This is the oft-stated challenge. But it becomes real and poignant and vital here in New Delhi when, right now, hard-working Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and his government wrestle with the goals and objectives—and stark needs—of India's third 5-year plan.

For India, now completing its second plan, must move forward with a third in 1961-62, and a fourth after that. The factories below the Bhakra Dam must be built. Unemployment must diminish in Kerala. Somehow the chronic food shortage must end despite an annual increase in population. Resettlement of 9 million refugees from Pakistan—taking place almost overnight—must be completed.

What's to be done? India can project a bold third 5-year plan and maintain the headway now gained. Or it can decrease its pace of modernization and risk political disaster—and the advent of a more authoritarian form of government.

The point which must be of major interest to the United States and the West is that India's third plan must have major infusions of foreign aid or it will falter and fail. The United States, Canada, West Germany, Britain, and the international lending agencies rode to the rescue of the second plan—their aid will enable it barely to succeed.

The third plan will require as much assistance in loans and credits. One authority estimates that the United States will need to underwrite the last 2 years of the second 5-year plan and the 5 years of the third (ending in 1966) to the tune of \$3 billion—plus larger allocations of surplus food grains.

Would this big underwriting—with other western industrialized countries doing their part—be worthwhile? Is it our own enlightened self-interest? Is there value and virtue in the commitment expressed by the Kennedy-Cooper Senate amendment to see India through?

There is intense interest throughout free Asia in development programs of all sorts. The Communist China experiment—communes and all—is being watched carefully. If democratic India were to stumble and fall, and Peking, with Moscow's assistance, were to succeed, there is not the slightest doubt that the repercussions would be tremendous.

The United States has seen one of Asia's great nations go Communist; it would be cataclysmic if the second great populous nation went the same way.

Congress should consider the potentialities. It would be useful if it could decide this year how big a stake it ought to have here. Then India's 5-year planners would have a sounder base for their blueprinting. The Kennedy-Cooper resolution could be passed—if that is the estimate of Congress concerning the gravity of the situation—by both Houses.

Then, with other western powers sharing the investment load, a longer range program would be worked out so that too much debt repayment would not fall due during the critical years just ahead. India could decide how much effort to expend in the next forward leap on engineering and secondary industries, and how much on land reform, cooperatives, village improvement, and the whole complicated drive to boost India's agricultural output.

To Americans it should be worth a great deal to have a share in proving to Asia and to the entire watching world that communism does not offer to backward countries the only road into the 20th century.

Hungarians Trusted Mikoyan and Were Slaughtered—All Free People Must Beware Any Communist Bearing Gifts or Wearing Smiles—With Them Bad Faith Is a Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following deeply moving letter to the President by a refugee from Soviet massacres in Hungary. The letter appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 16, 1959:

SOME MAY ASK WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES ONE MAN'S LIFE MAKE

When President Eisenhower receives Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan tomorrow, one young veteran of the Hungarian revolt now living here will be absent from the picket line at the White House. He has written the President a letter to explain why.

He was among the university students who met to draw up the anti-Soviet demands that started the Budapest revolt 2 years ago.

Captured after 5 weeks of fighting, he said his Russian captors decided "to beat me to death" when he refused to name comrades. But he made a frantic dash "when they got tired of beating me and went out to rest," dived into the icedotted Danube, and swam to safety. He is now a student in a Washington college.

Here is his letter:

"Dear Mr. President: I, a Hungarian refugee who hopes to be an American citizen in 3 years, shall respect your call for courtesy and not join my picketing countrymen when Mr. Mikoyan arrives at the White House. I fear I could not remain peaceful, despite the demands of courtesy, for the arrival of the man who agreed to the removal of Russian troops just before they opened an attack in which 27,000 Hungarian men, women, and children died.

"You see, this week I got a letter from home. My close, lifelong friend, George, is dead.

"He was such a little person in the scene of diplomacy and world politics. Tall, warm-hearted, intelligent, he was 22, the same as I. He came from a poor family that did not have money to send him to college, but because of his brilliance he won a scholarship to the University of Budapest Law School.

He could speak eight languages fluently. I remember, we used to sit around a table and discuss politics in many languages. Or, he would recite Virgil, whom he could quote for hours. And his only dream was to see once the place where George Washington was born and lived.

"The revolution came along, and he fought with the rest of us. And suddenly, after Mr. Mikoyan visited us there were ruins and flames, and we stood above a trampled nation and a destroyed dream of freedom.

"A man can only run so far from his fate, and then he has to take a stand," George told us. "Where would I go?" he asked. So he stayed on his native soil.

"They let him live, to write urging us here to come back to the university, to Hungary. We felt from the sound of his letters that he was under pressure; we wouldn't go. And so he was of no more use.

"Last week, while Mr. Mikoyan was telling Americans there are no more political arrests in Russia today and we did the same thing in Hungary the United States did in Lebanon in answering the call of a legal government, while Mr. Mikoyan said this, they came. The Hungarian secret police or the Soviet soldiers (who they were really doesn't make a bit of difference) on Wednesday, January 7, early in the morning, dragged him out of bed and shot him.

"Mr. President, some may ask, what difference does one man's life or death mean for a nation of 170 million, or for the world? You, the moralist, know what life is worth. So while we speak of courtesy, will you please ask your visitor, Mr. Mikoyan, to have the courtesy to take his Russian heel off the heart of Hungary?

"Yours respectfully,

"ROBERT SOLYMOSSI."

(The name signed here is not the young freedom fighter's real one, in order to protect his family remaining in Hungary.)

Comprehensive Conflict of Interest Bill and Government Ethics Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 I introduced two bills in Congress to strengthen the Federal conflict-of-interest laws and to enact a comprehensive code of Government employment ethics.

Testimony taken before the Antitrust Subcommittee and before other congressional bodies has revealed that a thorough revision of the Federal laws prohibiting conflicts of interest in Government employment is long overdue. Existing laws are confused and inadequate. They contain pitfalls for the unwary and loopholes for the unscrupulous.

To correct this situation, one of the bills I am introducing today revises, simplifies, and coordinates the conflict of

interest statutes and the related prohibitions against bribery. The measure should assure the Federal Government of the maximum protection against unethical practices, without unduly impairing the attractiveness of the Government service to competent persons.

Principal provisions of this bill include the following:

First. Lifetime prohibition of breaches of confidence in matters formerly worked on by employees who leave the Government.

Second. Prohibition of payments to—as well as receipts by—Government officials of compensation for services rendered before Federal agencies.

Third. Uniformity of provisions prohibiting bribery of officials, and extension of bribery provisions to witnesses before committees of Congress and before Federal agencies.

Fourth. Cancellation of Government contracts, licenses and grants consummated in violation of the conflict of interest and bribery laws.

The other bill that I will introduce would enact an overall code of ethical conduct to cover employees of all Government agencies, as well as all former employees, and members of the public dealing with the agencies. Unlike existing law, this bill would provide administrative penalties, including, first, discharge, for employees who engage in unethical conduct; second, suspension or disbarment of representatives who violate rules governing the activities of former Federal employees; and third, disqualification for contracts and grants of private parties who engage in unethical practices in dealing with the Government.

A Tribute to Congressional Secretaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the day-to-day press of our congressional duties we are prone to take for granted the dedicated work of our secretaries and other staff personnel who, in a real sense, keep the wheels of Congress turning so efficiently. The other night Joseph McCaffrey, the distinguished radio-TV news commentator, paid a tribute to congressional secretaries on his radio program "Today in Congress" which is presented each night, Monday through Friday, over WMAL at 6:45 p.m., as a public service by Independent Airlines Association. For the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed that particular broadcast of this oral congressional record, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. McCaffrey's tribute in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

This Congress won't seem the same to many of the oldtimers on Capitol Hill because many familiar faces will be missing. This reporter will certainly miss at least one of the many who retired at the end of

the year and won't be around for the new 86th Congress.

I'm going to miss Dorothy Woodring, a veteran of 36 years on Capitol Hill who has been with Congressman WALTER NOBLE of Oregon since he came to Congress. Prior to that she had served his predecessor James Mott. In all, 20 of her 36 years on Capitol Hill were devoted to Oregon's First District.

And if the constituents of every district received the attention, care, and worry that those folks in Oregon's first received from Dorothy Woodring there'd be more contented voters from coast to coast.

Dorothy Woodring, to my mind, was proof of the value of a good secretary to a Member of Congress.

She knew the answers; and, if she didn't, she knew something even more important: she knew where to find the answers.

She not only knew her official Washington—which can be a jungle—but she knew the district back home and she matched the two together.

Like people who are a success in any field, Mrs. Woodring learned a little something new every day—and she was willing to learn—and that's why she was probably the best in the business on Capitol Hill. And I hope she enjoys her retirement.

But this actually is more than a few words of praise for a good friend; it's also another way of pointing out the vital role a Capitol Hill secretary plays.

It's a tough job, an important job, and the men and women who fill those jobs don't get the credit that they deserve and earn.

Progress Noted by Bureau of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues a recent news release issued by the Secretary of the Interior on the Bureau of Indian Affairs educational and economic advances made during 1958. I am pleased with the work being done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and commend the Commissioner and his staff for their efforts expended in behalf of our American Indian citizens. The news release follows:

EDUCATIONAL AND ECONOMIC ADVANCES IN 1958 REPORTED BY INDIAN BUREAU

Both educational and economic opportunities for Indian people were significantly increased by Federal Government action in fiscal year 1958. Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton said in the Department's annual report released today.

One of the most important developments, the Bureau of Indian Affairs section of the annual report points out, was the launching of a new vocational training program designed to improve the job skills and earning capacity of adult Indians. During the year the Bureau reviewed and approved for purposes of the program 165 occupational courses in 65 trade or vocational schools throughout the country and 376 adult Indians were enrolled in these courses. An additional 325 applications from potential Indian trainees were on file and awaiting action at the end of the fiscal year.

Shorter-term training for specific jobs was also provided during the year for 168 In-

dians in industrial plants near the reservations under contracts between the Bureau and the employing companies.

Another major development was the further expansion of the adult education program which the Bureau initiated on five reservations in 1956 for the benefit of Indians who missed the advantage of schooling in their youth. By the end of the fiscal year 1958 courses of this kind were being regularly given at 72 locations on Indian reservations in the United States and among the native villages of Alaska.

Enrollment of Indian children of regular school age increased by over 3 percent as compared to the preceding year and reached a record high of 130,000. Of the total, 61 percent were enrolled in public schools, 30 percent in Federal schools operated by the Bureau, and 9 percent in mission or private schools. During the year the Bureau operated 80 boarding schools and 214 day schools including 23 trailer schools on the Navaho Reservation and 10 instructional-aid schools conducted without professional teachers in the remoter localities of Alaska. Classes were conducted for student patients in three Public Health Service Indian hospitals. Dormitory facilities were furnished by the Bureau for 2,900 Indian students who attended public schools in communities bordering the Navaho Reservation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

For the benefit of Indians seeking jobs away from the reservations, the Bureau continued providing financial help and guidance in community adjustment. Offices for this purpose were maintained in Cleveland and Cincinnati, Ohio; Chicago, Joliet, and Waukegan, Ill.; Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; St. Louis, Mo.; and Dallas, Tex. At the end of the year the Joliet and Waukegan offices were closed and merged with the office in Chicago. Help in moving was provided during the year to 5,728 Indians. This included 4,331 individuals in 976-family units, 1,023 unmarried men, and 374 single women.

Income to Indian tribal groups and individual Indians from the leasing of their lands for oil and gas development dropped considerably from the record-breaking figure of more than \$72 million for 1957 but still reached the second-highest level in history at \$55,210,467. Of this amount, more than \$28 million represented bonuses in a single lease sale involving lands in the Four Corner portion of the Navaho Reservation.

On the Klamath Reservation in Oregon several important steps were taken leading toward the eventual termination of Federal trust supervision in accordance with a 1954 congressional enactment. An appraisal of the tribal property was completed. Slightly over three-fourths of the tribal members elected to withdraw and receive cash payments for their individual shares of the assets. A management plan for the residual tribal estate was drawn up. At the very end of the fiscal year a division of the property between the remaining and withdrawing members was completed.

To Keep Your Dollar Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the President's budget message so universally accepted by thinking people throughout the country and was

impressed with the content of this morning's editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times, "To Keep Your Dollar Sound." It would be my fervent hope that those who fall within the category of free-wheeling spenders would meditate seriously over the content of this editorial. It makes good sense.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Sun-Times, Jan. 20, 1959]

TO KEEP YOUR DOLLAR SOUND

President Eisenhower has given Congress a big order. He has asked the Democrats, who control both Houses, to help him fight inflation and keep the cost of living down. To do this, Congress must trim Federal spending and vote some \$1½ billion in new or increased taxes, in order to balance the Federal budget. The recommendations have brought cries of anguish from some Congressmen. Neither thrift nor increased taxes arouse enthusiasm on Capitol Hill.

Yet, despite the criticisms that have been evoked from Democratic leaders, the President's program is based on fundamentals that they must recognize if they keep faith with the voters who sent them to Washington. Every American is concerned about the depreciating value of the dollar—it buys about one-fourth less than it did 10 years ago. If the Government, which is going into the red more than \$12 billion this year, continues to spend more than it takes in next year, the dollar will buy less and less. As the President has said, if the Government persists in living beyond its means it makes it difficult for every family in the land to balance its own household budget.

In his economic report sent to Congress yesterday, the President asked not only that Congress exercise restraint in spending, but he asked that labor, business and the consumer help the Government defend the value of the dollar. He urged labor leaders not to ask for wage increases not based on increased output of workers. He asked business to hold the price line. He told consumers they could help by shopping carefully for price and quality.

The Government itself must set a good example by holding down its spending. The President is alarmed about the possibility of further inflation because economists see 1960 as a year when inflation could go bounding up. The budget that he sent to Congress covers the last half of 1959 and the first half of 1960.

This year the Nation is expected to recover fully from last year's recession and to go on to the best business year in history.

Especially during such a period the Government should be able to live on its income, which will go up as incomes and profits go up. If instead the Government continues to operate in the red, the pressures of inflation would build up for a real explosion in 1960.

That is why the President said solemnly that if Congress does not help fight the battle of inflation by accepting his balanced budget it may be necessary to restore economic controls. These are just as abhorrent as inflation and would also be an obstacle to economic growth and development.

If the case for a balanced budget is so persuasive and clear cut, why should it be so hard to put across in Congress?

Some Congressmen do not believe that it is dangerous for the Government to continue to operate in the red. They say that the country is growing and that the Government must continue to spend huge amounts for defense and to meet the increasing needs of the people—even if this spending puts the Government deeper and deeper into debt. They belittle creeping inflation, and some even argue that 1 or 2 percent of inflation a year is not only inevitable but beneficial.

We disagree. A little inflation is like a little snowball going downhill. It gathers size and momentum. It swallows up the savings and incomes of retired people who must rely on pensions and insurance policies for their incomes.

Some Congressmen who argue against thrift also argue against increasing some revenues to pay the cost of Government. The President has asked for no general tax increase. He wants an increase in postal rates, aviation, and auto gas taxes, and on a few other special items.

No one likes to see taxes increased. But it is better that a few taxes be raised to keep the dollar sound than to pass an irresponsible budget that steals from every wallet and purse in the land by cheapening the dollars they contain.

What the South Needs Is a Strong Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Monroe Sweetland in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review. Mr. Sweetland is a leader of the Democratic Party in Oregon, being currently a State senator and having formerly been Oregon's Democratic national committeeman.

The article follows:

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, Jan. 1, 1959]

WHAT THE SOUTH NEEDS IS A STRONG REPUBLICAN PARTY

Habit and tradition are both good and evil. While they may be fine attributes in moderation, they can become obsessions which will ruin a man or a nation.

This, we think, is what ails the American South. The fine traditionalists who operate southern business and industry, and do it now with great success, think they still have to be Democrats. Their party is no longer a reflection of their thinking on economics or government. They find themselves rejected by its conventions, outvoted in its highest councils, and at the coming session of Congress they will be cast in the role of an obstructionist minority. On many issues they are in agreement with the Republicans of the North and West, but the obsessions of habit and tradition compel them to pretend they don't even know those who wear the Republican label.

In presidential elections these southern leaders find themselves more and more on the sidelines. Every 4 years they are relegated into the unproductive role of sulking in their tents or bolting their Democratic Party. The platform and the candidates are now invariably unacceptable.

The Nation needs its two-party system. It needs a two-party system which gives the people a real choice between conservative and liberal philosophies of government. Across the North and West, with minor exceptions, this polarization of the people into their two great parties has already taken place. In the South it is confined to the Democratic primary and the November elections have become a farce. The liberal Democrats have won some southern spots, but mostly it is still an old guard area.

Already in Florida and Texas a substantial Republican Party has emerged. It should spread to South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Louisiana, where a large, restive conservative bloc of traditional Democrats should join them. There would be better government in the South, and much more honest registration of public opinion in our November elections.

Mikoyan Came; the People Saw; He Did Not Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following splendid editorial from the New York Times of January 16, 1959:

MR. MIKOYAN AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Deputy Premier Mikoyan's press conference at U.N. headquarters yesterday revealed little not already familiar to persons accustomed to following the activities and arguments of the Russian delegation in that same set of buildings. The famous personality, the outer aspect of good will, the glow that followed Mr. Mikoyan's electioneering tour of the American hinterland—these were new. Mr. Mikoyan is more pliable and insidious than Mr. Sobolev, who was master of ceremonies yesterday, but the positions taken were essentially those the Soviets have already taken at the United Nations.

Mr. Mikoyan did not yield in any important particular. His expressions of good will were general. His attitudes were the same old attitudes. He was asked some questions that had obviously been prearranged, and some that just as obviously had not been prearranged. He was, at times, momentarily nonplused, but he showed the same skill in parrying dangerous questions that has kept him alive and in public life in Russia, alone among the outstanding figures of the old Bolsheviks.

What did he say that was news? This was the question that most of the journalists were naturally asking themselves. He was in favor of cooperation in the use of outer space. He merely deplored that the U.N. committee set up for that peaceful purpose did not give the U.S.S.R. a commanding position. He was asked about the treatment of Jewish writers in Russia. He replied, in effect, that those who preferred to write in Yiddish in Russia were free as anybody else, but that they generally preferred to write in Russian. He accused the United States of attempting to impose a "diktat" on Russia with regard to conditions proposed for controlling tests of atomic weapons. He came out against the enslavement of the Arabs by the colonial powers, with bland indifference to the fact that the Arabs are no longer enslaved by any colonial powers.

He complained of the reluctance of the Western World to enter into a summit conference on Russian terms. He denied that Russia held captive any American fliers who had, unfortunately, come to earth on the wrong side of the boundary. He said that Hungary and the Hungarian people are happy, and that "it would be rather nice if the situation were as normal in many other countries as it is in Hungary." He accepted the business of coexistence and added that "our people do not need or want to interfere

in the internal affairs of other countries." He admitted that "the Americans today have a higher standard of living than ours."

In a moment of greater asperity, at the end of the conference, he denounced freedoms for hooligans—meaning, as we may presume, the Hungarian demonstrators in this country, who have sometimes shown more honest indignation than wisdom in embarrassing distinguished Russian visitors.

This visit to the United Nations, this press conference, well guarded by the New York City police outside and by the U.N. security staff inside, was a spectacle in which the Russian relationship to the United Nations and to the whole free world was vividly dramatized. Mr. Mikoyan made no new enemies yesterday. On the other hand, he revealed more poignantly than he had done before, the shabby nature of the bill of goods he is trying to sell in this country.

Health Insurance for Retired Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Frank G. Dickinson, Ph. D., before the American Association of University Teachers of Insurance at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, December 28, 1958. Dr. Dickinson recently retired from his position as economist and statistician of the American Medical Association and director of its bureau of medical economic research:

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR RETIRED PERSONS

(By Frank G. Dickinson)

PREFACE

I would be less than human if I did not express at the outset my pleasure in being invited to give this paper before a growing professional organization which I helped to organize in 1932 and was later honored to serve as secretary and as president before I left the University of Illinois more than 12 years ago. I congratulate the officers of recent years who have so wisely planned the activities of the association.

The topic "Health Insurance for Retired Persons" is far too broad for a short paper. I shall present last my only suggestion for legislation; I shall confine myself largely to presenting brief and inadequate answers to seven basic questions:

1. What is the role of life insurance in financing the terminal illness or accident?
2. Does prepayment diminish in importance as one grows older?
3. Has the present generation now approaching age 65 had a greater opportunity to save than the generation which attained age 65, say, 20 years ago?
4. If accumulation during the working years of life is the ultimate solution, is the current national problem one of saving or one of insurance?
5. Will the increase from 15 to 22 million persons age 65 and over necessarily aggravate the problem?
6. Is the prospect of lengthening life much beyond three score years and ten realistic or fantastic?
7. What Federal legislation, if any, is likely to provide a sound solution to the problem of financing medical and hospital expenditures during retirement?

1. HEALTH INSURANCE VIA LIFE INSURANCE

Many years ago, a wise judge once observed, "What we know as men we must not forget as judges." Why did you and I buy life insurance? Why do we continue to pay the premiums? One of the reasons is to provide a cleanup fund at the time of our death to pay outstanding bills, including those for our last illness.¹ Typically, the last illness, especially among persons age 65 and over, is by far the most expensive illness. Last year the grand total of death benefits paid by life insurance companies on death claims of persons 65 years and over in the United States was about \$1,100 million. Of the 1,600,000 deaths in the United States last year, 900,000 were among persons in this older age group.

Unfortunately, we do not know how many of the 15 million people in this older age group are currently protected against the medical and hospital costs of the last illness through life insurance. Suppose it is 10 million; it may be more. We are probably entitled to say that some two-thirds of those suffering their final illness have provided in a large measure the means for meeting the economic costs of their last illness through the institution of insurance—in this case, life insurance.

I submit that life insurance plays a major role in financing the terminal illness or accident. You who teach all branches of insurance are not likely to be so shortsighted in the treatment of health insurance for the aged as to forget this time-honored role of life insurance. As the number of persons aged 65 and over increases from 15 million to 20 or 22 million, the life insurance companies and their agents can make an enormous contribution to the social, political, and economic impact of the final illness by selling more life insurance and keeping more life insurance in force. Moreover, the availability of loans under these life insurance policies constitutes a tremendous backlog upon which our older citizens can rely in postpayment or prepayment of the costs of illnesses before their last illness.

So my answer to my own question about the role of life insurance in financing the terminal illness is that it plays a tremendous role. I trust that the life insurance industry will succeed in making this role even greater in the future.

2. PROPENSITY FOR PREPAYMENT DIMINISHES

The pressure of obligations to a family is one of the basic reasons for buying insurance, for paying in advance if you will. It is one of the reasons why we buy life insurance and health insurance. As you and I have passed through time we have shouldered the rather heavy medical and hospital costs incident to having children and frequent visits to the doctor for children at preschool ages.

As the children grow older they kick out a pair of shoes every month and seem to be hollowlegged when it comes to stowing away food. Later on they present understandable demands for recreation, better clothing, and many social activities. Then come high school and college with their heavy financial burdens. So that when we reach age 50 most of our children have left home and we have paid off all or most of the mortgage on the home. The best savings period of life begins after age 50 for many.

One turns west, so to speak, around age 50. Why should older persons over age 50, or more particularly over age 65, want to prepay the costs of health insurance? The young-

sters are grown and even the grandchildren will be teen-agers or older. One reason for prepaying health care costs—that is, to protect the wife—would continue for couples in their later years. As mentioned, as we grow older we look upon life insurance as a means of clearing up our debts including the cost of the last illness when we die.

Although I have no statistical proof, it seems to me that the advancing years bring with them a decrease in desire to prepay health care costs and an increasing desire to postpay them. I daresay that even the best plan and the most attractive program of health insurance for older people may encounter sales resistance simply because the pressure to prepay diminishes after 50 years of age, and more particularly after age 65. I do not present this tendency as an insurmountable barrier for health insurance underwriters, but I submit that sales resistance will be encountered even where the flow of funds is sufficient to pay term premiums during retirement. Apparently one-third of them are now insured for medical and/or hospital services; and the proportion is rising.

3. A LUCKY GENERATION

Those who are approaching retirement age now are finishing their working period of life in an era favorable to savings. Contrast the situation for a person in this retiring class of 1958 with one in the retiring class of 1938, two decades ago. Those who attained age 65 two decades ago completed their working years during the depressed conditions of the 1930's. Personal savings of the American people in some of those years were negative. On the basis of 1955 prices, per capita personal savings in 1957 were seven times as great as they were in 1938. The source does not give this change by age groups. But the present generation approaching retirement is certainly more fortunate than the generation which approached retirement two decades ago. We shall avoid speculation herein regarding the relative prospects of the two retiring classes having their savings materially reduced by inflation.

This is a lucky generation that can finish out the working years of life in the period of prosperity. The point I wish to make here is that the problem of financing health care during the retired years is on its way to solution, but not for many of those who are now over 80 or 85 years of age as they finished up their working years of life during a period of depressed economic conditions. Considering the people over 65 years of age as a homogeneous group for the purpose at hand leads to generalizations which are not warranted.

4. A PROBLEM OF SAVINGS

My fourth question and fourth point is that the problem of financing health care during retirement is basically a problem of saving during the working years of life. Health insurance has been sold on a term basis. The means of providing a flow of income during retirement to pay these term premiums monthly, quarterly or annually, or to postpay these costs remains the basic economic problem. The entire savings mechanism of our society must be brought to play on this problem of financing health care during retirement. It is not exclusively a problem of insurance, but of savings during the working years of life—life insurance and annuities, mutual savings banks, savings accounts in commercial banks, direct ownership of securities, property, and so forth. The rapid expansion of pension systems is one of the more favorable factors on the horizon. Moreover, an increasing number of employers, often under collective bargaining pressure, are specifically providing for medical and hospital care during retirement over and above the pension payments.

5. FROM 15 TO 22 MILLION

Population projections indicate an increase from 15 to 22 million persons in this older age group. Those on old-age assistance

¹ The author has presented this point elsewhere. "Why People Bought Life Insurance," an editorial, The Journal of the American Medical Association, 167, 7: 866 (June 14), 1958. Reprinted as Bureau of Medical Economic Research Miscellaneous Publication M-113, Chicago, American Medical Association, June 1958.

now number about 2½ million and an unknown, but probably greater number, either do not want to buy voluntary health insurance or do not need it. A rough guess would be that 3 to 6 million of the present 15 million population in this older age group are outside the market for voluntary health insurance. Whatever the number may be, life insurance, other forms of savings and pensions accumulated during the working years of life will probably continue to grow at a faster pace than the number of older persons. I think the stress on the predicted increase in the number of persons in the age group 65 and over—from 15 to 18 to 20 to 22 million—is far too great in public and political discussions. The real problem is to increase the savings and other provisions for old age per 100 persons reaching age 65, or later retirement age, each calendar year. If sufficient progress is made, the increasing number of persons in the higher age group could actually present a smaller problem in future years than the current problem.

6. THREE SCORE YEARS AND TEN—A PLATEAU

While on this question of population forecasts, it may be helpful to examine briefly the claim that medical and scientific progress will continue to lengthen life in future decades as much as it has in recent decades. Assuming that will happen, the alarmist jumps to the conclusion that the problem of health insurance for retired persons will attain vast proportions. The expectation of life at birth has increased by an average of almost 4 years a decade in the 20th century; but the increase between 1950 and 1960 will probably be only 2 years as compared with 6 years during the 1940's. Earlier reductions in infant mortality exercise tremendous leverage on this measure of length of life. But infant mortality is now below 2½ percent and the possibility of reducing it much more is obviously a flight of fancy. Moreover, if mortality could be entirely eliminated at all ages below 45, the present expectation of life at birth of 70 years could be increased only to 74 years. Success in the management of the older diseases of life will doubtless lead to some improvements in expectation of life at ages over 45. But the evidence is clear that in the absence of fantastic medical progress, expectation of life at birth will not move much above 75 years during the balance of this century; if, indeed, it actually reaches 75 years by 1999. But my point here is that some of the scare propaganda about the future increases in length of life aggravating the problem at hand is just scare propaganda and nothing else.

7. TAX ENCOURAGEMENT

I need not give a description of the Forand bill to this audience. If the time has come to consider spending Federal tax money to provide free hospital and surgical care for the 10 to 12 million persons eligible to receive or actually receiving OASI benefits, one may question whether this is the wisest use of Federal revenues. If we consider the primary long-run problem involving savings in its broadest form for retirement, it follows that the encouragement of such savings would seem to be more in the public interest than the Forand bill proposals. Our time on this program today is too short to go into details about Federal legislation. What I have in mind is a bill somewhat similar to H.R. 10 which passed the House but not the Senate last summer—a bill commonly referred to as the Jenkins-Keogh bill—a bill to encourage self-employed persons to save for old age by providing tax deferment on reasonable amounts set aside in a taxable year for the purpose of providing income after age 65 or 70. This same device could also be used to encourage savings by any taxpayer to finance medical and hospital care during the retired years. The annual set-aside in a taxable year might be limited

to \$100 per taxpayer and placed only in restricted funds of the types provided in the Jenkins-Keogh bill. The accumulation of these savings in funds designated by the Secretary of the Treasury would be primarily a savings function until retirement age was attained; after that these accumulated funds could be used only to purchase health insurance on a current basis or some form of a medical or hospital care annuity, or to postpay medical and hospital bills during the retired years. Such legislation should be carefully drawn so that the savings could be used only for the stated purpose, and the deposits and accumulation of funds prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury. In the taxable year itself the set-aside of a maximum of \$100 would not be taxed but the income derived therefrom during retirement would be subject to current income taxes—tax deferment, not tax free. This temporary loss in Federal income tax revenues would be for the purpose of solving a problem for young taxpayers as well as old taxpayers. For the younger taxpayers this contingency could not arise for many years. Such legislation would clearly put us on the right track, namely, encouragement of savings during the working years of life to finance medical and hospital expenditures during retirement.

Korean Government Pledges That Powers of New Security Law Will Not Be Used To Curtail Basic Freedoms but Only Against Enemy Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, many people in our country have understandably been concerned at news reports from Seoul that the majority party in control in the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, after weeks of unavailing persuasion, finally used force to clear out the minority which had seized possession of the chamber in a sit-in strike to prevent passage of a new national security law. The minority expressed the belief that the law could and would be used to suppress the opposition party and the press, not just Communist infiltrators and agents.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that in both the U.S. Senate and the National Assembly of Korea, the majority has difficulty getting opportunity to work its will—in each case because of the fears of the minority that too drastic measures may be taken by the majority.

When this incident in Korea was reported in the press, I consulted responsible Korean officials and am happy to include with my remarks a summary of the new law and the reasons for its enactment, a detailed report of the incident by Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, along with the pledge of President Rhee and the Ambassador that "in the operation of the law there shall not be any abridgment of speech, press, and personal freedoms." This statement will be very reassuring to the American people. We

are all friends of Korea and wish for it and its people freedom, reunion, peace and prosperity. We recognize that many of the problems with which it struggles came directly from our own division of the country with Communists controlling the north and determined to undermine and gain control of the south, too:

A COMMENTARY ON THE REVISED NATIONAL SECURITY LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

(Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, made the following statement today:)

Recently, there have been a number of newspaper articles and editorials which have been appearing in the American press concerning the circumstances surrounding the passage of our revised national security law and its contents. Because some of the newspaper reports indicate fragmentary knowledge, and because some of the editorials indicate inadvertent misrepresentations, I feel that it would be helpful to the American reading public if the actual record were made known.

Why did the administration introduce the bill for this new law? What is generally not realized in the United States is that Korea is still in a state of war. During the past year, the Communists have multiplied their efforts to subvert the Republic of Korea. Hundreds of Red agents, thoroughly equipped with military weapons and tremendous sums of cash, have been sent across the 38th parallel to foment the strife and to bring about the downfall of the Korean Government.

It was to eliminate this clear and present danger that the national security law was enacted. None of our previous legislation was adequate to handle the problem. Last year, over 900 Communist agents were arrested, but went largely unpunished because of the lack of adequate legislation. The previous Korean laws were too obsolete to cope with current Red infiltration tactics, as none of them had been modified since during the early days of the U.S. military government in Korea. The Criminal Code could not be applied to North Korean Communist agents, because its punitive provisions are only for spies of an enemy state—yet North Korea cannot be considered a state but only a puppet regime. Similarly, our national defense law has jurisdiction only over military units, and, thus, is not applicable to acts of espionage committed by civilians outside combat areas. Indeed, supplying North Korea with any private, confidential or secret information or any other act abetting the Communists had not constituted a crime under then-existing legislation.

In view of these facts, the administration presented the new national security law bill to the National Assembly on November 18, 1958.

The opposition minority party, called the Democratic Party, in opposing the new bill, launched an organized program of filibuster in order to delay the orderly deliberation. On December 19, at 5:25 p.m., the opposition party members, without obtaining the permission of the Speaker of the House, physically occupied the main hall. Members of the Government majority party, called the Liberal Party, having finished their general meeting, sought to enter the main hall, together with 30 Sergeants at Arms belonging to the Secretariat. The Sergeants at Arms sought to pick up the bedclothes and bedding and other miscellaneous items scattered about upon the rostrum of the House of Representatives, whereupon the opposition drove out the guards, and destroyed the desks, chairs, and the Speaker's seat in the House of Representatives; the session then had to be adjourned.

It should be noted that these clearly were acts of violence, and Government property in

the main legislative chamber had been destroyed.

Nevertheless, the speaker of the assembly met several times with the opposition to negotiate, while the latter went on a sitdown strike in the Assembly Hall. These negotiations proved fruitless, and on December 23 the Secretary-General of the National Assembly appointed additional security guards so that order could be restored. On the next morning this security guard was asked to clear the hall. The sitdown strikers sought to block the opening of the plenary meeting by barricading the hall. In the violent action directed against the sergeants-at-arms which ensued, 15 security guards were beaten so extensively as to require hospitalization.

The whole event was a black mark upon the mature legislative processes in Korea. The administration had again and again invited the opposition to express their argument against the proposed legislation verbally, instead of through violence. My Government welcomed their early suggestions, and, indeed, incorporated several of them as amendments to the new law. The law itself was badly needed, the sitdown strikers functioned in an undemocratic and unparliamentary way, and the speaker of the house was in his legitimate right in invoking the support of the sergeants-at-arms.

Apprehension has been expressed in some quarters that the provisions of the new legislation would in some way abridge freedom of speech and press. But this has never been, and is not now, the intent of the law. President Rhee, the Government, and I personally pledge and guarantee that in the operation of the law there shall not be any abridgement of speech, press, and personal freedoms. The clear-cut intent of the law absolutely is only to allow the Government to apprehend and punish enemy agents. The world will see in the years to come the utter fairness in the applicability of the national security act.

Removal of Two-Term Limitation on Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, I introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to repeal the two-term limitation imposed upon the Presidency. The constitutional amendment which first enacted this limitation was never thoroughly considered. It was never a clearly thought out proposal, used for constructive purposes, but was, in my opinion, an emotional reaction against President Roosevelt, who had succeeded in winning four elections. It was enacted by the Republican 80th Congress with unbefitting haste.

Time has proven how sorry a mistake this amendment is. The country is living with a lame duck President who, in his second term, has lost much of the political power essential to him for leadership. It hampers, in my opinion, the treaty-making powers of the President, and is disadvantageous in the delicate day-to-day operations of our foreign affairs.

In short, with such limitation—namely, that his powers terminate on a day certain—the President loses effectiveness, both at home and abroad. Moreover, this limitation is to my mind an unjustifiable expression of distrust of the electorate.

I firmly believe that the repeal of this amendment is one of the musts of the 86th Congress.

Just How Underpaid Are Our Teachers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the School Support Act of 1959—H.R. 22—is to strengthen the financial structure of our public schools by Federal grants to the States to be used to build schools or increase teachers' salaries or both, as each State sees fit.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I was impressed by a recent article in the Star. Special writer George W. Oakes asked, then answered, the question: Just how inadequate are teacher salaries?

Mr. Oakes found that the principal reason for the national shortage of some 135,000 qualified teachers is a salary scale which discourages capable people from becoming teachers, or causes teachers to leave the profession.

Mr. Oakes' article follows:

JUST HOW UNDERPAID ARE OUR TEACHERS?

(By George W. Oakes)

One of our hardest public perennials is the question of schoolteacher pay.

Everybody admits teachers are underpaid. Everybody talks about it and a few people do something about it. Its ramifications run all the way from people who lay at its door all our scientific inadequacies to those who just say it's a shame for people who train our youngsters' minds to make less than those who fit their shoes.

Just how inadequate are teachers salaries? The National Education Association has spent a lot of time gathering figures for the answer. Theirs are regarded generally by Government officials as the most reliable available.

They have found out these things:

There are 1 1/4 million public schoolteachers instructing in elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States.

About 60 percent teach in schools located in urban areas—the highest proportion in cities with a population of 100,000 to 500,000.

Nearly three-fourths of all teachers are women. They predominate in the elementary schools where only 14 percent are men.

AVERAGE MAN TEACHER

The average man teacher in the public school system is 35 years old, married, and has one or two children. He is a college graduate but usually doesn't have more than an A.B. degree. He's probably teaching in a secondary grade, has been in the profession for 8 years, most of this time in the same school system.

The average woman teacher is considerably older, with an average age of 45, is married and has one child. About a third of women teachers are unmarried, a higher proportion

than is true of most workers in this country. She holds a college degree but very few have done graduate work. She's likely to have been teaching 15 years in all, 7 in her present school system.

The married woman teacher is financially best off of all as 83 percent have husbands who are employed full time.

AVERAGE EARNINGS \$4,520

The average teacher earns about \$4,520 per year.

Women's salaries are in general about 10 percent less than men's.

Pay also varies considerably according to different areas of the country. For example, in California the average teacher receives \$5,925, and in New York \$5,800 per year. In the District of Columbia it's about \$5,364. It is due to be more since a pay increase was voted in July.

In Mississippi the average annual salary is only \$2,650 and in Kentucky \$3,125.

Despite the relatively high scale in some States one out of every four classroom teachers in this country gets less than \$3,500.

In spite of his academic training and professional status, the teacher is paid just a little more than the average American wage-earner, including the unskilled.

To take some concrete cases: The average civilian employee of the Federal Government was paid \$4,971 and a typical railroad clerk got \$4,778 last year while the average professional person earned approximately \$7,600.

The most serious aspect of the teacher's financial situation is the fact that he is infinitely worse off today than he was half a century ago in comparison with other workers. Between 1904 and 1953 teachers gained 37 percent in purchasing power but telephone operators gained 111 percent, railroad clerks 92 percent, and those in furniture manufacturing 137 percent. Yet during this period the average school term lengthened by about 23 percent while industrial and office workers reduced their working week from 48 hours in 6 days to 40 or less in 5.

OTHERS PAY MORE

The difficulty in attracting outstanding men into teaching is well illustrated by salaries offered inexperienced college graduates by 20 major Chicago corporations compared to those available in the public schools of one of Chicago's best suburbs, Winnetka. A year ago those entering accounting, sales work, industrial relations, engineering, and general business were paid from \$4,800 to \$5,300. But Winnetka teachers started at \$3,900 a year.

In general the male teacher who must support a family is particularly hard hit financially. Therefore, 3 out of every 10 teachers' wives work full time. In order to make ends meet the typical man teacher has to take other jobs which furnish about 10 percent of his total income. Most earn their extra money during summer vacation.

What makes this serious from the viewpoint of improving teacher competence is that such outside work is generally not even professional in nature and often prevents the teacher from attending summer refresher courses. As a result he does a poorer job of teaching. Less than a third did professional work as a summer job. Most men worked as clerks and sales people, farmers or unskilled workers.

As one married high school teacher who has a \$5,200 salary (about \$1,000 higher than the national average) and earns \$400 from outside jobs put it:

"Every summer is a major crisis for my household. In the past few summers I have been dishwasher, ditchdigger, truck driver, gardener, screendoor salesman, and tutor."

The comments of a fourth grade 36-year-old teacher illustrate how the need for extra earnings penalizes teacher training:

"I should be happy to have at least as many hours each week to devote to my own learning outside the classroom as those I must spend to supplement my inadequate teaching salary. Perhaps I would then be better qualified to help satisfy our need for better education."

SALARIES DON'T GO UP

One important factor which discourages capable people from entering teaching as a career and causes others to leave it is that teacher salaries do not increase over a 10- or 20-year period nearly as rapidly as do those in business or the professions. In the Chicago school district, where a high salary scale applies, earnings for those with a college degree will run after 10 years 52 percent above the minimum.

But a college graduate during the same period, would have had a 78 percent pay raise in engineering, 109 percent in accounting, 123 percent in sales work and 105 percent in general business. As a young English teacher in a big city junior high school sees it:

"If I could plan on sizable raises in pay over the years, which accompany success in other fields, it would add incentive to be sure. But I look at the pay schedules for our State and find it would be in vain to move (ours is average) to greener pastures."

In their living arrangements, teachers are at least in line with the national average. In fact the proportion who own their own homes—59 percent—is practically identical with the national figure. Most teacher homes—one-third—are valued at from \$10,000-\$15,000. Almost as many are worth less than \$10,000.

Eighty-eight percent of the teachers own a car which is 17 percent higher than the national average.

DEPEND ON CREDIT

The consumer debt among teachers shows that as a group, they depend on credit a little more than most Americans. For example in the \$4,000-\$5,000 income bracket—above average for teachers—34 percent of all teacher families had a debt of more than \$500 compared to 32 percent for the average family at that income level.

Despite the fact that teachers do have a difficult time financially and are at a considerable economic disadvantage compared to other professional people, there has been a continuing improvement in their pay. During the past decade the pay of school teachers, principals and supervisors has risen in general at an average annual rate of about 6 percent.

In 1957-58, their average salary was approximately 63 percent higher than it was in 1948-49. When this salary raise is translated in terms of purchasing power, however, it is estimated that the net gain for teachers is about 38 percent during these 9 years. In the 1955-56 school year, about half the teachers questioned in an extensive Nation-

wide survey felt their financial position had improved over the preceding year. Starting salaries have also risen about 10 percent between 1955 and 1957.

Yet it is still true that more men quit teaching because of inadequate financial compensation than for any other reason. Of all who leave the profession more than one out of three does so because of the low salary.

That's why only about half of all men teachers would go into the profession if they could start their careers over again. In the words of the Rockefeller report, "until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profession to attract its full share of the available range of talent." This could well mean a raise of as much as 50 percent in the salary scale.

Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare commenting on the same problem, says the salary structure is the most serious weakness in our total educational system. He put it this way at a recent press conference:

I think the most serious weakness in our total educational system today is our salary structure. I don't care whether you are talking about elementary or secondary education, or whether you are talking about higher education, I think that as a Nation we should be ashamed of the compensation that we pay those who are willing to serve us in what is certainly one of the most important areas in which people can serve the society of today.

There are those who say that we won't correct the situation unless we are willing to double the salaries that are now being paid.

I appreciate the fact that that is a generalization that possibly is subject to, or should be subjected to, fairly close scrutiny, but personally I am willing to subscribe to it.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Citizen Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, yesterday my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], delivered an address in Dallas, Tex., at the annual convention of the American Road Builders Association.

The Senator from West Virginia, who served 14 years in the House of Representatives, and for all of that period was a member of the Committee on Roads, delivered a thought-provoking address on this occasion before 1,200 men and women. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZEN LOOKS AT GOVERNMENT

(Address by U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at national convention luncheon of the American Road Builders Association, Dallas, Tex., Jan. 20, 1959)

President Steelman, members of the American Road Builders Association, and distinguished guests, it is a pleasure to be here and to have this opportunity to renew so many of the happy associations that developed during my work with you in the past 10 years. These have been warm and enduring relationships which I trust will remain, even though I have been impelled to withdraw from active participation as an officer of the association. And you may be assured that the work of the ARBA, and the development of our Nation's highway system will always be matters of the most fundamental interest and concern to me.

I am sincerely sorry I was not here earlier to hear the excellent addresses by the able Senator from New Mexico, Senator CHAVEZ, the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and also the address by Senator FRANCIS CASE, a longtime advocate of improved highways. A former House colleague, Representative GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, was also a distinguished speaker, as was Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida.

It is pleasant being in the home State of two outstanding Americans, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. They are positive in their efforts to build a better America.

Today, although I intend to talk in part about our roads, I am going to discuss them in the context of the general topic, "the Citizen Looks at Government."

As most of you may know, I recently completed a political campaign of almost 8 months' duration for the unexpired term of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely. During that period, I traveled the highways and byways of West Virginia and talked with thousands of my fellow citizens. And I may say quite categorically that there is no substitute

for a grassroots campaign in sounding the sentiments of the people.

The framers of our Constitution took this fact into consideration when they established a House of Representatives to be elected every 2 years, their theory being that the House, whose Members must counsel with the citizenry every 2 years, would thus be most responsive to the needs and the will of the electorate. Although the technological development of our communications and transportation systems have, in part, eliminated this distinction between the two Houses of the Congress, the political campaign is still a vital part of the educative process in a democracy, for the candidate no less than for the electorate.

I wish, therefore, to share with you some of the observations and reflections coined from my experiences of recent months. It is not too early to appraise the meaning of the last election. But when I say that, I am not implying any use of partisan political rhetoric. I wish to go beyond such terms to a consideration of the needs of the citizen in relation to the nature of a democratic society itself.

And, in this inquiry, it would be well for us to remember that democracy is still a rather new experiment in the history of mankind—one that has by no means embraced the loyalties of people throughout the world. We who live within the democratic tradition—we who maintain faith in the dignity of the individual—are still a minority of the human race, and it is not written in the stars nor in words of fire across the sky that our way will prevail. Our endurance will be due to our imagination, our intelligence, and our will—not to some benevolent cosmic force in history which protects us from ourselves.

In viewing our topic in generic terms we find that certain material and spiritual conditions must be satisfied in order to develop and maintain a democratic society:

First. A minimum level of material prosperity must be achieved, sufficient to fulfill the basic needs of the populace—the need for food, shelter, clothing, employment, and provision for tomorrow.

Second. An adequate system of communication, transportation, and information must be maintained in order to assure the operation of a free and informed public consensus. In the city-state of ancient Athens the scope of democracy was defined by the range of the orator's voice. This fact, in itself, should preclude any casual comparison between the Greek democracies and our own.

And, the third condition that must be satisfied is an intellectual and spiritual one—the belief that men and women are capable of being governed by reason and good will.

These are the minimal conditions of a democracy. Now, what bearing do these generalizations have on our discussion today and the findings of the recent campaign? In brief, we may state the answer in these terms:

Although the conditions necessary for a democratic society—as I have outlined them—are universal, the way these conditions are satisfied varies with the complexity of the society and the state of its technology. This, in turn, affects the citizen's view of his government's responsibility.

Thus, in a dynamic society such as ours, these conditions are in constant flux—a flux which calls for persistent and continuous reexamination of the role of government itself. I shall, therefore, use the conditions of the State of West Virginia as a laboratory example of the kind of reexamination necessary, and the degree of governmental responsibility the citizen expects.

President Lincoln and other great statesmen and political philosophers have defined the functions of government as doing that for the individual which he could not do for himself. Thus, 100 years ago, with still half a continent virtually unsettled—with free land available for the taking—the Government did not need then to concern itself with problems of unemployment, social security, retirement benefits, etc.

The hardy men and women who pioneered West Virginia—as well as the rest of America—were well able to provide for themselves from the fertile land they settled, and the close-knit family-group provided for its own aged.

But what of today? Their descendants who work the coal mines of West Virginia are no less hardy than their fathers and grandfathers. But they are less independent—and through no fault of their own. They now are part of an immense industrial complex which they cannot control—an industry, the condition of which is controlled by the technology of our society as a whole, the development of new fuels, new blast furnaces for steel, and new ways of producing power, to name only a few changes.

The production of coal, incidentally, in West Virginia declined from 150 million tons in the year 1957 to a gross production of only 112 million tons in 1958.

In 1948 there were 125,000 persons who labored in the coal mines of my State. But, by 1957, coal industry employment dropped to 58,000—and as of December 15, 1958, there were only 47,000 men working in the coal mines of West Virginia.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in all of the polls taken during the Senate campaign in West Virginia the issue overriding all others in the minds of the voters was the recession and the problem of unemployment. At the present time, when we are being told that the Nation is pulling out of the recession, and business is on the road upward, in West Virginia approximately 15 percent of the labor force remains unemployed, and 300,000 people of the State are living on surplus food commodities, or are eligible to receive these Government surplus food items.

Self-righteous talk about stern measures of economy in Government thus means little to able-bodied men and women who have the will to work but are denied the opportunity. Nor is this a problem that confronts the people of West Virginia alone—as the recent figures in the rise of unemployment testify.

We are, indeed, faced with the ironic and anomalous situation of a nation at the peak of its productive capacity impelled to give thought, as a result of technological advancements, to impending unemployment in many sectors of its productive system—in the mines, in the steel industry, in the automotive industry, and in agriculture.

And this, I reiterate, is a responsibility of government, for we are here concerned with the survival of a democratic society—a concern which cuts through party divisions or

questions of moderate or liberal or conservative political philosophies.

I do not choose to be considered a prophet of doom and gloom—a Cassandra reading in the flight of birds the downfall of our society. But democracy means a certain condition of morale among the people—a condition in which the citizen walks upright, assured of his own dignity as an individual. A jobless man, whose family lives by suffering rather than by right, does not long retain his sense of strength and freedom. And a democratic society cannot long afford the erosion of morale that follows.

Thus, through Federal planning and Federal action, as was quite clearly implied in the Full Employment Act of 1946, we must assure the material conditions of democracy by maintaining full employment. Such a view is not the product of liberal sentimentality, nor Christian charity, nor socialistic theory—it is the product of a hardheaded regard for what is necessary for our survival—and an acknowledgment that we have the material resources if we but have the imagination, the intelligence, and the will to use them.

Turning now to the second set of conditions I mentioned earlier—the need for an adequate system of transportation, communication, and information—it is interesting to note that these factors also weighed heavily in the minds of the West Virginia voters. In the same polls that showed unemployment as the chief issue, the second-ranking issue was invariably either the improvement of roads or schools. In both respects the citizen looks to the Federal Government for a contribution to the solution of the problem.

As most of you know, I have for many years been convinced of the vital importance of transportation—all forms—to the development of our expanding Nation. And of all forms, none is more important than our highway system. For highway transport not only supplements every other form of transportation, but it makes available to us the wealth of choices in where we live and work and seek our recreation.

It is important, also, to be reminded that many of the educational advancements of recent years—that have been achieved through our consolidated schools—have been made possible by an improved highway system.

It is worth considering, as well, that an adequate highway network which provides farm-to-market roads might do much toward easing the plight of the independent farmer who has contributed so much to the quality of American life. Indeed, a balanced highway program is one that not only provides for interstate superhighways between cities, but, also, for other primary arteries, and a large network of secondary roads that serve mining, agriculture, and other rural industry.

When I was a Member of the Congress in 1944, serving the sixth of my seven consecutive terms, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of that year authorized and designated 40,000 miles of a National System of Interstate Highways, but only the regular Federal-aid funds were available from the Federal Government to finance its construction. Such limited funds, of course, were utterly inadequate to complete the much-needed development in any reasonable time.

By 1956, as you are aware, Congress was in a position to pass legislation establishing a long-range program for improving the Interstate System and authorized \$25 billion, to become available over a period of 13 years. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 also stepped up the regular Federal-aid highway program—often now referred to as the ABC program.

These funds, which must be matched 50-50 with State funds, are available for the improvement of two Federal-aid systems and their extension into urban areas—the

250,000-mile Federal-aid primary system and the 528,000-mile Federal-aid secondary system.

Funds for the ABC program are generally authorized by the Congress every 2 years. These averaged \$500 million for the first 9 years after World War II. But the 1956 act stepped these funds up to \$850 million for the fiscal year 1958, and to \$875 million for fiscal 1959. Then came the 1958 Federal-Aid Highway Act, which increased the outlay to \$900 million for fiscal 1960, and to \$925 for fiscal 1961.

With such a large expansion as is anticipated, however, there must be close consultation between Federal, State, and local governmental agencies with the local citizenry to so plan our highway work that it will benefit local areas, rather than ruin tracts of land that would be useful for agrarian, industrial, and residential purposes.

As much as we need vast highway developments, we must do our utmost in careful planning to avoid strangling ourselves with our own improvements.

Equal in importance—in the minds of the citizen, as in the fate of the Nation—is the question of maintaining and improving our educational system in the face of the challenges of increasing population, and the growing complexities of technology and society itself.

Although the problem has recently been dramatized by our contest with Russia and the tremendous educational and scientific strides of our adversary, this contest did not create the problem. Nor should we attempt a solution by imitating the Russian example, as some have suggested.

For the greatness of a nation is shown in many ways—in its cultural and scientific achievements, in its moral responsibilities, in its art, in its national aspirations. But its ultimate strength lies in the quality of the individuals who comprise its living substance.

And the strength, the final strength, of these United States lies in our belief in the dignity of the individual, the belief that man should live in the light of reason, should exercise his own free choice, and should develop to the full the latent talents within him. To this end we have established our free public education system.

Our system is not designed merely to mold a select few into polished aristocrats of a preconceived pattern—as are the older systems of Europe; nor is it designed to make our young people servants of the state—as are the schools of Russia, China, and the satellite nations.

On the contrary, we have designated to our schools the chief responsibility for the development, in all our young people, of the emotional, moral, and intellectual capacities that will qualify them as responsible members of a democratic society.

If the schools have partially failed, as some would now maintain, it is in large measure because we, citizens and representatives alike, have failed also in providing sufficient support, moral and intellectual, as well as financial.

Forty-three million Americans—one out of every four go to school. On this basis, with the expected population in 1975 of over 222 million, our school population will have soared by that time to 55 million. While, according to the authoritative Rockefeller report, we now have 22 million in our elementary schools, by 1960-61 we will have 34 million. By 1969, high schools will be deluged with 50 to 70 percent more students than they can now accommodate; and by 1975, our colleges and universities will face at least a doubling and, in some cases, a tripling of present conditions.

To carry this tremendous burden we have, in the recent past, devoted only slightly more than 3½ percent of our gross national product. To refer again to the Rockefeller report, in 1955, with a gross national product of \$391 billion, we spent—on both pri-

vate and public education—a total of \$14 billion, or 3.6 percent. According to the same source, the cost by 1967 will be \$30 billion, or about 5 percent of an estimated gross national product of \$600 billion.

To this end, more than 20 members of the Democratic majority, including myself, have joined in cosponsoring a bill introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, to provide Federal support for the public schools. The bill, given the number S. 2 to indicate its high priority in the business of the Senate, authorizes assistance to the States for the purpose of helping to pay for school construction and increases in faculty salaries. Financial aid would be granted on a per capita basis of \$25 per child the first year—to be increased \$25 per year until the fourth year—at which time it would be stabilized at \$100 per child per year. The total outlay would range from \$1.1 billion the first year to \$4.7 billion the fourth year—increasing thereafter with the rise in school population.

There are specific provisions in the measure guaranteeing local school board control, which is a necessary requirement.

This, if the bill is enacted into law, would be a significant contribution, but it would be no more than the national Government should do to fulfill its responsibility for what has become a national problem. But our efforts must not end here.

This should be only the beginning of a concerted program of mobilizing our resources, private as well as public, local as well as national, to assure our young people of the quality of education they deserve.

Equality of opportunity in education means not only the opportunity to be exposed to learning, but the opportunity to achieve excellence in the development of one's full potential. This, in turn, means that we cannot and must not sacrifice quality for quantity; we must have both. This will be an expensive business, one where there are no shortcuts or easy solutions, but surely the wealthiest Nation in history can afford whatever is required to preserve and utilize its most precious national resources—the hearts and minds of its youth.

It is no less true today than in Thomas Jefferson's time that the integrity of a democratic society rests upon an informed and intelligent citizenry—or, as Jefferson himself stated it, "The people are the only censors of their Governors; and even their errors will tend to keep these to the true principles of their institutions. . . . The way to prevent these irregular interpositions of the people, is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people."

These, then, are the necessary conditions of a democracy which the citizen looks to his Government to maintain:

A sufficient prosperity and employment level to satisfy the fundamental needs of the individual, an adequate communication and transportation system to maintain the vital flow of ideas and commerce, education of high quality and adequate quantity for our youth, and governmental practices that are responsive to the right of the citizen to participate in making those decisions which shape his or her own destiny.

Youth, Communist Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, J. Edgar Hoover is always willing to warn

the citizens of our country to beware of communism. One of the most recent examples of this is a column in *Our Sunday Visitor* of Sunday, January 18, entitled "Youth, Communist Target."

Mr. Hoover does not mince words in his warnings. The Communist movement is seeking out the young, impressionable people of the country, realizing that they are most apt to believe their misleading statements about a better world under communism.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's latest contribution to the opponents of communism be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

YOUTH, COMMUNIST TARGET
(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The English statesman, Burke, said, "Tell me what are the prevailing sentiments that occupy the minds of your young men, and I will tell you what is to be the character of the next generation." Goethe, the German poet and philosopher, expressed much the same thought in these words: "The destiny of any nation, at any given time, depends on the opinions of its young men under 5 and 20."

Today's youth are tomorrow's future. No one is more acutely aware of this fact than are the Communist conspirators—and no one is more eager to exploit the idealism, enthusiasm, credulity, and inexperience of youth than are they. Lenin pointed the way in his words: "We need young forces. . . . The youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth and still more the working-class youth."

There has been no deviation. At this moment—all about the earth—the Communists are striving to make youth the key by which they can open the door and force the whole of mankind across the threshold of a Communist world.

To bring about this end, Communists the world over are taking advantage of two fundamental facts: the urge to experiment and improve which is common to idealistic and enthusiastic youth, and the present condition of the world.

All of us must recognize the idealism of youth—the great dreams, hopes, and aspirations which are the impetus to action. This eager idealism of the young insists on perfection, and this is a good thing for it is the spur which helps eliminate injustice. But idealism, without the checkreins of knowledge and sound judgment, may take one on a short cut to disaster.

There is always an element of rebellion against authority in the young. Every child is eager to reach the age when he can make his own decisions—when he doesn't have to do what he is told. And that which is new and novel holds great appeal for the immature, rebellious youth particularly if it differs from traditions.

Communists know that innovations appeal to the young, and they know that the more idealistic youth can be trapped by the emotional appeal of a cause presented with crusading spirit and zeal.

In past decades, the Communists have captured the minds of thousands of inexperienced youth by presenting a wholly false picture of a brave new world, while, at the same time, their most intense efforts were bent toward the creation of a menacing totalitarian monster.

This brazen and cynical exploitation of the wonderful traits of youth is one of the most vicious aspects of the whole conspiracy to enslave and dominate the world. But despite their best efforts, the Communists

cannot keep the false curtain entirely closed to inquiring young minds. The freedom fighters of Hungary and a Russian poet, in their own way, made rents through which reality shone all too briefly.

Unfortunately, the very unsettled conditions of the world today—conditions created in large part by Communist activity—help the Communist in his work of subversion. This is an age of great social change. And change—the breaking of the moorings of parental control, and the breaking with past traditions—makes it much easier for exploiters to ridicule and destroy the principles, standards and morals which have proved the safeguards of freedom throughout history.

The complete amorality of the convinced Communist enables him to take full advantage of the proneness of youth to relinquish the stable moorings of principle and tradition. The young mariner too often sets sail with false charts to steer by and a false star to guide his course.

And make no mistake about it. Every child in America is an ultimate target of Communist effort in some form or other. Students and young workers, particularly those in industry, are objects of concentrated propaganda effort. This effort is extremely subtle. It consists in large part of a ceaseless, relentless campaign against our American way of life, our ideals, culture, laws, morality, religions, traditions, principles, customs, and institutions.

It seeks to destroy the respect of the young for all of these things which are termed by the Communists "petty bourgeois ideologies and influences."

It seeks to eliminate—often by means of ridicule—that patriotic love of country which at Valley Forge held a ragged, barefoot army together in a cause that many times seemed hopeless.

It seeks to weaken character, destroy individualism, and create a mass man who will offer little resistance to Communist collectivism.

Much Communist propaganda directed at youth feature a pacifist, antimilitarist theme. This, of course, is calculated to weaken the military potential of the United States.

By every possible means, propagandists seek to present the false face of communism to inexperienced youth.

They not only seek the college campus as a forum, but they also strive with every means at their command to place Marxist members in sound, wholesome youth groups for the purpose of influencing and subverting nonparty youth.

Again and again Communist functionaries have indicated that they consider the assignment of party members to work among teenagers as vital. Every youth organization is a target. No group is immune.

In one instance we learned of the formation of a Communist-dominated youth group which had, as its main purpose, the infiltration of two specific organizations.

In another instance we learned of an individual boasting that he had succeeded in turning a youngster, met through a sound youth organization, away from the latter's religion and had nursed him along to the threshold of communism.

We are beginning to learn how the Communist conspirators exploit the natural idealism of youth to advance an unnatural brutal and godless tyranny. How do we propose to meet such a challenge here at the threshold of the nuclear age?

It is our responsibility to recognize and to understand the forces motivating our youth. Confronting the same conditions which Communists use in exploiting youth for evil ends, we must, in a positive and dynamic fashion, direct the same forces to serve the ends of justice, truth, and freedom.

The future belongs to youth. If the world

of the future is to be a free one—a whole-some one, in which the word "justice" has meaning—we must offer nourishing food to build the minds and characters of youth. We must implant sound ideas, hold forth high standards, and develop the ideals essential to the preservation of freedom. We must teach true values and instill necessary disciplines. We must, by example, help our youth live up to—and preserve—the spiritual heritage which is the birthright of every American.

Our Republic is predicated upon the premise that extraordinary qualities exist in ordinary people and that freedom of opportunity enables those qualities to develop and flourish. This is traceable to the creativeness inherent in Christian metaphysics. It is the direct antithesis of the quality of negation which marks the Communist philosophy.

In no area of living can the spirit of man soar skyward when it is chained to earth by an ideology which denies man either soul or spirit.

What is to be the character of the next generation? Goethe said that the destiny of any nation depends on the opinions of its youth under 25. There is no question but that this vital group is a direct target of intense Communist endeavor. How are we going to meet that challenge?

Address by Hon. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, Before the National Political Science Conference on Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on Friday, January 16, the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] gave a very thought-provoking speech on urban problems before the National Political Science Honorary and Citizens Conference on Washington Area Problems, at the American University in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech entitled "National Policy for Urban America" be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

I am honored that you have asked me to speak to such a distinguished gathering. Let me make it clear that, as a freshman—a Senator, I do not want to be presumptuous. Let me add also that I do not claim to be an expert. However, as a former mayor who is now operating in higher echelons of government, I have had some experience along the lines which you folks have been discussing.

Problems of our cities can't be explored too deeply or too often. But we must do more than explore. We have to prepare to act, then act.

It is concerning the role of Federal Government in helping promote effective action for a better way of life for our urban citizens that I speak tonight.

Before continuing with this talk, "National Policy for Urban America," I want to take note of something that happened to me just 2 days ago.

As you may know, I have been appointed to the District of Columbia Committee. Now,

some Senators, frankly, do not consider this a choice assignment. However, I am as pleased with the challenge this committee offers as I am with my appointment to the Finance and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, which are considered major appointments.

You see, I am pleased that the Senate leadership has considered my experience as mayor of Evansville, Ind., valuable background for this work here. I consider the challenge of helping wipe out slums and traffic bottlenecks in the Nation's Capital as important—or more so—as the challenge I felt in facing these problems in Evansville.

I hope I can help bring better government to Washington. And I hope to have a part in bringing local self-government to the presently voteless residents of the District.

In addition to Washington, we have 167 metropolitan areas in our country, ranging in size from Macon, Ga., and my own city of Evansville, Ind., to the multi-million-sized centers of New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Around 80 percent of these metropolitan areas now have fewer than half a million inhabitants.

In the next few years, we're going to have many more metropolitan areas. By the year 2000, we are told, some 235 million persons will be living in these metropolitan areas alone in our country.

Cities which now have between 100,000 and 200,000 residents will grow far beyond their present boundaries. These areas offer us opportunity. We have opportunity to help them avoid the problems that have ravaged our largest cities.

Somehow, the meaning of population and growth figures is so simple it has escaped us. Cities, which once served as service areas for the countryside, now dominate the landscape and our civilization.

The figures are impressive. They're almost frightening. But the full significance comes in translating the figures into problems of real impact on the cities and their people.

For those of us who must travel to work in such areas and who use municipal services, metropolitan growth problems are personal problems.

But, the implications and the size of urban growth can hardly be classed as something strictly local. It is statewide. It is interstate. Indeed it is national.

The new swift means of getting from place to place, the way in which our people move from one place to another, have made the problems national in impact. Transportation needs, requirements for huge quantities of water, national defense needs, all of these have made it unrealistic to talk of metropolitan problems in terms of one community or as something less than a national situation.

With two out of three American citizens already living in metropolitan centers, no single level of government alone possesses the organization, the funds or the leadership to cope with the problem.

The sad truth is governments have not been equipped to handle the metropolitan problem. They have not been able to, or have been unwilling to, anticipate the changes which our century has brought to cities.

The impact of the car is a good example. We have been unable to move fast enough or with enough determination to prevent the problems brought to our cities by 60 million cars on their streets.

Yet, cars are simple things compared to jet planes and helicopters. They're simple compared to automation and atomic power. All of these more complicated instruments will probably be in common use in another 50 years.

We can anticipate their use and the problems they may create just as we could have

anticipated the impact of the car. But if we can't turn this anticipation into action our problems will multiply. That is because we still haven't solved exhaust pollution, street congestion, and roadbuilding. On top of this we know we can expect air-transport congestion and prospects of pollution and waste disposal from atomic sources.

What's more, there will be a mass of leisure time which automation is bound to bring.

To date we have not used mobility as something creative. Instead, we have let it too often be a noose for strangulation as well as a force for growth and opportunity.

The challenge of these new scientific and technological developments lies not alone in making out life more productive, but in making it more fruitful and more decent. Why must we go through growing pains of technological advancement when advances can be anticipated?

Let's gear our policies to change and to the warning signs. As a nation, we have never been adverse to experimenting in Government programs and organizations. Indeed, our representative democracy is itself an experiment not yet in full flower.

The problems of this new technology are focused on our cities. The products of the mines, the fields, the factories, the laboratories, and of the cultural heritage of this country are stored in our cities.

Our cities are rich.

Rich in material things. Rich in human resources.

They are themselves important resources. Our cities are our latest frontier. Unless outer space can be substituted for green space and parking space, the cities may be our last frontier.

Like earlier frontiers, our cities have been settled, exploited, and somewhat eroded. Continuing this pattern means degrading the lives of millions. Yet, our goal should be continuous raising of human dignity. This is impossible in the midst of urban erosion.

Rising crime rates, social diseases, juvenile delinquency, segregation, filthy living conditions flourish partly because of uncontrolled or poorly controlled urban growth and population management.

Out in the countryside our rural residents learned some of these lessons long ago. They found out conservation is essential to growth.

Soil conservation, for instance, is widespread and national in scope. Yet, there is almost no urban conservation program.

If we can work to save and restore the resources that God has given us, surely we ought to be able to do the same with resources that have been largely of our own making. The spectacle of urban growth, then, requires anticipating needs of citizens for applying technological achievements to make life better through them. It requires stopping erosion and restoring its effects.

First, we must anticipate the problems we will soon face. I refer to anticipation in the full, active sense of the word.

Let us mobilize, for instance, all the sources of information on city problems and funnel this information into a policy. Right now the Federal Government has programs in urban renewal, highways, flood control, water and land management, economic aid, housing, school construction, and law enforcement, all of which are designed to help cities.

But there is a sad lack of coordination among these programs, just to mention a few. What's more, many cities aren't even aware of what help is available or how to get it.

Similar programs are being carried forward on other levels of government without being dovetailed with Federal programs.

They cannot be divorced. A highway linking two major cities has in itself impact on commercial and residential growth, on relocation of residents, even on crime rates. Urban renewal is related to transportation,

to water supplies, to sanitation facilities, to law enforcement. All are tied into the expanding economy of the Nation. All are part of the defense system in supplying the goods and getting the goods delivered, as well as to a better standard for us to hold up as a model to our friends and allies.

We need to anticipate the net effect of these programs on specific places.

For instance, a community needs to know how, if at all, it may benefit from the distress-areas bills and from highway legislation. In Evansville, for instance, we found that by pushing a sewer-development program ahead at an accelerated pace we were able to get around \$250,000 in Federal funds for planning.

To gauge how well needs of individual cities are being met by existing legislation, each metropolitan area has to be studied and the national implications weighed. To do this means local, regional, and national planning.

Many conferences on metropolitan problems are held every year. But these efforts are not coordinated. So far as I know, no one community has mobilized all the forces available to cope with its problems, let alone any such national mobilization.

The Federal Government, it seems to me, can provide the incentive to pool information, talent, energy, and resources to focus attention on metropolitan problems and suggested solutions. It can help anticipate and plan. It can help gain public support and understanding.

Existing agencies might be called on to analyze present programs and their net effect, adding how these programs can be used in other places.

There also is a need for reviewing the relationship of these programs at the top level. The Council of Economic Advisers should be concerned with a new dimension in our complex economic situation—the probable consequences of trends on our civilization. Or, put another way, where are we likely to end up if we continue on the same road?

The council could perhaps tell us where this production is, from what markets and to what markets do products flow, what the effect of certain policies will be, and developments on the opportunity for a full life for citizens.

The Budget Bureau or some other agency of the executive could well review programs for urban growth and see that these are meshed in such a way as to spread their benefits. We have books on farms and their products and on such things as jobs. Why not on our cities?

It should, indeed, be the business of all agencies to report on implications to our people of new scientific developments. This could be done through urban research in the National Academy of Science or some similar group.

Such a group could make information available to local groups such as the metropolitan study group of Washington. Pooling and sharing of information then would be possible. Cities could learn from each other from an agency trying to store knowledge on problems and possible new problems.

But this anticipation and presentation is only the first phase.

We must also plan.

Now is the time for a long-range program to pool brains, energy, money, and experience which is being frittered away in separate meetings, conferences, and institutes.

It should be a goal to keep talking about problems and also to start doing something about them.

I refer to setting goals in welfare, public works, transportation, water supply, sanitation, decontamination, living standards, defense, communication, recreation, and many more. I refer also to setting up requirements to meet needs which can also serve as a yardstick to measure local achievement.

Along these lines, I understand the best guess for residential renewal requirements is \$700 billion or 10 percent of the gross national product between now and 1970. The same estimate calls for quadrupling present outlays for these purposes. Yet, national urban renewal plans now propose only spending 10 percent of this amount.

Going too slowly is not economy. It isn't fair to those who suffer the consequences. We can afford what is necessary, surely. Just as surely as we cannot afford a thing that is not necessary.

But how are we to judge? If our information is correct, we are spending no more than 3 percent of what we are told is needed.

But we also need to know the effects of these goals on other programs for urban development. And we have few standards on which to base judgment.

We face similar problems in transportation and water resource development. We must project effects of present programs and anticipated needs if we are to make even an educated guess. And, with the size of the problems we have and will have, guessing ought to be reduced to a minimum.

The Federal Government should serve two-thirds of its citizens by helping them with information for rational decisions. This calls for looking into all policies affecting urban life, highways, housing, urban renewal, water supply, stream pollution, etc., to find out if they measure up to our obligations.

After anticipating and planning to meet anticipation, we must set up adequate standards.

These can be set up only with understanding of problems and with plans that require local areas to measure up. Again the Federal Government can supply both initiative in presentation and resources to accomplish the goals. It can set a pattern for planning and it can set standards.

By publicizing the problem, it can give aid to new values for the new way of life. If our cities are the just brunt of public scorn, it is a national disgrace that they should continue to be when most of our people live in them. The very vitality of democratic government is at stake in the rebuilding of our cities. If democracy fails to meet these urban problems, how can we hold out our system as one for others to follow?

Our culture, oddly, has two images of city life. One is that of Sodom and Gomorrah. The other is that of the Heavenly City.

If many of us cling to the idea that cities are dens of iniquity, we may get little more than that from many of our cities. I believe, however, from experience in Evansville, that we can raise our cities to new stature and prestige. To do otherwise is to allow erosion of great material and spiritual resources.

Our cities must provide highest standards of convenience, efficiency, service, and beauty. If they do, the cities can become monuments to our civilization. If we don't, the cities may become our tombstones.

Third, we must spell out our standards and plans in a strategy for urban development. To be meaningful, this strategy should have national leadership. I believe this can be furnished by National Government.

It could use its resources to coordinate the plans I spoke of. It could use scientific information resources to analyze trends in growth and development and the implications. It could help spell out, with all the minds and skill available everywhere, objectives and goals and standards.

This could be done through a White House conference. A joint congressional-Presidential commission is another way. Revitalizing and revamping National Resources Planning Council or some other group is another way.

We need information, digesting of this in-

formation, analysis of statistics. Without these, there can be no review of implications, no evaluations, no setting of standards.

Then these goals must be implemented. There are, perhaps, two interim approaches for constructive criticism.

We certainly can see the need for more land. And we can see the need for conservation of present resources.

Let's learn again from the farmer. We need something like an urban land bank to acquire in urban areas land for future expansion. This may take Federal assistance at least until State legislatures release cities from 18th century financial straitjackets.

Perhaps we can use a city agent—someone who can help cities help themselves as the county agent does for rural America.

Urban growth is a fact. Our metropolitan living is the dominant way of life. We can't escape it.

I know of no domestic problem which does not have a bearing on the problems of urban growth.

The solution is not one of capability. It is not one of lack of brainpower. And it certainly is not one that can be shoved from one level of government to another as someone else's problem.

It is the problem of all of us.

We cannot afford the price of undue delay.

We must develop national policy. To do so, we must plan, set standards, spell out the standards with strategy for accomplishment. Then we must provide the machinery and money to realize the goals.

In all this, we must not lose sight of the greatest goal—human dignity of high order for all.

I think it can be done.

I think we can come a little closer at least to the "heavenly city."

If we don't try, we may come closer to hell on earth.

Item Veto for President Way To Save Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Monday the Milwaukee Journal published a forthright message to this Congress in an editorial which called for enactment of the item veto bill which President Eisenhower has requested. I especially commend the editorial to those of my colleagues who disagree with the President on this request, but who are willing to be told in blunt language why they are wrong.

The Journal put a perceptive finger on congressional motivation when it wrote:

Congressmen don't want the President rummaging through pork barrel bills, killing the wasteful pet projects for their home districts. They don't want him knocking "riders" and "sleepers" off of otherwise good bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Item Veto for President Way To Save Money," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM VETO FOR PRESIDENT WAY TO SAVE MONEY

The President's opening message to Congress was typically studded with climactic points at which applause was indicated if there was enough enthusiastic agreement on the floor. But one burst of applause was all unexpected, when he asked for item veto power over spending bills. Surprised and pleased, he departed from his text and gave the point added emphasis off the cuff.

The lack of enthusiasm for yielding this point in past Congresses has set some sort of record. Presidential pleading for it goes back at least to Grant, regardless of party.

Yet the ability to delete or reduce single items in appropriation bills, without risking loss of the whole bill, is thoroughly accepted as an elementary and needful part of executive power in 40 States, including Wisconsin. It was routinely included in the new Alaskan constitution, which the last Congress approved without question.

Lack of it in the Federal Government is fearfully costly. Congress lumps all sorts of spending in a bill and forces the President to approve the bad with the good, or veto the good with the bad—all or nothing.

Powerful, old Representative CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, professes to see in the item veto proposal an invasion of the legislative "power of the purse." Nonsense; this would be no more true than it is of the existing veto power, which is one of the constitutional checks and balances between the two branches. The President can't get money from Congress unless Congress votes it—that's what the "power of the purse" means. But he can prevent congressional spending if his veto will stand up. And an item veto is just as subject to overriding as any other.

The real reason why the Cannons have historically balked at this reform is not constitutional; it is simply "pork." Congressmen don't want the President rummaging through pork-barrel bills and killing the wasteful pet projects for their home districts. They don't want him knocking riders and sleepers off of otherwise good bills. These are ignoble and unprincipled reasons.

The substantial approval shown this time when Eisenhower again mentioned the item veto is encouraging. Maybe we're getting somewhere. Nor would a Congress in earnest about the reform have to wait for a constitutional amendment, although it should start that, too. It can begin right away to specify in each appropriation bill that its items are separately subject to veto.

Texas Won More Civil War Battles Than It Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although it is not generally known, the first and last military actions in the Nation's War Between the States were fought on Texas soil. In addition, a number of other sharp engagements were fought in the Lone Star State, including the defense of Sabine Pass and the recapture of Galveston by the Cottonclads.

These important events have never been fully publicized in Civil War lit-

erature. However, John W. DeVine, editor of the Nueces County News, a weekly newspaper published at Corpus Christi, has proposed that the Civil War Centennial in 1961 would be a fitting time for recognition of these important historical events.

The editor of this newspaper suggests to the Civil War Centennial Commission that that remote theater in the great conflict not be overlooked in the observances which might be had, designed, we hope, to bring the people together, rather than to disunite them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Texas Can Obtain Recognition for Part It Had in Civil War; Coastal Battles Could Be Shown to Entire Nation as Portion of Centennial Celebration in 1961," published in the Nueces County News of Friday, January 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS CAN OBTAIN RECOGNITION FOR PART IT HAD IN CIVIL WAR—COASTAL BATTLES COULD BE SHOWN TO ENTIRE NATION AS PORTION OF CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION IN 1961

Texas, next year (1961) has a wonderful opportunity to see that Texans are properly credited for their efforts during the War Between the States.

It is all being brought about through the Civil War Centennial Commission, appointed by Congress to set up for reenactment a series of the early battles of the occasion on the 100th anniversary of each battle.

Congress appropriated sufficient funds to pay expenses of the Commission for the next few years, and set up its duties as supervising the efforts of individual communities so there will not be a duplication of effort; so that each community will, if it wishes, be able to again bring to life the olden days and the part it played in the struggle that for over 4 years divided our Nation. It also provides each of these communities an opportunity for much publicity that is appealing and tourist-attractive.

Here on the coastal area of Texas were enacted many dramas of nationwide interest that are completely ignored in the history books of our Nation, but which at the time were all important in the all-out war effort both by the North and South.

In chronological order, these are:

1. The capture of Fort Brown (now Brownsville) 3 months before the first gun was fired at Fort Sumter. (First actual battle of the Civil War.) It was fought by early day pioneers of both Corpus Christi and Galveston who banded together, marched from here to Brownsville, surrounded and captured it, taking the U.S. Army soldiers prisoners;

2. The capture of Padre Island by the Union, and its patrolling by Union soldiers to prevent British ships from bringing supplies to Corpus Christi to be hauled overland to New Orleans and other southern points; and to prevent smuggling of war supplies from Mexico to the South;

3. The attack on Corpus Christi, featuring the cannon balls filled with whisky;

4. The attack that resulted in the fall and occupation of Corpus Christi by Union troops;

5. The attempt to launch a land invasion of Texas at Port Arthur, defeated when a large formation of U.S. battleships were defeated at Sabine Pass by a little handful of southern soldiers stationed at Sabine Pass. The original plan called for capture of Port Arthur, a land march, and capture of Houston, San Antonio, and Corpus Christi, tearing out the entire segment of Texas that was

enabling the South to obtain supplies from Mexico; and

6. The capture again of Fort Brown 3 months after the war ended and the dramatic arrival of a ship bringing news to the U.S. soldiers stationed there that the war was finally over and the South had surrendered. This attack again was made by volunteers from Corpus Christi and Galveston who were determined to oust the Union soldiers from south Texas.

These were important events in Civil War history of Texas and its part in the war. However, little is known of them outside this area, and when you get over the Texas borders you will find that nothing is known about them.

This condition can be and should be remedied.

The Commission, set up by the Government, would work with the local chamber of commerce in making them come alive, and installing them into U.S. history books. The records of the Union's part in them can be found in the records in Washington. It was not until 3 or 4 years ago that the importance of the Sabine battle was determined when an interested local historian who had "heard" of the event from ancestors, made a search of the war records and discovered the Union had meant to stage a "march from sea to sea" in Texas that would have resulted in the burning and sacking of Houston, San Antonio, and probably this city if not also Austin, Fort Worth, and Dallas. No doubt if a serious check of these records was undertaken now, it would result in many exciting incidents in the War Department records.

The Commission in charge is urging communities to get their State legislators to help by appropriating funds for some of this work.

Our local chamber of commerce could help much in engineering and developing a plan whereby these events might be pictured or televised and released to the rest of the Nation on the anniversary of their occurrence.

Few people in Texas and practically none outside of Texas know that the first and last battles of the Civil War were fought in Texas—history books made no mention of them, yet if Union soldiers had remained at Fort Brown during the war much of the goods used by the South that came from both England and Mexico could have been obtained.

We have over a year in which to develop the theme, have moving pictures of it taken for TV presentation on the dates in question, or to set up a program reenacting the events for a television audience on these dates.

Such action on our part would acquaint the rest of the Nation with a portion of Texas history of which they know nothing; would bring "reams" of publicity to this area, and, who knows, might later result in a TV series as interesting to the viewing public as present-day westerns.

We respectfully submit it to the chamber of commerce, the library, and historical associations of our city for study, thought, and action.

It wouldn't cost as much as one Buccaneer Days celebration and would bring us 10 times as much publicity.

Treatment of Negroes in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is a tendency among newspaper-

men hostile to the South to seize upon isolated occurrences in the South which would show it off to the rest of the Nation and the world in a bad light. Then, exponents of so-called civil rights legislation aimed at forcing the Southern States to adhere to public opinion frequently say: "You southerners must correct your ways because you are giving the United States a bad name throughout the world."

The Greenville (S. C.) News ably portrays the latest case of this in an editorial entitled "Negro Boys Helped, Not Persecuted." This editorial appeared in the January 20 edition of the News, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO BOYS HELPED, NOT PERSECUTED

Antisouthern propagandists in other parts of the United States and anti-American propagandists in other parts of the world have made a cause celebre out of the affair involving the commitment of two Monroe, N.C., Negro boys, to a State training school after they had molested a small white girl.

The hatemongers couldn't have picked a worse case, if the truth could be gotten across to those who have been grossly misinformed and have chosen to believe what they wanted to believe, even after the Governor and other North Carolina officials had taken steps to correct the false impressions so wide spread about.

Naturally, the NAACP got into the act. Through its attorneys, it demanded and got a court hearing in which it sought to have the boys released. The higher court ruled against the organization.

But the truth is that the NAACP, if it is genuinely interested in the welfare of individual Negroes, should long before have been doing all it could to get the two boys into a training school where they could be retrained and rehabilitated.

And, instead of trying to get them released, it should either have been taking steps to see that they were kept there or, else, placed in a foster home where responsible members of their own race could see to their training and welfare.

The juvenile court system, which keeps records secret, and the North Carolina newspapers, which have failed to send out the full story as they should have since it came to light, are partly to blame for the distorted story which has spread around the world. (The latest incident, since the higher court refused to intervene, was the breaking of a five-column spread in an Italian Communist newspaper published in Rome.)

Around the world and throughout the United States the story has gone to the effect that two Negro boys were imprisoned because one of them was so presumptuous as to kiss a little white girl. Some accounts have said they were sentenced to life. Others have said they received an indeterminate sentence.

Here are the facts:

The two boys, 8 and 10, were turned over to the juvenile court last October after they were accused of molesting the white girl. They caught her in a culvert near her home in a white neighborhood, and one of them held her while the other kissed her. (In a few more years the pair will be old enough for rape.)

The judge of the juvenile court committed them to the State training school until such time as the officials there were convinced that they could be returned to their homes and that their parents were ready, willing and able to give them proper supervision and care. They were not imprisoned nor, in the usual sense, were they sentenced.

The clerk of the juvenile court and the superintendent of the training school both have said they will be released as soon as they and their homes are ready. Meanwhile, they are going to school regularly, which they never have done before.

The kissing incident was not the whole reason for the committal of the boys to the training school. Before that they had a long record of misdemeanors of the sort that lead to a life of crime. Both were on probation and under supervision of the court for thievery. The record shows that one one occasion they had stolen a bicycle and on another a ham.

More to the point, the court had records of their having molested little girls on at least two other occasions.

Both come from the worst sort of home environment. The mother of the older boy says she was deserted by her husband, leaving her with one child, in 1941. Since then, she admits, she has lived with a succession of men to whom she was not married and has borne nine other children.

The mother of the other boy has twice been married and has about nine children. The family lives in a neighborhood where the police constantly have trouble.

In neither instance have the children been encouraged to go to school and other children of the families have been in trouble with the police. Police officers testify that they have many times picked up the two boys in question off the streets late at night and taken them home. Usually the mothers were not at home.

The older boy is in the fourth grade at the age of 10. Yet the report of the court shows that he has failed every subject he has ever taken in school. He has been given a series of social promotions.

These are the facts, as made public by Gov. Luther Hodges after a careful investigation.

This is the case that the antisouthern and anti-American propagandists have built into a glaring example of southern mistreatment of the Negro. Actually, the kids are better off than they ever have been.

If Monroe and the State of North Carolina are in any way at fault in the affair, it is because they did not act sooner to get those boys off the streets and out of trouble into an environment where they could be trained for a useful place in society.

As for the role of the NAACP, it betrayed itself in the eyes of all thinking people when it tried to make a big thing of the case by trying to free the boys from the chain gang for publicity purposes.

Unless and until the NAACP begins to do something constructive toward the improvement of Negro institutions and educating Negroes in the ordinary decencies of family life and responsible citizenship, it had better stay out of the civil rights courts.

The episode should point out to the NAACP a great opportunity to do something really worthwhile for the "advancement of colored people." It could start by assisting, rather than impeding, law enforcement among Negroes.

But the sorriest aspect of the whole affair is the fact that white Americans, who should know better, contributed to the spreading of a false impression of race relations in the South.

Mikoyan Handling Trade Like a Gun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ray Tucker entitled "Mikoyan Seen Handling Trade Like a Gun," which was published on January 16, 1959, in many newspapers across the country.

Mr. Tucker, one of the top columnists in the country today, calls attention to the immaturity and gullibility of captains of American industry, business, finance, and motion pictures in their lavish treatment of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan during his visit here. Mr. Tucker asserts very strongly that the Russian Deputy Premier for Economic Affairs is "world public enemy No. 1 to those who are now extending their warm greetings to him. He is robbing the gracious hosts of present and potential markets throughout the world," Mr. Tucker points out. Mr. Tucker has performed a distinct public service with his concise, hard-hitting column regarding Mr. Mikoyan, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a means of distributing it as widely as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**MIKOYAN SEEN HANDLING TRADE LIKE A GUN—
CAPTAINS OF INDUSTRY SHOW GULLIBILITY IN
WARM WELCOME TO RUSSIAN**

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—The warm welcome given to Anastas Mikoyan by the captains of American industry, business, finance, and motion pictures at Washington, New York, Cleveland, Chicago, and San Francisco testifies again to their immaturity and gullibility in the presence of distinguished foreign visitors.

Although the State Department may not have warned them in advance, Russia's deputy premier for economic affairs is their World Public Enemy No. 1.

A shrewd Armenian who has managed to survive Lenin-Stalin-Khrushchev purges, he is robbing his hosts of present and potential markets throughout the world.

He is disrupting the normal flow of commerce, and destroying historic price structures.

He is executing Khrushchev's orders to handle trade like a gun and for political rather than economic purposes. He is trying to make good his master's threat that "we will bury you."

His ultimate objective is to force neutrals into the Communist camp by making them utterly dependent upon Moscow's favors and friendship.

They would then become vassal or satellite states, as Finland, Egypt, Iraq, and East Germany have become, willingly or unwillingly.

The grand design of this Khrushchev-Mikoyan trade war is to isolate the United States economically, and to bankrupt the one Nation which furnishes the resources and the leadership for the worldwide, anti-Communist coalition.

Once the United States cannot afford to finance this alliance, Khrushchev figures, he will have only to pick up the pieces of the free world bit by bit.

In welcoming Mikoyan so warmly, American businessmen are also disregarding the administration's viewpoint and attitude.

Although they could not deny him the minimum amenities, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have treated him with only slightly veiled unfriendliness.

They recognize the Mikoyan menace, if his private enterprise hosts do not. President Eisenhower has described the Russian and Chinese offensive in this field, as a "subtle and long-range instrument of warfare."

Secretary Dulles says that it is fully as dangerous and insidious as the Communists'

military activities in Korea, Indochina, and the Far East.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, warns that "it is the most serious challenge that has ever confronted the United States in time of peace."

And yet, simply because Mikoyan smiles, speaks fair but meaningless words, pats children on the head and stands in line at supermarkets, the men he would destroy open their hearts—and their factories—to him.

The reception which the trade war generalissimo received from the heads of the great automobile firms in Detroit is especially ironic, in view of his planned offensive against that industry.

On the very day that they dined him, an American firm announced that it was selling steel to Russia in return for chrome. It is really the kind of primitive barter deal which Mikoyan favors in trading with nations that cannot pay in cash.

Russia needs that steel because Mikoyan plans to swamp West European and other markets with a new, small, cheap automobile. It will be called the Satellite, a reference to the Soviet's outer space triumphs rather than to the nations it has imprisoned.

Mikoyan recently crushed little Finland—again—in an unusually callous and brutal trade war strategy, forcing the Fagerholm government to fall because of the resultant hardships and actual suffering.

He did so because, after liquidating heavy reparations payments to Moscow, the conservative Finns preferred to buy western goods.

And the American commodity whose purchase precipitated Mikoyan's wrath was automobiles made in Michigan from parts manufactured in small plants throughout the United States.

Criticism of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in many quarters the NAACP is given credit for truly advancing the cause of the Negro. It has been my opinion that more often than not, the organization has agitated rather than advanced our Negro citizens.

A recent editorial, entitled "The NAACP Has Gone Too Far and Needs To Be Checked," appeared in a Negro-owned South Carolina publication, the Herald, and gives some facts seldom published about the NAACP. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald, Jan. 11, 1959]

**THE NAACP HAS GONE TOO FAR AND NEEDS
TO BE CHECKED**

(By Davis Lee)

In attacking the publisher of Lee publications, last week, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, demonstrated to what extent that organization will go to destroy anyone who stands in its way.

Mr. Wilkins stated in news releases that our newspapers have no following, and that no one pays any attention to Davis Lee. Then why did he go out of his way to attack Lee, and to attempt to discredit him? Mr. Wilkins

underestimated Davis Lee, and may spend the rest of his life regretting his unwise act.

Roy Wilkins has set the NAACP up as the national clearinghouse for Negro thought and opinion. If a Negro leader expresses himself, and his expressions do not coincide with the policy of that organization, he will be discredited and destroyed. This has happened dozens of times.

SEEK TO DIVIDE NEGRO AND WHITE CITIZENS

The NAACP is a vicious, undemocratic, un-American organization that is dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. It is an organization that seeks to divide the Negro and white citizens of this Nation. It does not have the welfare of the masses of Negroes at heart. It seeks to exploit for the purpose of getting power, and making money.

It agreed to sponsor Mrs. Bradley, mother of Emmett Till, on a speaking tour and pay her \$500 per week. The meetings were successful. At these meetings the collections ran from one thousand to twenty-five hundred. When Mrs. Bradley saw her son's death was being exploited, she demanded more money. The NAACP refused to give her more money and the tour was canceled. This also happened with other so-called victims of southern injustice.

The only cases that the NAACP enters into are those that have excellent exploitive possibilities. The organization is staffed with well-trained agitators; they agitate for pay. The Negroes in this Nation are well aware of this fact; and that accounts for the reason that the NAACP has only 300,000 members out of 17 million Negroes.

SEEK TO PUT DAVIS LEE OUT OF BUSINESS

Wilkins and company now seeks to put Davis Lee and his newspapers out of business, because Lee has the courage to speak out against their high handed methods.

Racial strife, dissension and prejudice is sweeping this Nation like a prairie fire as the result of pressure and agitation by this irresponsible organization. It is irresponsible because the heads can libel any citizen in the South, including elected officials, and there is nothing you can do about it. The organization doesn't own anything, and has nothing that you can attach.

Just last week the courts in Georgia attempted to collect \$700 in court cost, and the NAACP didn't have a typewriter or a desk that could be attached to satisfy that court cost.

THOUSANDS OF NEGROES OPPOSE NAACP

There are thousands of Negroes in the South who are opposed to the NAACP's program of force and pressure. But these Negroes are afraid to speak out because they don't want to be hurt. If the South enacted adequate laws to protect these Negroes from Wilkins and company it would be a different story.

Before an insurance company can operate in a State it must put up a stipulated sum with the insurance commission or secretary of state. If the most reputable citizens want to organize a bank, they must go through the same procedure to protect the citizens.

The legislatures of the South can end all of this pressure, agitation brought on by this organization by passing legislation requiring all national organizations that engage in organizing citizens for pressure purposes to deposit with the State \$250,000 in cash. This money would be held by the State for the protection of its citizens in the event some might suffer some loss brought about by said organizations.

If a State can enact financial responsibility laws to force motorists to carry such protection for others, it can enact laws to force these pressure organizations to be financially responsible for their acts to protect others.

SOUTHERN NEGRO MADE GREATEST PROGRESS

This type of legislation would bring an abrupt halt to all of this agitation, and would cut off the flow of dollars that is pouring into New York from the South, dollars that are now bringing grief, hardship, and economic pressure to millions of Negroes who are not aware of the suffering they bought.

The southern Negro has made more progress than Negroes any place else in this Nation, and he made that progress with the aid of white friends, but if something is not done quick, he will lose those friends. And this he cannot afford to do.

Roy Wilkins and no other top NAACP official is in a position to know the suffering, the hardship and pressure that has been forced upon the Negroes of the South as the result of all of this agitation. Thousands of Negroes are jobless, homeless, and are now being denied many privileges and opportunities which they enjoyed 4 or 5 years ago.

NEGRO EMPLOYMENT DROPS

Just last week this writer addressed a white group in Georgia and made an appeal for tolerance and understanding for his people. One businessman came to him afterward and stated that 1 year ago he was employing 100 Negroes. At present he is employing just 10. The others were replaced by white workers. He hated to admit it, he said, but all of this force and agitation had turned him against doing anything for Negroes.

Another businessman came up and joined in the discussion. He had 45 Negro truck drivers 2 years ago, but now he has only 11, and he intends to let them go. He is going to let the NAACP hire them, he said.

Last week this writer met another prominent Georgian who employs 100 Negroes. He has seven young Negroes in college. He is supplying all of the money, but his attitude is changing.

LEE HAS DONE MUCH TO EASE TENSION

This writer has done more to ease tensions and to convince white people that the southern Negro is not responsible for all of this racial upheaval and should not be penalized for it, than any other person alive. Mr. Wilkins and the NAACP couldn't help these defenseless Negroes, and in fact they don't want to help them.

This writer enjoys the friendship and respect of millions of white people throughout this Nation, and because of this fact is able to do more for his race peacefully than the NAACP will ever be able to do. There is no money in keeping the relationship between the two races on a friendly basis, but there is in pitting one race against the other.

The NAACP is a destructive force that needs to be checked before it causes riots between the races in the South, and before it causes the southern Negro to lose everything he has.

This writer is no stooge or an Uncle Tom; he doesn't have to be. And he is not afraid of any man alive, and that includes Wilkins and company.

Wilkins and the NAACP has caused the kind of bitterness, hatred and strife that it will take years to erase, if ever, and neither race in the South wants that.

NEGRO SHOULD BE TREATED AS A CITIZEN

The Negro is a citizen, and should be treated as such. He should enjoy every right that any other American enjoys. His color should not prevent him from the same job opportunities that others enjoy if he is prepared, and southern Negroes are working at many jobs that Negroes in other sections of the country cannot get because of race.

PRESSURE NOT THE ANSWER

There is certainly lots of injustices being perpetrated against Negroes in the South, and a big job lies ahead to correct these conditions, but you can't do it by threats

and pressure. You can't uproot a well established custom over night by legislation and court decree. If the NAACP has a constructive, practical, workable solution to this Nation's racial problem, then sell it to the people, don't ram it down their throats.

NEWSPAPER DEDICATED TO SERVING THE NEGRO NEEDS

My newspapers are dedicated to serving the needs of the little Negroes, and this includes the Telegram, which Mr. Wilkins criticized, and public castigation by the NAACP cannot silence us, nor will it put us out of business.

We are for right, justice and fair play. The NAACP believes in law and order, but it wants to make the law and give the orders. It is responsible for Little Rock and the cities in Virginia that are without schools, and if something is not done immediately to curb its activities and make it financially responsible for its acts, we won't have any schools in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, or Mississippi.

Strengthening the Cooperative Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a major challenge facing this Congress is: What action will be possible to help improve the farm situation? We recognize, of course, that economic problems cannot be entirely resolved by legislation. However, in view of the predicted 5 to 10 percent drop in farm income this year, the situation must be carefully and sympathetically examined.

At the same time, it is important to recognize the constructive efforts of the farmers themselves and their organizations in trying to work out a solution of their problems.

Over the years, a major pillar in these programs has been our cooperatives.

Dairy, wool, poultry, eggs, and other cooperatives have helped the farmers by enabling them to pool their physical, financial, and human resources for the purpose of marketing farm products, obtaining production supplies, and securing needed farm services.

Overall, these organizations have:

Improved farm income; enabled more of our farmers to weather the downturn in prices; and provided better living on the farm.

In Wisconsin, we have more than 415,000 farm co-op members. Many farmers are members of two or three cooperatives.

Today the farm co-ops are attempting to grow, to build themselves into more efficient organizations for helping the farmers.

We recognize, of course, that at times questions have been raised as to just how big they should ultimately grow.

However, within their proportionate role in the farm economy, the cooperatives in the future—as in the past—will, I believe, continue to perform an outstanding service for the farmers.

The January 17 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist contained a thoughtful article on the efforts of cooperatives to improve their ability to be of maximum benefit for the farmer. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM COOPERATIVES MUST GROW

Speed up consolidation so farm cooperatives can bargain better for their members. That's the theme of cooperatives in Wisconsin for 1959.

Compared to giant business corporations, the bargaining power of farmers is going downhill, says Milo Swanton, secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives. "To improve this situation, cooperatives must expand their marketing facilities. They must grow at least as rapidly as the corporate firms in industry," he says.

Today many cooperatives are engaged in only one marketing function. For example, 48 percent of the net sales of dairy co-ops comes from those having practically no processing facilities. Most livestock associations also perform only a selling function.

It is only natural that large cooperatives operate more efficiently than small ones. A large organization can afford to hire more qualified personnel and can spend more money on processing equipment.

Dairy Economist Linley Juers, with the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, points out that a large cooperative or a network of cooperatives have the advantage of being able to carry on research. By improving a product and finding new uses for it, a cooperative can expand its market. A small cooperative can't afford to venture into research even on a small scale. Take a cheese plant, for example.

If the plant has two vats and the cheesemaker decides to try a new starter, he's gambling with half the day's cheese. On the other hand, a plant with 25 vats wouldn't stand to lose more than 4 percent of its cheese.

Actually, consolidation isn't anything new in Wisconsin. Juers says that Wisconsin leads all other States in consolidation of fluid milk plants.

Lake-to-Lake Dairy Cooperative in east central Wisconsin merged with the Modern Dairy Cooperative of Sheboygan 2 years ago. Truman Torgerson, manager of Lake-to-Lake, says that both organizations benefited by the merger.

Lake-to-Lake, being a large dairy cooperative, wanted to get into the bottling business. Modern Dairy bottled milk, but didn't have a large enough volume to operate efficiently. As a result of the merger, members have a greater outlet for their milk and are more assured of a good price.

In September 1958, Jefferson Farm and Home merged with the Jefferson County Farmco Cooperative. Bob Johnson, manager of Farmco, says that it's a little early to tell, but it looks like the merger will increase buying power and help streamline the administration.

Marvin Schaars, University of Wisconsin farm economist, says that a university study of dairy marketing in six southwestern counties shows that many small dairy plants would do themselves a favor by consolidating. "Larger organizations usually have an easier time selling at a good price because they can maintain the quality of their products. They can also do a more complete job of processing," he says.

However, this doesn't mean that all small co-ops should consolidate, Schaars says.

"Take the local livestock co-ops, for example. They are rather small, but they do the job for farmers in their community.

There isn't any particular economy in their consolidating," he says.

There are some small cooperatives that, because of an aggressive and efficient manager, operate just as efficiently and return just as much to their members as large cooperatives. If they can keep an efficient manager, they will probably do all right. If not, they may be in for trouble.

But Schaars points out that sometimes consolidation can eliminate some of the competition and indifference between cooperatives in the same community. "It doesn't make for an efficient operation, or add to the respect and dignity of cooperatives when there is ruthless and antagonistic competition between them," he says.

"There isn't always a need to abandon present facilities for a new plant," says Milo Swanton. Some small co-ops may be able to consolidate on paper.

They can form super pool or contractual agreements and split the profits. This way they increase their bargaining power, return more profits to their members, and operate without any change in their present facilities.

Membership in farmer cooperatives continues to increase. Latest figures show that members in marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives total more than 7.7 million, an increase of 1.7 percent over the previous year.

Wisconsin has more than 415,000 farm co-op members. This is 4,000 new members in 1 year. Since there are some 145,000 farms in the State, each farmer is a member of nearly 3 cooperatives.

In the same period the number of cooperatives headquartered in the State has dropped slightly—808 to 785. The national figure dropped from 9,887 to 9,876. Thus, outside of Wisconsin the number of co-ops actually increased rather than decreased.

Only Minnesota, which has 1,297, leads Wisconsin in the number of cooperatives.

Cooperatives are businesses which must be operated efficiently and kept up to date with sound, modern business practices, such as salesmanship, accounting, service, and credit extension. They must strive to be just as efficient as privately owned businesses with which they must compete.

However, cooperatives are more than just another business. They are people organized to help themselves by helping each other. They emphasize neutrality in the sense that men of all creeds, races, and classes can be members of a cooperative association.

All members share in the savings and other benefits in proportion to their participation. Cooperatives are a bulwark of democracy when they are kept free from partisan politics. They can be a common meeting ground for men of differing viewpoints.

Criticism by the Attorney General of the Association of State Chief Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, early this year Attorney General William P. Rogers attempted to soft-pedal the State supreme court justices' report of last August which criticized recent decisions of the National Supreme Court. The inference was that the jurists on the State supreme courts did not mean to

include in their criticism the decision which would require States to desegregate their schools.

The Greenville (S.C.) News, in a January 12 editorial entitled "Facts Show Through Rogers' Whitewash," shows that it has seen through the Attorney General's statement. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS SHOW THROUGH ROGERS' WHITEWASH

Comes now Attorney General William P. Rogers to try to apply whitewash to the report of the Association of Chief Justices of the States criticizing recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

That report was widely publicized because of its great significance, and even the severest lay critics of the Court were surprised at the lengths to which the dignified and even staid State justices went in taking the highest tribunal in the land to task.

In calm, judicial language the chief justices who comprised the committee which prepared the report for presentation to their association literally took the Supreme Court apart.

From the point of view of their proper concern for State-Federal relations, they deplored the fact that the Supreme Court has assumed a policymaking role and has usurped many of the powers and functions of Congress and the State courts and legislatures.

Their strongest indictment was that the Supreme Court has failed in recent years to practice the virtue of judicial restraint; that is, to refrain from trying to write into the law as they interpret it their own ideas of what it ought to be rather than what it actually is.

The report was read in the presence of Chief Justice Earl Warren and others of the Supreme Court. It not only was adopted by an overwhelming majority of those present, but the wording of the resolution which accompanied it in some respects was stronger than the language of the report itself.

Mr. Rogers now says that the report was not aimed at the Supreme Court decision attempting to overthrow the power of the States to run their own schools and to separate the races in the public schools if they see fit.

He cites as proof of his position an exchange of letters with Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the equivalent of our State supreme court.

In his letter, Rogers said that letters he had received implied or assumed that the report was directed at the segregation cases.

Judge Brune replied, according to Rogers, that the "report did not mention the school cases and it did not undertake to deal with them." He went on to say that he knew of no exception to the rule that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions are binding.

Judge Brune replied honestly. But he did not say what Rogers says he did.

It is, of course, true that decisions of the Supreme Court on constitutional questions are binding. That is the heart of the trouble. That is why the trends the Court has established are so threatening to the proper balance of power among the branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal and State Governments.

The highly critical report adopted by the State chief justices deliberately avoided mentioning the decisions in the school cases. It did mention other more obscure and less controversial decisions in which the Court took much the same sort of course. That, too, is somewhat beside the point, for the report addressed itself primarily to the dan-

gerous and alarming trends established in a long line of Supreme Court decisions.

And if Attorney General Rogers were the lawyer he should be, rather than the politician he obviously is, he would have recognized this fact and let it go at that.

However, what he has now done makes it necessary to point out once more what everyone realized at the time: the criticism of the State chief justices applies more clearly and more directly to the antisegregation decisions than to any of the others.

It was the most clearcut instance of the Court's trying to make policy rather than to interpret the Constitution and the acts of Congress. Its actions then and, especially, in subsequent decisions have shown an utter lack of judicial restraint.

Other trends established by the Court are equally serious. For instance, there is no end in sight for the precedent established by the Court when it said that, once Congress enacts a law in a certain field, that the field of law has been preempted by the Federal Government and pertinent State laws are null and void.

In one such case the Court virtually forbade the States to enact and enforce laws against subversion, and in another it seriously weakened the power of the States to enforce laws pertaining to the purity of food and drugs.

And this despite the fact that Congress plainly had no such intentions when it enacted the Federal statutes.

In another series of decisions, the Supreme Court all but destroyed acts of Congress intended to keep the Communist conspiracy in the open and has made it almost impossible to try and punish Communists for acts which amount to sedition if not treason.

The report of the chief justices was rendered in August. Mr. Rogers waited until the public might well have forgotten the summaries of its contents published in the newspapers of that period. He then placed his own interpretation on Judge Brune's letter.

He should not be allowed to get away with it. The facts show too plainly through the whitewash.

Decline in Coal-Mine Fatalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the son of a former coal miner and as the elected Representative of a large coal mining district, I cannot but rejoice in the news that in 1958 the State of Illinois set the finest mine safety record in the history of the State. I congratulate Director Ben H. Schull of the State Mines and Minerals Department and Director Marling J. Ankeny of the Federal Bureau of Mines for this remarkable achievement. And while I am at it, I think that those Members of the House who were here in the 82d Congress, which passed almost unanimously the amendments to Public Law 40, are entitled to congratulations for their foresightedness and statesmanship.

For an industry that once killed as many as 2,500 miners a year and numbered its injured in five figures, we have come a long way. In 1957, 473 men were killed. It is estimated for 1958 that

there will be 350 fatalities nationwide, an improvement, but still far too many. The greatest killer of all, roof falls, remains to be conquered and I am satisfied that continued cooperation between the mining States and the Federal Government will one day bring about this desirable end.

From Springfield, Ill., under a UPI heading, comes the following announcement:

Illinois, in 1958, set the finest mine safety record in the history of the State, it has been reported by the State Mines and Minerals Department.

Ben H. Schull, department director, said Thursday there was an unprecedented period of 174 consecutive days without a single mine fatality. The period was from February 21 to August 14, when 15,563,797 tons of coal were mined. October also was a death-free month.

There were nine fatalities in the mines last year, Schull said. In 1957, there were 21 deaths, he said. There were six fatality-free months in 1958. This compares with four in 1957, three in 1956, two in 1955, and the first death-free month in the history of the State, August 1954.

Schull said some 183 Illinois mines, including some of the largest in the country, produced an estimated 43,200,000 tons of coal in 1958.

Economic Relief for West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it has become a matter of public concern in my State of West Virginia that our economy is badly crippled. Several factors enter into this, including a decline in soft coal production, our basic industry, because of competing, laborless fuels. Mechanization of our mines, too, has reduced the labor force in that industry from approximately 125,000 a decade ago to less than 50,000 at the present time.

West Virginians have always shown a capacity to solve their problems and in this instance we are making a determined effort to attract new industries to an area where there is ample transportation, power, and available labor.

However, leaders in our State administration, and our congressional delegation here have taken official notice of the situation and will neglect no opportunity to help better conditions back home. It is to help better conditions back home.

To give the true picture of West Virginia's plight, which I fervently hope is only temporary, I submit an official resolution adopted by the steering committee of the West Virginia Legislature:

Whereas a steering committee from the membership of West Virginia Legislature on the 19th day of December 1958, met and considered the economic conditions of the State of West Virginia; and

Whereas the committee ascertained that there are now 30,000 people, or 15 percent of the total population of West Virginia, drawing surplus commodities; and

Whereas the committee further determined that there were 75,000 persons, eligible for employment, that were unemployed; and

Whereas it was further shown that in the year 1948, there were 125,000 persons employed in the coal mines of West Virginia and that in the year 1957, there were 58,000 and as of December 15, 1958, there were only 47,000 men employed in the mines; and

Whereas in the industries of West Virginia, excluding mines, there has been a decline in employment, and, in the year 1957 there were 10,000 unemployed and in the year 1958 this figure was increased so that there are now 20,000 unemployed in West Virginia industries, amounting to a 100-percent increase in a 1-year period; and

Whereas there are now 42,125 people drawing unemployment compensation or benefits from the West Virginia Department of Employment Security, and it would also appear that there are many thousands others unemployed who are not eligible to draw such benefits; and

Whereas the production of coal in the State of West Virginia has declined from a gross production of 150 million tons in the year 1957 to a gross production of only 112 million tons in the year 1958, or a decrease in production of 38 million tons in a 1-year period; and

Whereas it would now appear that the revenues of the State of West Virginia are declining, and the board of public works has pointed out that State revenue has declined \$3.7 million for the first 5 months of the fiscal year 1958-59; and

Whereas the per capita income of the citizens of West Virginia is at least 30 percent below the national per capita average; and

Whereas the steering committee has determined that immediate action must be taken for the benefit of business, industry, and particularly for those unemployed in West Virginia: Be it therefore

Resolved as follows—

That the steering committee does now recommend and urge that the president of the Senate of West Virginia and the speaker of the House of Delegates of West Virginia, each appoint a committee consisting of four members, with representation from the minority party, to work with his excellency the Governor of West Virginia and the West Virginia congressional delegation and the United States Senators, representing the State of West Virginia, in an effort to obtain an immediate conference with the President of the United States of America, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; that those persons representing the State of West Virginia request the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to take immediate action to provide help and aid to the people of West Virginia and that said committee from the State of West Virginia further request the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to take prompt action to establish public projects in the State of West Virginia in order to provide work for the unemployed, food for the starving, relief for the destitute, and to stimulate the economy of the State of West Virginia as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be promptly forwarded to Cecil H. Underwood, Governor of West Virginia; Senator-elect Robert C. Byrd; Senator Jennings Randolph; Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States, and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and the congressional delegation from West Virginia in the House of Representatives of the United States.

One Was Absent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Editor's Corner of the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes for November 20, 1958:

EDITOR'S CORNER—ONE WAS ABSENT

Veterans Day, or Armistice Day—take it as you wish, was celebrated throughout the Nation on November 11, the 40th anniversary of a day which resulted in a truce between the warring powers and resulted in the end of World War I.

Veterans of our wars and our citizens generally remembered the day and held appropriate ceremonies in the big cities, the smaller ones, the towns, and the hamlets.

By far, as was to be expected, the most important observance of the anniversary was held in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

Here, led by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, whose year it was to take charge of the rites, many wreaths were laid before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the last resting places of his companions in arms from World War II and the Korean war.

Despite the cold and high winds the ceremony went off in good fashion. Who, that witnessed it was not impressed by the massing of the colors in the amphitheater prior to the beginning of the exercises? Who, that listened to the words spoken by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, was not impressed by the message he brought not only to his immediate listeners but to all the Nation—to all the world?

But something was missing. We cast about to determine just what was lacking in this tribute to the veterans of all our wars, living and dead, and finally began to understand when we were informed over the loud speaker that Sumner G. Whittier, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had been designated to represent the President of the United States and place the President's wreath at the tombs.

Now Sumner G. Whittier, as we have been able to watch him and listen to him in his utterances on veterans' affairs since he took office, seems to us to be a fine upstanding young man—a war veteran—one whom we know to have been instilled with the spirit of patriotism from his earliest days. A good man to choose but for one thing, Sumner G. Whittier did not represent himself as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In his position he, himself, might have appropriately laid a wreath for the great organization he heads, devoted to the care of veterans and their dependents.

No, he did not speak for the thousands of his employees whose duty it is to advise and guide veterans as to their rights under existing laws but he spoke for the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of all our Armed Forces—a veteran of two world wars who could not find time to be present.

We were informed by the local press that the President was too busy to attend—too busy at the White House. At least that's what the city dailies said.

Now, when we consider that the distance from the White House to the Arlington amphitheater would take up about 7—no, let us say 10 minutes, especially when escorted by motorcycle policemen, perhaps 10

minutes to lay the wreath, and 10 minutes to return, we wonder why our veteran President could not give up half an hour of his time to pay his respects in person to the men and women for whom he had proclaimed Veterans' Day.

A good many attended. Young and old, civilians and veterans, members of practically every veteran organization in the Nation. But one was absent. The leader, who could not spare 30 minutes of his time to join with the country in its tribute to the warriors of our Nation. The ceremony, as we have said, was an inspiring one but left us with a feeling of sadness that our leader, our Commander in Chief, was not there.

Statement by Hon. Lindsay Almond,
Governor of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, Virginia and her people have had the guns of Federal judicial tyranny trained upon them. The NAACP and the liberal leftwing groups that are trying to nationalize and mongrelize our Nation have made an all-out effort to bring Virginia to her knees and to compel her to submit to judicial tyranny and unconstitutional usurpation of authority. The vast majority of our true Virginians have stood firm and refused to forsake principle. They have stood on the solid rock of sound, constitutional government and the concepts of individual liberty and freedom of our people as envisioned by our forefathers who gave us our Constitution as well as our form of Government.

This week a number of the so-called massive resistance laws enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia to prevent integration in the public schools and thus preserve public education in Virginia, were declared unconstitutional. This does not mean and will not mean that the public schools of Virginia will be integrated. It simply means that Virginians must continue to stand firm and continue more than ever to fight for constitutional government and the right of the State to govern in its own internal affairs. We cannot and we must not permit integration in a single public school in Virginia. Ways and means can be and must be found to cope with this situation and to preserve public education in Virginia. The State administration working with the general assembly, I am convinced, will find a solution. The thing needed most is to have the people of Virginia support and stand with those of us who are dedicated to the preservation of the sovereignty of our State and our way of life.

Last night, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia, poured out his heart to the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia and reaffirmed his determination to resist usurpation of authority to the utmost and to preserve segregated schools in Virginia. It was an

outstanding analysis of the present situation facing Virginians and noble covenant with the people to preserve the rights of our people, the integrity of our State and the continued operation of segregated schools.

Realizing the importance of the Governor's statement and what it means to the people of Virginia, I include it with my remarks:

My fellow Virginians, I am grateful for the privilege of this brief appearance to discuss with you some aspects of the constitutional crisis shackled upon us by a judicial oligarchy and its shocking and terrible impact on our public school system.

Throughout this struggle Virginia has fought to preserve and defend her rights vouchsafed to her under and within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. On the highest plane of honor, inherent conviction, and loftiness of ideals and principle she has sought only to maintain those rights reserved by her and her sister States, and which have never been delegated, forfeited, or surrendered to the Federal Government. Her loyalty to our Federal system of government as ordained by the Constitution is woven with indestructible thread into the heart and fiber of her people. A combination of forces motivated by political expediency, armed with arrogated power and inimical to our constitutional system, has advanced with ruthless threat to strike down and destroy the right of the people of this State to have a voice in the education of their children. This is lamentably true, notwithstanding the indisputable fact that the fundamental law of the land embraced and protected the use and enjoyment of this right for nearly a century. The right is now denied through the process of judicial legislation amendatory of the Constitution in contravention thereof, and in violation of the oath to uphold and defend it.

VIRGINIA WON'T WEAKEN

Without reference to the people as the Constitution requires, it is demanded of Virginia by the executive and judicial departments of the Federal Government that she forsake honor, abandon principle, and eschew her loyalty to the Constitution by slavish acceptance of this travesty upon the Constitution, and grace the violated oath with a modicum of decency.

Virginia will not weaken in her allegiance to the compact which forms the basic structure of this indissoluble Union of indestructible States; she will not dilute and desecrate her concept of honor; she will not abandon or compromise with principle to have it lost never to be regained.

To those of faint heart; to those whose purpose and design is to blend and amalgamate the white and Negro race and destroy the integrity of both races; to those who disclaim that they are integrationists but are working day and night to integrate our schools; to those who don't care what happens to the children of Virginia; to those false prophets of a little or token integration; to those in high places and elsewhere who advocate integration for your children and send their own to private or public segregated schools; to those who defend or close their eyes to the livid stench of sadism, sex, immorality, and juvenile pregnancy infesting the mixed schools of the District of Columbia and elsewhere; to those who would overthrow the customs, morals, and traditions of a way of life which has endured in honor and decency for centuries and embrace a new moral code prepared by nine men in Washington whose moral concepts they know nothing about; to those who would substitute strife, bitterness, turmoil and chaos for the tranquility and happiness of an orderly society; to those who would destroy our way of life because of

their pretended concern over what Soviet Russia may think of us, to all of these and their confederates, comrades, and allies let me make it abundantly clear for the record now and hereafter, as Governor of this State, I will not yield to that which I know to be wrong and will destroy every rational semblance of education for thousands of the children of Virginia.

PEOPLE WILL DECIDE ISSUES

I call upon the people of Virginia to stand firmly with me in this struggle. Be not dismayed by recent judicial deliverances. I propose to restore the tax revenues of this Commonwealth to the control of the people. They and they alone will decide these issues. United in the common purpose of defending constitutional government and advancing the welfare of our children—with determination more relentless than ever before—we have just begun to fight.

No price is too high to pay; no burden too heavy to bear; no consequence too grave to endure in defense of the right and duty of this Commonwealth to protect the people of Virginia in the proper enjoyment of their right and obligation to mold the character and promote the welfare of their children through the exercise of their voice and judgment in their education and development.

The grave constitutional crisis which has been thrust upon us makes it imperative that our energy, resources, and efforts be launched and applied on a statewide basis. Abandonment of the principles involved anywhere is to forego them everywhere. The inevitable result will be total engulfment with the progress of dissolution and chaos measured by the combination of forces confederated and arrayed to divide, conquer, rule, and ruin.

The people of Virginia through their elected representatives and by registering their convictions in the exercise of their franchise have repeatedly made it crystal clear that they cannot and will not support a system of public education on a racially integrated basis. I make it equally clear that I cannot and that I will not break faith with them.

PEOPLE HAVE RESPONDED

No parent of guardian is under any legal compulsion from any source to send a child to a racially mixed school. In certain areas affected by adverse Federal decrees the people have responded magnificently to the emergency created through the closing of schools. Thousands of our children have adjusted to the situation. The processes of education are being admirably and effectively administered. The hardships and sacrifices have constituted a challenge to overcome obstacles with the result that fundamentally sound educational progress is being made without chaos or undue confusion.

Amid the agony of these trying days I have been heartened and inspired by the profound spirit of dedication and determination of these citizens and their children, as well as the teachers, who have comported themselves so as to reflect immeasurable credit on the highest qualities of patriotic citizenship.

It is my purpose to appoint and convene with all practical expedition a commission composed of members of the general assembly for the purpose of assessing and evaluating the entire situation in the light of existing conditions. It is my earnest hope and desire that we may be able to formulate a sound and constructive program for submission to a special session of the general assembly. The problem is not one lending itself to an easy solution. It is most grave and difficult. It will require hard work, patience, and a deep sense of dedication.

To prevent the pyramiding of chaos, confusion, and disruption, I urgently request that private instruction now obtaining, and

wherever it may become necessary, continue and go forward without interruption. I urge the wholehearted cooperation of all concerned to this end. It is my firm belief that to break the chain of continuity in the administering of private instruction and the consequent confusion of a transition which may invoke conditions justifying its termination would be productive of incalculable harm.

CALLS FOR RESTRAINT

I shall not hesitate to use every available and proper means at my command to keep the peace and good order of this commonwealth. I call upon our people to comport themselves with dignity and restraint to the end that the honor and name of Virginia be not defamed.

I have implicit faith and confidence in the genius of the people to cope with any emergency, and their loyalty and dedication to the preservation of their inherent and inalienable rights. Our cause is sound, right, and just. With your unwavering loyalty under the guidance of Almighty God we shall go forward to higher and greater accomplishments.

Adrift in a Sea of Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I offer an editorial which appeared in the January 13, 1959, issue of the Jefferson Bee, Jefferson, Iowa. Let this serve to remind the Congress that the farm problem confronts us today in more serious proportions than ever before, and unless immediate action is undertaken to aid in the solution of this situation our whole national economy will suffer an irreparable setback.

The editorial follows:

ADRIPT IN A SEA OF CORN

Last fall farmers voted in a controversial corn referendum. They had two choices: a higher support price of \$1.25 per bushel with corn allotments; a lower support price of \$1.14 with no planting restrictions.

Farmers chose the latter. This year, for the first time since the so-called farm program was enacted by Congress in the early thirties (war years excluded), no corn acreage allotments will be issued. Voting out allotments also means the elimination of the commercial corn-growing area with whatever advantage farmers may have enjoyed under the plan.

Some people interpreted the referendum results as defiant action on the farmers' part. No choice, they said. A vote against acreage allotments was a vote against the general policy of the Agriculture Department and its administrators.

Still, powerful farm spokesmen heralded the referendum outcome as a step toward greater freedom. Farmers don't want controls, they declared. The law of supply and demand will stabilize prices, offer greater opportunity.

So, here we are at the beginning of another crop year. Corn stocks are at an all-time high—33 percent over the 10-year average in Iowa—and no relief in sight.

Indeed, if we are favored with another good growing season, and farmers take ad-

vantage of unrestricted corn planting, our present surpluses may look small.

The farm problem seems to grow each season, along with the corn.

This Monster, Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of Sunday, January 18, 1959:

THIS MONSTER, MIKOYAN

Deputy Soviet Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan is reported to have been unusually frank for a Soviet official in replying to questions from executives of the Detroit auto industry.

One of the topics was the revolt in Hungary in October-November 1956. Mikoyan's comment was that he was distressed that many Americans thought the Russians enjoyed shooting people.

The Soviet, he said, came to the assistance of a lawful government (in Hungary) just as the United States did in Lebanon last summer.

The truth of the Hungarian massacre is almost unbelievably shocking—and, of course, a far cry from Mikoyan's above explanation.

Deputy Premier Mikoyan was sent to Budapest to take charge for Moscow, when the freedom-fighters deposed the puppet regime and set up a new government under Premier Imre Nagy.

On October 31, 1956, Mikoyan personally assured Zoltan Tildy, Minister of State of the new Hungarian Government, that Soviet troops would be withdrawn from Hungary. This welcome news was announced over the Budapest radio by General Maleter, Defense Minister in the new Hungarian Government, and reported from free-world news correspondents on the scene.

Even as Mikoyan gave his pledge, however, he was calling for Soviet troop reinforcements to mass outside Hungary, in preparation for the attack of November 3-4.

Having put the Hungarian leadership off guard, Mikoyan arranged a series of conferences between Soviet and Hungarian military leaders, "to plan the withdrawal." After several sessions, an emergency "parley" was arranged for 10 p.m. November 3, at Soviet military headquarters outside Budapest.

Once inside the conference room, General Maleter and his aides were arrested, and immediately, the signal was given for a massive Soviet tank and infantry attack on Budapest. While Premier Nagy, unaware of the trap, implored over the radio for General Maleter to return to his post, the Soviet forces moved in for the kill.

A few days later, with Mikoyan still in full charge for Moscow, Nagy himself was tricked into leaving asylum in the Yugoslav embassy and taken prisoner.

Mikoyan's vital role in this bloody chapter of history has not been as widely reported as it should have been. The Soviet Government has never mentioned it, and the witnesses who would have testified to it have gone—by death in the fighting, by deportation, and by execution. The voices of General Maleter and Premier Nagy were silenced by

firing squad. As is his custom, Mikoyan tried to leave no trace!

It is an insult to the American people for this arch-murderer Mikoyan to pretend to be a good-will ambassador to the United States.

Only disaster can come from American businessmen and officials fawning over this Machiavellian monster.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from Howard W. Burden, of Cortland, N.Y., which I feel should be read generally:

CORTLAND MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Cortland, N.Y., January 4, 1959.

Representative JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. TABER: Because this is the start of the budgeting year, I am asking you to forgive a letter written in from a hospital bed on a day too rough even to have any of my business stationery brought down. Unless I send this out at once, there's no sense even writing. It's about the Federal budget, and I wish that you would see that every single U.S. Senator and Representative gets a copy. I wanted to get one typed and maybe photocopied, but you can't do that with a broken leg, in bed.

First, let me refer you to the article, entitled "Do You Want a 10-Cent Dollar?" in this month's Reader's Digest, by Roswell McGill.

Writers have harped on this for years, and it's about time that we did something besides keeping on going in the hole.

The skids are greased. If we keep on we may start a slide we can't stop. When it does come, I don't care if you are worth \$1,000 or a million, we're all in for a fall.

Read the article. It's good; it's careful. Just let me refer to a few figures from it.

First, on family debt: A \$288 billion debt and 180 million people, that's \$1,600 per individual or over \$6,000 per family. State and county debt may run \$2,000 to \$4,000 and local \$4,000. There you tally up \$1,400 before your homeowner has bought his house, his car, and all the rest. Say you put down only \$1,600 for them and you are up to \$30,000. That's a lot of money for the average person to owe. The interest eats him up.

Again, I refer to page 26 of the article in the amount of time for a man earning \$4,500 a year, to get certain things out of life: 2 hours 39 minutes per day for Government; 1 hour 39 minutes per day for food; 1 hour 25 minutes per day for housing; 37 minutes per day for clothes. Lopsided? You are the only hope of the people to control this rat race at the national level. This is a brandnew January. Now is the time to act. Let's do it.

Referring again, this time to page 29, left of the article each \$1 billion you shave off the budget saves the average family \$200. I'm for it.

Looking again at page 29, left, center: "It looks as if the Government had better take the other fork of the road, uphill and stony though it may be, and reduce expenditures and levy such taxes as are needed to pay for current costs."

I think I've said enough.

So to you, Mr. TABER, and to each of you other representatives in our two Houses of Congress, do your best to sharpen that red pencil, and thanks, we're looking for you.

Earnestly and with a personal wish to each of you for a fine 1959, and for a new sensible deal starting now for our country from here on in.

HOWARD W. BURDEN,
Cortland County Republican Committee.

Businesslike Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the January 19, 1959, issue of Barron's, National Business and Financial Weekly, carries as its lead article a much-deserved tribute to a distinguished member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General.

The article points out the remarkable progress that has been made toward improved mail service under the leadership of Postmaster General Summerfield and under leave to extend my remarks I offer the magazine's comments in their entirety:

BUSINESSLIKE MAILMAN—Mr. SUMMERFIELD HAS DELIVERED A BETTER POSTAL SERVICE

One of the less glorious traditions of the American Republic requires its Postmaster General to be, if not exactly a dunderhead, at best a figurehead. Down through the years, the highest office in the postal system all too often has served as a refuge for the party hack, a sinecure granted as a reward for managing a successful presidential campaign. Indeed, to call the roll of those who have held top command in the Post Office is to turn up a succession of public non-entities. Seldom does a famous name—a Benjamin Franklin or a John Wanamaker, a Will Hays, or a Jim Farley—grace the roster. The rest are blanketed today in a common obscurity.

The present incumbent, however, hardly conforms to this dreary stereotype. Since taking office 6 years ago, Arthur Summerfield has made notable progress in modernizing and streamlining the operations of his department. To be sure, owing largely to the financial obstruction of Congress, as well as that of some Federal agencies, the postal deficit in fiscal 1958 soared to an all-time high. Nonetheless, by successfully pushing through the first general increase in rates in a generation, the ex-Chevrolet dealer unmistakably has stemmed the rising tide of red ink. Meanwhile, he has increased the efficiency of the Post Office and speeded up its service. Most promising of all, he has begun to enlist the talents and energies of private industry to help find better ways of processing an ever-mounting volume of mail. Thus, to the great task of keeping the massive Federal budget under control, Mr. Summerfield has made a signal, if largely unsung, contribution.

The job has not been easy. Both the physical and financial challenges faced by the Postmaster General were, and remain, formidable, indeed. Over the years, while Congress kept postal rates at the levels set in the thirties, a steady rise in costs rolled up bigger and bigger deficits. In 1958, as the gap

between income and outgo rose to a new fiscal year high of nearly \$900 million, the administration, spearheaded by Mr. Summerfield, waged a last-ditch fight to raise rates. It was only partly successful. The lawmakers increased some charges less than the President asked, and ordered more generous pay raises for postal workers than he thought justified. The net result was largely to offset a gain of some \$530 million a year in the Department's receipts by a payroll boost, current and retroactive, totaling over \$360 million. Furthermore, after Congress adjourned, the Interstate Commerce Commission dealt another blow to postal finances by awarding the railroads huge increases, including a retroactive \$54 million, for carrying the mails.

Despite these temporary setbacks, the long-range financial outlook of the Post Office plainly is improving. For one thing, the retroactive boosts in costs now are out of the way, while the higher postal rates voted last year will be swelling revenues throughout calendar 1959. Moreover, some of the rate hikes are progressive; those on third-class mail went up by one-third on New Year's Day, and second-class rates jump a second notch this year and a third in 1960. Finally, as the budget message today presumably will underscore, the administration is launching another determined effort to boost postal receipts. At the same time, the Department is working hard to cut costs. As the expense of shipment by train has climbed, for example, it has switched increasingly to transportation by truck and plane. Consequently, the deficit for fiscal 1959 will decline fairly sharply, for the first time in 6 years, to an estimated \$625 million. In fiscal 1960, it is likely to drop further.

While costing the taxpayer less, the Post Office also is taking steps to improve its service. Thus in the past year, it has expanded rural deliveries, extended window hours, and stepped up its collection of mail. It has adopted such up-to-the-minute transportation facilities as Bunyan Boxes, which are huge aluminum containers designed to eliminate bag-by-bag loading of commercial cargo liners; Mailsters, small three-wheeled vehicles which enable postmen to deliver parcels along with regular mail; and Flexi-vans, loaded highway trailers which, in a refinement of piggyback railroading, can be separated from their wheel assemblies and placed aboard a flatcar in a few minutes. Such innovations are combining to speed deliveries. Indeed, Mr. Summerfield, always the optimist, talks buoyantly of eventual overnight service between any two cities in the United States.

Even more significant, in the long run, is the beginning of a drastic change in mail handling within the post office itself. To help mechanize his Department's antiquated internal operations, Mr. Summerfield has sought the aid of many a private concern in designing, producing, and testing equipment. Enlisted in this program, under the supervision of the National Bureau of Standards, are such knowledgeable enterprises as Aerojet-General Corp., American Machine & Foundry Co., Burroughs Corp., Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp., Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Mechanical Handling Systems, Inc., and Pitney-Bowes, Inc. Currently in experimental use in selected post offices are mechanical and electronic gadgets for sorting, facing, postmarking, and canceling huge quantities of mail—as much as 36,000 pieces an hour—with a minimum of human attention. Beyond these intermediate Rube Goldberg devices looms the more distant goal of a completely automatic post office. Intex Systems, a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, expects shortly to receive a contract to build and equip the first such installation in the country.

Under the Summerfield management, in short, the Post Office has displayed unusual initiative and vision in coping with its difficulties. Undeniably, the service still has a long way to go, in terms of both efficiency and solvency; the postal authorities, in the latter instance especially, cannot do the job alone. Certainly, the 86th Congress should raise rates again, and thus help reduce the deficit to less burdensome proportions. Nonetheless, for the progress already achieved, and for the gains in prospect through the new partnership with private industry, Mr. Summerfield clearly deserves a belated thank-you note from the taxpayer.

The Corn Allotment Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative editorial on the corn allotment vote. This editorial appeared in the November 27, 1958, issue of the Des Moines Register, and offers an excellent and valuable commentary on the reasons and events leading to the farm vote on the 1958 corn referendum. The editorial follows:

THE CORN ALLOTMENT VOTE

The heavy vote by corn farmers against acreage allotments for 1959 will be widely interpreted as a vote against production controls in principle—and for freedom to plant. Secretary Ezra Benson already has attached this meaning to the vote, which is no surprise. But it would be more logical to interpret the results of Tuesday's referendum as a rejection of production controls which did not work.

There is no evidence to indicate that farmers would not welcome a production control system that would hold output in line with demand. There is some evidence that farmers in the Corn Belt, at least, prefer the soil bank method of taking land completely out of production as a means of controlling output. This has been the position of the Iowa Farm Bureau.

We fail to see how the allotment program was any more of an interference with farmers' freedom than the soil bank. It was voluntary as the soil bank is. There has been a great deal of nonsense spoken about this matter of "controls," especially by the Secretary of Agriculture himself. Mr. Benson's speeches create the impression among nonfarm people, that the Government has been ordering farmers around, telling them what to grow and what not to grow. This isn't true, and we don't believe farmers voted against any such purely imaginary control setup.

Farmers have seen that the allotment procedure, affecting corn alone, has not limited the output of feed grains. Secretary Benson has not administered this program sympathetically in an effort to make it work. He has refused to require cross compliance on other crops as a condition of eligibility for benefits. He has reduced corn allotments rigorously according to formula, with no attempt to get a minimum national allotment as in the case of wheat. He has provided a corn loan about 25 cents below the regular loan for farmers who didn't comply with allotments.

Thus everything has been geared to discourage farmers from participating in the program and to make the allotment program look bad. Allotments worked poorly enough even with the most sympathetic administration. But Benson stacked the cards against them.

The referendum offered farmers such a choice that they could hardly fail to vote against the allotments for next year. The allotments were to be reduced sharply, and the price support loan for compliance also to be cut. Benson announced that there would not be a noncompliance loan next year.

The alternative was a corn loan for everyone at a somewhat higher level than the noncompliance loan this year—with no limitation on corn acreage.

Under these circumstances it is surprising that as many as 30 percent of the farmers voting chose to stick with the allotment program.

Zeboim Lupton Patten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, Tennessee lost to eternity one of its finest native sons and loyal citizens, Zeboim Lupton Patten, of Chattanooga, died at the age of 51 years and his passing brought great sorrow to all citizens of our State and to his many acquaintances throughout the entire country.

Lupton Patten was a close friend of many years. To know him was, simply, to love him. His personality, his kindness, all of his fine qualities of heart and mind, and his great selfless service to his community and the Nation placed him a notch above other men. Born of an honorable and distinguished pioneer family of Tennessee his life was devoted to high principles and standards that brought benefit to all with whom he was associated.

This great man who has been lost to the people of Tennessee served to build one of the great family industries of our State. As president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co., and its various subsidiaries, he led his firm into a position of nationwide prominence. Under Mr. Patten's leadership, his company has conducted much original research that has contributed greatly to medical advances. His business principles were equally as exemplary as his personal life. As a national president of the Proprietary Association he contributed to development of safe and ethical practices in a field of business that affects all our lives.

The interests of Lupton Patten were as varied as his talents. He not only brought the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to a position of leadership but he was equally interested in and was given a position of leadership in civic, religious, and educational movements. He was voted the young man of the year back in 1940. He was chairman of the board of the University of Chattanooga and

saw it grow to become one of the South's great educational institutions. He was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1940 and 1948 and his talented widow is now a member of the Republican National Committee. He was a member of the board of the National Manufacturers' Association and president of the Tennessee Manufacturers' Association. He served as president of the Community Chest. No worthwhile civic movement was without his interest and support. One interesting example is the fact that, as busy as he was, he served as foreman of the grand jury in Chattanooga at a time when inspiring leadership was needed.

It was typical of Lupton that he would prepare his business so that his high standards of business practice would be continued. The announcement of his nephew, Alex Guerry, Jr., as president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to succeed Lupton Patten was in line with his wishes and I am certain the great traditions of this firm will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the Record at this time some of the editorials that were written and published in Tennessee newspapers upon the demise of Lupton Patten. I am proud of the respect and honor paid him in these editorials. The sincerity of these thoughts and the great compliments given him are well deserved. I know that Lupton Patten would bear these words of compliment humbly and honorably. He was a kindly and simple man; a trusted and beloved friend.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the Chattanooga Daily Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

LUPTON PATTEN DEAD AT 51—BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADER—PRESIDENT OF CHATTANOOGA MEDICINE, CHAIRMAN OF UNIVERSITY OF CHATTANOOGA BOARD—BANK, INSURANCE EXECUTIVE, METHODIST—FOUNDED TENNIS CLUB

Lupton Patten, 51, civic and business leader and member of one of the city's pioneer families, died at 7 a.m. Sunday at his home, 1636 Hillcrest Road, after a heart attack.

Mr. Patten was first stricken in the fall of 1957 and after a short stay in the hospital returned to his home to recuperate. He later was able to resume most of his activities and had been at his office several times last week.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p.m. in John A. Patten Memorial Chapel of the University of Chattanooga, the Rev. Arthur H. Jones, Jr., pastor of First Methodist Church, and Dr. LeRoy A. Martin, president of Tennessee Wesleyan College, officiating. Burial will be in Forest Hills Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be the following university students: Richard Holcomb, Bill B. Jones, Thomas A. Williams, Charles Pierce, Craig Smith, Larry Houghton, Art Grayson, and John Green.

The family asked that flowers be omitted and suggested gifts may be made to the university.

The body is at the home. Funeral arrangements are by Wann's.

Mr. Patten was president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co., one of Chattanooga's oldest and most widely known institutions. He was a guiding figure in other enterprises and movements in Chattanooga.

He made outstanding contributions to the community through his service as chairman

of the Community Chest campaign of 1939, as president of the chest in 1948 and 1949 and as chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chattanooga and as a member of the boards of the Bright School and the Girls Preparatory School.

He also was a leader in several businesses and in worthwhile movements and organizations at both the local and national level. Active in the Republican Party, he served as a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1940 and was an alternate delegate in 1948.

Zebolm Lupton Patten was born in Chattanooga January 29, 1907, the son of the late John A. Patten and Edith Manker Patten. His father was the nephew of the late Z. C. Patten, one of the founders of the medicine company, which Lupton Patten had headed since 1938.

BAYLOR GRADUATE

Lupton Patten was graduated from Baylor school in 1923. In 1927 he received a B.A. degree from the University of Chattanooga. He was a member of Sigma Chi fraternity, the Blue Key, and Alpha societies.

In 1927 and 1928 he served as instructor in French and philosophy at U.C.

In 1928, he became associated with the medicine company as a member of its credit department. Subsequent promotions made him assistant sales manager, sales manager, and then president. He also was chairman of the board of the Brayten Pharmaceutical Co.

At the time of his death he was chairman of the board of trustees of the university and a member of the boards of the Bright and Girls Preparatory Schools.

WAS 1940 JAYCEE MAN OF THE YEAR

In recognition of his leadership in civic affairs he was selected as the junior chamber of commerce's young man of the year of 1940. He served as vice chairman of the Greater Chattanooga War Fund in 1941, after having served as Community Chest campaign chairman in 1939. He was president of the Chest in 1948 and 1949.

He was a member of the executive committee and a director of the American National Bank & Trust Co. and a member of the board of directors of the Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co. He was the founder of the Chattanooga Tennis Club.

He received national recognition from the medicine industry when he was elected president of the Proprietary Association to serve in 1950-52. He also was a member of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Tennessee Manufacturers Association and on the L. G. Noel Memorial Foundation.

LAUDED AT WESLEYAN

At commencement exercises of Tennessee Wesleyan College in Athens, Tenn., in May 1957, Mr. Patten was given the honorary degree of doctor of laws. At the ceremony he was extolled by Dr. LeRoy A. Martin, the college president, as "an example of the man of business whose decisions and standards flow from an understanding of the philosophy of the Greeks and the truths of Christianity."

He served as foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury in 1949. In 1950 he was a member of the blue ribbon grand jury which looked into jury irregularities.

He was an active leader in the First Methodist Church. His clubs included the Mountain City, Fairlyland, and Chattanooga Golf and Country Clubs.

He was married to Miss Mary Sanford in June 1928. He is survived by his wife and their four daughters, Mrs. Richard Winningham, Mrs. David Michael Wheelchel, Mrs. Reid

Douglas Hardin, and Miss Mary Fontaine Patten.

[From the Chattanooga Times, Dec. 8, 1958]
ZEBOLM LUPTON PATTEN

When Tennessee Wesleyan College conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon Lupton Patten in 1957, it cited him for being, among other things, a man whose "leadership has extended beyond the boundaries of personal business interests."

Simple in its truth and profound in its implications, the statement might well be included in the epitaph this community now must write in its sorrow. For here indeed was a man whose abilities were manifold, whose concern for the betterment of the place of his birth and of his deserved success was without limit, whose willingness to give of himself in its behalf was without measure.

Lupton Patten was of a family which has contributed so richly to Chattanooga's growth that we might almost say, with meaning that it would not have been possible without them. He was aware of this heritage; he accepted its privileges with humility and its responsibilities with a deep sense of obligation. He was worthy of both.

At the core of his position in this community, of course, were his business achievements which were both varied and sound. After a brief tenure as an instructor at the University of Chattanooga—a facet of his life which many of his friends never knew or tended to forget but which might explain his lifelong interest in education—he joined the family-founded Chattanooga Medicine Co. in a subordinate position in 1929.

His rise in the company was through the sales department, and at the age of 31 years he became a successor to his father, John A. Patten, as president of the firm. This was in 1938, and the 20 years since have been those of the medicine company's greatest growth.

In addition, he served on the directorates of the American National Bank & Trust Co., the Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., and of the Brayten Pharmaceutical Co.

To say that Mr. Patten was active in civic affairs is merely to suggest the barest sort of outline of what he did and of what he gave for Chattanooga and its people. There was scarcely an area of its development in which he had not worked with ardor himself or supported with sound advice and material aid.

He had long been a trustee of the University of Chattanooga, his alma mater, and had served as chairman of the board. In addition, he was on the boards of the Bright School and Girls Preparatory School.

He had headed War Fund and Community Chest campaigns, and was active in most of the city's cultural undertakings.

In 1949, Mr. Patten served as foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury, a tenure marked by action against masked night-riders in the county.

He was a Republican, an unabashed conservative, and much of his energies in recent years have gone into serving the party's cause as he envisioned it on the local, State, and national levels.

A man with an easy smile and a soft voice, he could argue his convictions cogently and disagree with others without rancor. He had a ready wit and was an accomplished storyteller in moments of relaxation.

Lupton Patten's death at the age of 51 is a blow to this city, a grievous burden for his friends. None will doubt that his good works have erected monuments more enduring than stone and memories warmer than any engraved words.

[From the Chattanooga Observer, Dec. 12, 1958]

A GREAT AND GOOD MAN IS GONE

When the grim reaper Death stilled the voice of Zebolm Lupton Patten early Sunday morning, December 7, it carried to his eternal home a great, good man. He was good and great at the same time. He was the guiding genius of one of Chattanooga's leading enterprises, the Chattanooga Medicine Co., and also a director in many of Chattanooga's leading businesses.

He was a man of great wealth, but he used that great wealth and ingenuity to help people. He followed in the steps of his illustrious father, who preceded him in death, by giving to many worthy causes thousands of dollars to help them on their way. Lupton Patten, like his father gave much of his means to Negroes, particularly Negro ministers. When adversities knocked on Negroes' doors they made a beaten path to the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to see the little man with the big heart, Lupton Patten. When Negro churches needed a roof and other things to keep them in good repair where they may religiously educate their children Mr. Patten furnished the means by which they could do the necessary work needed to be done. In that he was following in the footsteps of his illustrious father because his father, in all probability, gave more money to Negro churches in this community than any one that I know about. Sometimes it wasn't a need for the church proper, but it was a need for the minister of the church and he also considered their pleas and helped them on their way.

It can truthfully be said of him that he lived in a house by the side of the road where the races of men go by—some were white some were black, some were rich, some were poor, some were learned and some were unlearned but he considered their cries and used much of his money in answering their prayers. Thus, in the passing of Mr. Zebolm Lupton Patten the Negroes of Chattanooga sustain the loss of one of their greatest benefactors. Yes, he was a friend to man. He was an easy man to approach; he was very understanding; he harbored no prejudice because of race, religion, or previous condition of servitude.

Hundreds of people jammed and packed the Patten Chapel on the campus of the University of Chattanooga Monday, December 8 at 2 p.m. to pay their last tribute of respect to their fallen leader—captains of industry, insurance executives, bankers, real estate men, Negroes, lawyers, doctors, preachers, and laborers, in fact people of all walks of life.

He was a great Republican. He believed in the principles of the party of Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. I don't know of any one in the image of man since the days of my father that I held in higher esteem than I did Mr. Patten. He was genuinely a good man and because of his goodness, he was a great man. It has been said that the true measurement of a giant oak can best be taken when it is down. That is also true in the lives of great men. In the presence of death all people are impartial, then envy has no motive to actuate it, malice has no motive to inspire it, ambition sees no genius in its path, then history becomes the unbiased witness. Judging by every standard, whether in the full glow of his business career or at the journey's end, he served with marked ability in every position he was called upon to fill. He has gone to try the realities of another world, but his spirit will remain with us forever.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press,
Dec. 8, 1958]

LUPTON PATTEN

In the truest sense of the word, Lupton Patten was a gentleman. And the characteristics that made him so made him a great Chattanooga.

Integrity, ability and vision were blended with an inquiring mind, an enterprising spirit, a broad horizon of interests and a deep sense of civic responsibility. These are some of the factors that make Mr. Patten's death yesterday a real loss.

President of one of Chattanooga's major industries, Mr. Patten's business acumen caused the Chattanooga Medicine Co. to develop under his direction into a larger vital concern of greater national importance, and led to the development of subsidiary companies that have increased Chattanooga's importance in the drug world.

His business activities alone were sufficient to mark Mr. Patten as an outstanding Chattanooga. But while they were the center of his interests, business was only one of the many fields in which his influence was constructively felt.

Having assumed the presidency of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. 20 years ago at the age of 31, Mr. Patten already was active in civic affairs, so much that he was named young man of the year by the junior chamber of commerce in 1940.

The year before, the young Mr. Patten had successfully provided civic leadership through his service as campaign chairman of the community chest, an organization he was to serve as president for 2 years a decade later. In 1941 he was vice chairman of the Greater Chattanooga War Fund Campaign. He was scheduled to receive next month an honorary life membership in the United Fund.

Having received his schooling at Baylor School and the University of Chattanooga, Mr. Patten was deeply interested in the field of local education. Two of his early years were spent as a University of Chattanooga instructor. At his death he was chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Chattanooga and a member of the boards of the Bright School and Girls Preparatory School.

During the past several years the Chattanooga Tennis Club has proudly developed one of the best centers for the sport in the Nation, having built on the basis established by Mr. Patten as founder of the club and one of its most interested members.

A constitutional conservative in political outlook, Mr. Patten was active in local and national Republic affairs, serving as GOP National Convention delegate in 1940 and an alternate delegate in 1948, providing leadership in the Tennessee delegation for stanch, free enterprise Americanism.

Nor did he turn away from a call for government service. He was a distinguished foreman of the Hamilton County grand jury. During his term the community was stricken by a rash of mob violence as hooded hoodlums burned crosses and flogged residents of outlying areas. Grand jury investigation under Mr. Patten's leadership helped restore the peace in that troubled period.

In his church, the First Methodist, Mr. Patten was an active member and vital leader for many years.

With all his business and civic service, Mr. Patten was a man devoted to his family. He and Mrs. Patten were the parents of four daughters.

Though his years of life were relatively brief, Mr. Patten engaged his time better than most in more endeavors than most, living fully, constructively, honorably, and in a manner that causes his death to be a real community loss.

MEDICINE FIRM ELECTS ALEX GUERRY AS PRESIDENT, PAT ABSHIRE AS DIRECTOR

Alex Guerry, Jr. was elected president of the Chattanooga Medicine Co. at a special meeting of the firm's board of directors Monday afternoon.

Guerry succeeds the late Lupton Patten, who died at his home early Sunday morning.

In other action taken by the directors, Patten Abshire, secretary of the company, was named a director to fill the vacancy created by the death of Mr. Patten.

Associated with the drug firm since 1945, Guerry was named executive vice president last September.

Guerry, 40, is one of the city's most active young executives. He is president of the Rotary Club and a leader in various organizations and civic undertakings.

Prior to his promotion to executive vice president, he had served as secretary of the company since 1948.

Guerry joined the firm after establishing a distinguished record in the Army Air Force during World War II.

He is a graduate of Baylor School and the University of the South and holds a master's degree in business and economics from the University of North Carolina.

Guerry has been active in the work of the United Fund-Red Cross campaigns. He was primarily responsible for an exhaustive 8-month study of UF operations in other cities which resulted in the adoption of a combination plan for Chattanooga.

The new president is a member of the Church of the Good Shepherd on Lookout Mountain. He resides with his wife, Louise Pemberton Guerry, and children, Alexander III, Louise Chappell, and John P., at the family home on Lula Lake Road, Lookout Mountain.

Abshire, the new director, is a member of the law firm of Wilkerson and Abshire, general counsel for the company.

ances, better housing, equitable methods of promotion and retirement, and the present system of military justice;

That he is to be commended for his attention to duty and conspicuous ability in the field of military legislation, both as a member of the Military Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee;

That in the future the committee will sorely miss his great ability and wise counsel, but congratulates him on his selection as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics;

That the chairman of the Armed Services Committee be, and he hereby is, authorized to take appropriate steps to have this resolution made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A Bill To Assist in Relieving the Shortage of Housing for Elder Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons which became part of the housing bills passed by both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees last year and, I am hopeful, will become part of the omnibus housing bill this year. However, in order to bring this matter to the attention of the House and Senate, I am introducing a separate bill along with the statement I made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at the time I suggested this bill as an amendment to the housing bill:

A bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons—it is the further purpose of this bill to assist in provision of urgently needed construction of nursing homes, renovation, and equipping existing licensed nursing homes for the care and treatment of persons, particularly elderly persons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to carry out the purpose of this bill section 201(a), title II of the National Housing Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 229. (a) The purpose of this section is to assist in relieving the shortage of housing for elderly persons and to increase the supply of rental housing for elderly persons. It is further the purpose of this bill to assist in the provision of urgently needed nursing homes for the care and treatment of persons, particularly elderly persons.

"For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'housing' means eight or more new or rehabilitated living units, not less than 50 per centum of which are specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons;

"(2) The term 'elderly person' means any person, married or single, who is sixty years of age or more;

"(3) The term 'nursing home' means a facility which is or will be licensed or regulated by law, which provides continuous

A Tribute to Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services which pays high tribute to the distinguished Member from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS:

Resolved, That the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, does hereby express regret at the loss from its membership of Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana;

That the committee recognizes the valuable contributions to the national defense made by him during his long tenure in Congress;

That the committee in particular recognizes the untiring efforts he has put forth in order to build strong and effective Reserve components of the Armed Forces;

That the committee believes that both Regular and Reserve personnel of the Armed Forces are indebted to him for his endeavors to secure for them increased pay and allow-

nursing care, under medical supervision or direction, to the long-term, convalescent, infirm, or elderly patient in a home-like atmosphere, furnishing facilities and comforts normally found in a patient's home, and which provides, in addition thereto, such specialized service, equipment, and safety features as may be required for the safe, proper, and adequate care of patients at all times; and

"(4) The terms 'mortgage', 'mortgagee', 'mortgagor', and 'maturity date' shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of this Act.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on mortgages during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and to make commitments for insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage to provide housing for elderly persons shall—

"(1) involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed \$12,500,000 or, if executed by Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or nonprofit development or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structures, rate of return, or methods of operation, not to exceed \$50,000,000;

"(2) not exceed, for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, \$9,000 per dwelling unit: Provided, That the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of \$9,000 per unit to not to exceed \$9,400 per unit to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures and may increase each of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed \$1,250 per room in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;

"(3) if executed by a mortgagor which is a private nonprofit corporation or association or other acceptable private nonprofit organization regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States, or agencies thereof, or by the Commissioner under a regulatory agreement or otherwise, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purpose of this section, involve a principal obligation not in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner);

"(4) if executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner but which is not a nonprofit organization, involve a principal obligation not in excess of the Commissioner's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner, but shall not include any allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk): Provided, That the Commissioner may in his discretion require such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return and methods of

operation, and for such purpose the Commissioner may make contracts with and acquire for not to exceed \$100 stock or interest in any such mortgagor as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restrictions or regulations; such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance;

"(5) provide for a complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe;

"(6) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ per centum per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"(7) cover a property or project which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, with 50 per centum or more of the units therein specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner, and which may include such commercial and special facilities as the Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.

"(d) In order to carry out the purpose stated in the second sentence of subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new or rehabilitated nursing home, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may in his discretion, require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to charges and methods of operation, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Commissioner may make such contracts with and/or acquire, for not to exceed \$100, stock or interest in any such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the section 207 Housing Insurance Fund, and may be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed \$12,500,000, and not to exceed 75 per centum of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"(3) The mortgage shall—

"(i) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner shall prescribe; and

"(ii) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section with respect to the insurance of mortgages on properties or projects designed for use as nursing homes, the Commissioner shall consult with and secure the advice and recommendations of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, and shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons a preference or priority of opportunity to rent the dwellings included in such property or project.

"(g) The provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), and (p) of section 207 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section and all

references therein to section 207 shall refer to this section."

(b) Section 212(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The provisions of this section shall also apply to the insurance of any mortgage under section 229 except that compliance with such provisions may be waived by the Federal Housing Commissioner in such cases or classes of cases in which laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time on the project, voluntarily donate their services without compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Federal Housing Commissioner determines that any amounts thereby saved are fully credited to the nonprofit corporation, association or other organization undertaking the construction."

SEC. 213. This bill shall take effect sixty days after this enactment.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS B. CURTIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

I first want to thank the chairman for the opportunity of testifying before the committee on this important subject of adequate facilities for the aged.

No subject seems to be receiving more attention today than the problems that face our older citizens. It is very important that their problems receive attention. Indeed, the point has been raised of what value has been this increased lifespan given to us through the achievements of our medical and pharmaceutical professions if the years added to the lives of our people are to be spent in unhappiness.

What should be one of the greatest boons to mankind has in some respects become a bane. I believe it is well within our power to give the boon real meaning. However, it requires some clear thinking of what should be done. What has been done, although done with good intentions, has often produced poor results.

The problem of the aged is to a large degree a financial problem. Most older people are on fixed incomes, pensions, social security, or retirement of some sort. Their plans for financing their retirement have been thrown out of kilter by two major economic and social forces.

1. Instead of living 10 years they now are living 20 years. This is the boon that has become a bane, because they have not prepared themselves for this financial burden. The cost of staying alive is great—unnecessarily great. The drugs and medical care are available, but their cost is burdensome.

2. Inflation has hit this group of people most cruelly. What they had set aside has been cut in half. Although we have sought to alleviate this damage through granting double personal exemptions to persons over 65 in our income tax laws, and in other ways, this has amounted to too little for those who get it and has been of no help to those in the lower economic brackets who do not have enough income to be on the income tax rolls.

One way in which we can help these older citizens is to analyze with some care just what their needs are and see if we cannot provide the facilities that are tailored to their needs. What we have been doing, I suggest, is trying to convert the facilities that already exist in our society to fit their needs or, equally as bad, to distort their needs to fit what facilities exist. This does not work, and it is costly.

Let me illustrate. Older people need more medical attention than younger people but do not need constant doctor care, nor do they need constant nursing care. Yet, oftentimes, they are confronted with the choice of either staying at home or going to a hospital. They do not need hospitalization. They need something much less expensive, something in between. The result is we tend to overload

our hospitals and inadequately meet the needs of the aged and unnecessarily burden them financially.

I am going to make a confession. I was the first member of the male sex to serve on the board of the Visiting Nurses Association of St. Louis. I was deeply interested in the work that the visiting nurses were doing. I observed how their caseload had changed over the years. The primary caseload of the visiting nurses used to be instructing young mothers in prenatal and postnatal care, because most births took place in the homes and not in the hospitals. Today, there are very few maternity cases in the home. In place of maternity care, the visiting nurses now find their primary caseload is geriatrics—teaching the families of older people in the home how to care for the aged person in the home; how to administer a hypodermic shot; how to handle other problems of chronic illness or just old age.

I regret to state that the use of the visiting nurse approach, which is so much less costly than the hospital approach and much more suitable, has not received the attention and the development that it should. But it illustrates the point I am trying to make that facilities geared to the problems of the aged should be set up specifically for them rather than to try to make the aged problems fit into the facilities we have been using for the general society.

So I come to the specific question at hand—the encouragement and implementation of nursing homes designed to take care of the aged. As a matter of fact, the very terminology I am using—nursing homes—confesses that I am guilty of the very thing I am urging that we avoid. What we need is not nursing homes in the traditional way we know nursing homes to be. Nor do we need old folks' homes as we have known them. We need an entirely new type of facility. It may be a village of old folks, such as I have read has been established in Arizona. It may be just homes clustered around a medical facility that is set up to care for older people. Frankly, I am not certain just what kind of facilities we should be talking about.

And so we come closer to the question at hand. How do we go about providing the type of facilities that will most adequately fit the problem of our aged citizens? Do we do it by establishing a commission to study the matter, or a congressional committee? All this may help, but I suggest that there is a more direct way, a quicker way, a more satisfactory way—indeed, a way which is being followed to some extent in the natural course of events, whether the Government is aware of it or not.

The way is the private enterprise system. What Government should be doing is encouraging what is already coming about.

So many people misunderstand the private enterprise system. To me it is essentially a trail-and-error system, a system which permits individual citizens or groups of citizens to follow out their ideas of how to sell to or service certain social needs. The best way I know to provide adequate facilities to the older people is to allow various people to go ahead and provide what they think the older people would like at the price they can best afford to pay.

Ninety-seven percent of the nursing homes for the aged today are private institutions. These institutions are under State regulations, and the regulations are improving as experience with the operation of nursing homes grows. All that is needed now is to give some encouragement to private enterprise to move more effectively into the area of administering to the needs of our aged people. The Federal Government is in a very logical position to do just this through the FHA program.

I am familiar with the testimony of George T. Mustin, the head of the American Nursing Home Association, before your committee on May 14, 1958. I want to endorse what he has said wholeheartedly.

I believe that in this area the most can be done for the money to assist our older people, and this can be done right now. The plans, thousands of them, are in existence; all they need is financial implementation. Why we have not extended the FHA program to include private nursing homes before now is hard for me to understand. These are not fly-by-night operations. They all must qualify under State standards. Indeed, the Federal Government through the use of FHA funds can encourage the growth of the State-approved "Nestorian" facilities—I am coining a new term; Netsor was the respected older citizen in Homer's "Iliad"—and give impetus to the growth of qualified private facilities for our older citizens.

I urge this committee to give consideration to amending S. 3497, an act to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency or whatever proposed legislation would be most appropriate to include proprietary Nestorian facilities that meet adequate State standards.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Abuse of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Post of January 17, 1959:

ABUSE OF FREEDOM

Throwing eggs and spitting at a visitor from abroad, you venture, are not good manners ("Abuse of Freedom," editorial, January 10). Indeed they are not. Tossing temple-de-filers out of the place on their ears is not good manners either, but some people think well of the practice: people who hold certain things to be more important than good manners. Such people tend to be particular about who is treated as a guest of the Nation and who is not.

Would you invite just anyone into your house? A murderer? A rapist? A race agitator? A hard anti-Communist? Presumably a line must be drawn somewhere. Presumably there is a point at which good manners toward perpetrators and symbols of the things we despise implies condonation of the things we despise. Would you have welcomed Adolf Hitler to our shores as a guest of the Nation and have attended a dinner in his honor?

You sneer at these small minorities, these refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. I regard them as the chief defenders, at this moment, of our national honor and our national ideals. You say their conduct has no place whatever in a free society. I say their spirit is the only hope of free societies. You have the cheek to assert that they—have not yet learned the meaning of freedom. I throw eggs at you and spit.

BRENT BOZELL.

Time To Check Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes of September 4, 1958:

TIME TO CHECK AGAIN

This editorial is written to all veterans of United States wars and to the dependents of those veterans.

In our issue of June 26 we addressed an editorial to veterans of World War I primarily and to their dependents. In it we called attention to the attitude of Congress on the aspirations of this group and urged them to consider carefully their choice of Members of Congress when the coming election arrived.

We suggested that they pay particular attention to the voting records of the incumbents and endeavor to ascertain just who were their friends in Congress in both the House and the Senate.

We suggested that despite party predilections they set aside partisanship and send Representatives to Congress who would more understandingly speak for them when the time arose for a vote in both Houses of Congress on the question of benefits for veterans and their dependents.

We went so far as to suggest certain questions that might be asked of candidates in order that the veterans at home might know, in advance, the stand these candidates took on veterans' affairs, and be guided accordingly when it came time to cast their votes on election day.

We also suggested that we would discuss this subject again and believe that now is an excellent occasion to bring the question up in order that veterans may see to it that at voting day men and women will be chosen for the National Legislature who will truly represent them.

Just a few weeks remain before candidates for the 86th Congress will be chosen but in that time we believe that interested veterans can determine whom to vote for in order that their interests may not be lost sight of when the new Congress convenes.

In order that our veteran group may learn as promptly as possible just how each candidate stands we repeat our earlier suggestion that each candidate—those seeking reelection and the newcomers, be asked direct questions as to their stand on this important question and that the inquirer not accept pious lip service but a plain statement of fact in order that the veterans will know how to vote on election day.

We suggest that these inquiries be made now and be continued up until the time the veterans go to the polls in order that this vast potential strength might be definitely informed on the subject and thus know how to cast its vote when the proper time arrives.

On the question of service pensions the direct question should be asked, "Do you believe that men who served their country in time of war and who, in their old age find themselves in need of aid from their country are entitled to a pension in the true tradition of the United States of America?"

In response to such a question the veteran should not be satisfied with any wishy-washy reply or any beating around the bush,

but should insist upon as straightforward an answer as was the question.

Department leaders of the various veterans organizations in each State should know by now just who of the candidates seeking reelection have proven friendly to the veteran cause and can inform their members.

If they do not possess this knowledge we feel sure they can secure it by communicating with the national legislative representatives of the organizations and thus prepare their members with the knowledge to guide them at election time.

All other groups seem to have no qualms in determining those in Congress who are favorable to them or who oppose them and act accordingly.

For this reason veterans should try to find out those who will have the power to vote for or against them in the 2 years beginning next January and see to it that only friends are sent to Washington in order that veterans and their dependents may be assured of a fair break on the subject of veterans legislation.

Every veteran must remember that there are powerful influences in our land who would deny any and all benefits to ex-servicemen.

The one sure way to combat such influences is to send friends of veterans to Congress and the best way to find out your friends is to make certain of their position before the vote is cast.

Federal Employees: Time Off To Enable Them To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to allow 2 hours' time off to Federal employees for the purpose of voting in person. My bill directs the head of each department, agency, or establishment in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government to excuse from duty each employee under his jurisdiction, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave or loss of other employment benefit, for a period of 2 hours for the purpose of voting in person in primary or general election for Federal, State, or local office. Also, additional time may be granted when, in the discretion of the head of the department, it is necessary.

There was much confusion and difficulty in my own congressional district in the past election because of the conflict in the various regulations in effect concerning time allowed employees for voting. Federal employees were allowed only 1 hour, whereas other employees in the State of New York were given 2 hours off. A number of Federal employees got in touch with me and complained that they had difficulty in getting more than the hour off, and in some instances the additional time was denied them, although because of great distances they had to travel to their Federal jobs it was absolutely necessary for them to have the additional time requested. I presume this same situation must have prevailed in other areas as well.

Rather than leave the question of necessary voting time to the discretion of the heads of the Federal departments, provision for sufficient voting time should be made by law. In my opinion, at least 2 hours' time off should be granted Federal employees, to prevent any inability to exercise their franchise; this is only reasonable if our Federal employees are to be spared hardship. Surely they should be permitted to enjoy their privilege of voting, a right guaranteed them, without being penalized by the Federal Government, their employer.

Decade Brought Jersey's Biggest Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following article, "Decade Brought Jersey's Biggest Boom," by Mr. Richard O. Shafer, which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger, January 18, 1959:

DECADE BROUGHT JERSEY'S BIGGEST BOOM

(By Richard O. Shafer)

New Jersey had the greatest boom in its history during the last 10 years.

Everything that indicates a growing, healthy economy went up, up, up—population, employment, manufacturing, sales, buying income, farm production, bank deposits, housing, motor vehicle registrations, schools. And all indications are that the next 10 years will equal or exceed the phenomenal rate of growth of the last decade.

In fact, economic forecasters predict that by 1969 there will be a 100-mile strip city the length of New Jersey between New York and Philadelphia, teeming with industry, business, and homes. Such a strip city actually is well under way.

The greatest factor in New Jersey's past and present growth is its location between those two cities, the Nation's first and fourth largest. It is at the center of distribution for nearly all consumer goods for the Atlantic seaboard and overseas market. It is in the highest density of development in the Middle and North Atlantic States.

It is one of the most heavily industrialized of the 49 States. While only 45th in area, it ranks 6th in industrial activity, measured in total value added by manufacture, according to New Jersey Business Review magazine.

It is first among all the States in production of chemicals and plays a leading part in the manufacture of petroleum products, rubber goods, electrical machinery, foods, textiles, and ceramics.

The economic growth of New Jersey has produced a living standard for its citizens that is one of the highest in the Nation, according to a recent survey.

INCOMES UP 43.4 PERCENT

For example, the average net buying income per family in the Garden State rose 43.4 percent in the last 10 years—from \$4,961 in 1949 to \$7,115 in 1958.

Thanks mostly to ever increasing job opportunities, the population rose at the rate of 100,000 a year, a total increase of 16 percent during the decade, and now is 5½ million.

Latest available figures show total employment in New Jersey is 2,258,050, a jump of 13.6 percent, with 850,000 employed in manufacturing.

The State Chamber of Commerce reports 8,383 new manufacturing plants located in New Jersey between 1948 and the end of 1957, the latest year for which figures are available, and that factory payrolls jumped from \$2,214,159,000 in 1947 to more than \$4 billion in 1957. The total net buying income for the State rose more than 100 percent.

RETAIL SALES SOAR

During the 1947-57 decade, retail sales in the State increased 76.1 percent from \$4,034,374,000 in 1947 to \$7,104,475,000 in 1957, and bank deposits 53.1 percent from \$4,879,073,000 to \$7,468,101,000.

Motor vehicle registrations, which numbered 1,252,000 in 1947, today are well over 2 million.

The purchasing value of the dollar in New Jersey, based on a 100-cent value in 1939, dropped from 53.7 cents in 1948 to 46.9 cents in 1958.

In the last 10 years, New Jersey municipalities have made stupendous and costly efforts to keep pace with the growing population and school enrollment. The number of public school children in the State jumped from 616,000 in 1948 to 971,000 last year.

MILLIONS FOR SCHOOLS

To meet this increase, \$630 million was spent on new school construction, raising the total number of classrooms from 25,950 to 33,700 and the number of teachers from 26,121 to 41,500. Today, 62 more new public schools are under construction or authorized costing another \$57 million.

Teachers' salaries have risen along with other education costs. The minimum salary has gone from \$2,000 in 1948 to \$3,600 in 1958; the average salary for teachers from \$3,263 to \$5,530; the highest salary from \$5,600 to \$8,000, which now is earned by 351 teachers. These statistics were furnished by the State education department.

In the decade just ended, the total cost of public education jumped from \$126,970,457 to \$339 million.

In housing, despite herculean efforts, private builders and public agencies have been unable to keep pace with the population growth. It is estimated New Jersey will need 333,000 more dwelling units by 1968, to augment the 491,000 built in the last 10 years. The population growth for the next decade is estimated at 750,000 persons, or 250,000 families.

NORTH OF RARITAN

New Jersey's greatest growth in the last 10 years has been north of the Raritan River, but experts say the same factors that promoted that growth are at work in the southern sections of the State today.

Opening of the George Washington Bridge was one of the main factors for development of Bergen County and adjacent sections.

Today, south Jersey is benefiting from such projects as the Walt Whitman Bridge linking Camden and Philadelphia, the New Jersey Turnpike and Garden State Parkway and the Delaware Memorial Bridge.

The turnpike and the Walt Whitman Bridge place Philadelphia today in the same position as the George Washington Bridge placed New York City.

SOUTH JERSEY BOOM

One industrial expert says the pressures of growth from the Philadelphia area are causing it to spill over in such volume as to spell the same kind of boom for south Jersey as north Jersey experienced in the last decade.

This same expert cites New Jersey's tremendous inherent qualities of being a good place to live as certain to stimulate continued growth of the State.

Its easy accessibility to seashore and mountains and the cultural centers of New

York and Philadelphia attract many new residents, he points out.

"An industrialist who moved to New Jersey recently told me he was amazed at his ability to get anywhere in the State within 2 hours," he said.

HIGH FARM INCOME

In agriculture, New Jersey has maintained its rank as No. 1 among the States for cash receipts per acre—\$197. Connecticut is second, \$145, while such large agricultural States as California and New York are 6th and 12th respectively—\$74 and \$55.

U.S. census figures show New Jersey has 22,686 farms averaging 73.4 acres each.

Like all other phases of our economy, agriculture has undergone drastic changes during the past decade, said the State agriculture department.

These changes include increased mechanization due to greater use of electricity as a means of meeting higher labor costs, increased output and yield per plant as well as per acre, introduction of chemical weed control, vastly better control of animal diseases, and larger flocks of poultry and herds of cattle.

Fewer farms with less help are maintaining production levels despite the encroachment of residential and industrial developments into rural areas.

The department believes agriculture will survive in New Jersey despite the onward march of industry—total value of production on the State's farms rose from \$320,079,000 in 1948 to \$343,062,000 in 1957.

New Jersey agriculture is geared to the production of eggs, milk, vegetables, poultry, fruits, hay, grain, and berries, for nearby urban, industrial, and commercial centers.

Consequently, it is dependent on prevailing industrial activity and payrolls. Prosperity or depression on the farm is determined by business trends.

Could It Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we have always heard that truth will out. On Wednesday, January 7, 1959, there appeared a very pertinent editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, an outstanding newspaper published in Richmond, Va. The editorial comments very briefly but cogently upon the news item stating that Mr. Chief Justice Warren has dropped his membership in the American Bar Association. The question is raised that perhaps the Chief Justice now realizes that he is not a lawyer. The editorial is as follows:

COULD IT BE?

Chief Justice Earl Warren has dropped his membership in the American Bar Association, according to word received by the association's executive director from Justice Warren's office in Washington. No explanation was given.

Could it be that Chief Justice Warren no longer considers himself a lawyer?

The Air Force-Industry Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the remarks of Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, USAF, Commander of the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., on the occasion of the Seventh Annual Massachusetts Aviation Conference at the Andover Country Club, Andover, Mass., on September 25, 1958:

THE AIR FORCE-INDUSTRY FAMILY

(By Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Air Defense Systems Integration Division, Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., at the Seventh Annual Massachusetts Aviation Conference, sponsored by Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, September 25, 1958)

I appreciate this opportunity of speaking with you on the Air Force-Industry family, and hope to convey some of the significant things that are happening with respect to this family association—particularly as regards the defense of this country against enemy air attack.

Never, in the history of military planning and operations has the industrial relationship, and support needed, to successfully achieve military objectives been so pronounced as it is today. This trend will unquestionably continue indefinitely with the military-industrial association becoming an ever closer and interdependent relationship.

This type of relationship also applies to the scientific community, particularly as represented by the research analysis activities conducted under the aegis of educational institutions. Thus most of our equipment problems are tackled by teams of military, scientific, and industrial personnel.

There are great numbers of different military requirements and programs that, in the field of research and development alone, depend on technological and scientific assistance from outside the military.

The areas I refer to utilize weapons systems and supporting systems that are so technically involved they are difficult to describe in normal, everyday terms. However, the amount of time devoted to the research and development of these systems, taking into account the smallest details, becomes a controlling factor when expressed in terms of having an operational weapon in the time period required. The performance of the research and development effort within the military departments alone will not satisfy the requirement. We must depend on the scientific and engineering skills of the scientific community and industry to participate in weapons systems research and development in order to meet stated operational needs. What this really means, is that in current and future concepts for military planning, full consideration must be given to the role industry plays in order to reach the objectives specified in these plans. We, that is, both military and industry, are, in effect, a team, whose efforts are directed toward a common objective best described as "maximum defense, and maintenance of offensive

capability so strong as to make any attack by a possible enemy against the United States completely unprofitable."

You have no doubt heard the foregoing remarks expressed in a number of different ways by various individuals both in the military and the industrial environment.

Regardless of what interpretations may have resulted, there is really only one conclusion—we are in an era of great scientific achievement. We, as a nation, are dedicated to the establishment of permanent peace and complete harmony between all nations. We respect the rights of nations to be self-governing and to be completely free of aggression in any form that denies nations their freedom of government and political, social, and economic way of life. As long as there are nations whose policies and objectives are in direct conflict with these basic desires, and whose scientific achievements are exploited for the purpose of furthering their campaign of world domination, we must develop our military forces to counteract this threat to the best of our ability and capability.

I stated that the task of research and development is tremendously involved from a technological standpoint. I also indicated that industrial assistance is needed, but don't let me give the impression that the job ends with the completion of the research and development task. In reality, this is only the beginning.

Of equal importance, if we are to have military forces in being, is the production and procurement of the hardware. We find, in most cases, that the industrial organization performing the research and development job on a particular weapon, or weapon system, is also the production organization. Then, on the other hand, there are also industrial organizations, laboratories, and institutions confined solely to the research and development area and whose findings are used by the production people in the building of weapons and weapon systems.

An example of this is the work performed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at their Lincoln Laboratory in the field of research and development of air defense systems. Lincoln Laboratory has played a big role in the development of a semiautomatic system for air defense and continues to do research on this system so that it can be continually improved in keeping with the objective of providing maximum air defense capability.

The production phase of the program is highly important to obtaining our military goals. In general terms, it involves money, time and people. In the Air Force, as an example, we must keep in constant touch with all industries producing our hardware to assure that production schedules are in phase with our implementation plans for equipping our forces. This requires the utmost care in arranging budgets, financial plans, and fund expenditures to make certain that production and procurement is properly supported by the required money. This is primarily the job of the Air Materiel Command located at Dayton, Ohio.

Let me get a little more specific on what the production and procurement programs mean in terms of dollars. Since you gentlemen would be principally interested in how this expenditure affects the New England States and, even more specifically, how it affects Massachusetts, here are some facts. In Boston, the Air Materiel Command of the Air Force has established the Boston Air Procurement District whose job is to administer certain Air Force contracts with various industries in the New England States.

I would like to point out, however, that these contracts and figures I am about to give you do not include such things as local procurement by individual air bases for supplies and other support needed for daily operations. Also, they do not include Air Force contracts at the Pratt and Whitney plant at Hartford, Conn., which are administered by the Department of the Navy. The contracts I'm referring to are those the Air Force has with New England industry. As of June 30, 1958, the total dollar value of these contracts administered by our Boston office totaled \$552,683,000. This total was divided among 97 large contractors and 122 small contractors for a total of 119.

I'm sure you would be interested in how this is further divided among each of the New England States. In Maine, the contract dollar value totals \$44,000 involving four small contractors. In Vermont, there are two large and two small contractors with a total dollar value of \$1,192,000. Rhode Island has eight large and seven small contractors with a total dollar value of \$496,000. In New Hampshire the total amount is \$5,259,000 with four large and eight small contractors. Connecticut has 32 large and 34 small contractors with \$105,772,000 of the total.

Last, but not least, and of most interest to you is Massachusetts. Here there are 53 large and 67 small contractors with a total value of \$439,917,000. This is approximately four times the total amount of all the other New England States combined.

As you can see, the Air Force dependence on New England industry, particularly that located in Massachusetts, is of large proportions. As a matter of fact, over a span of about 5 years, the dollar value of these contracts has increased from \$266,636,000 in November of 1953 to the \$552,683,000 figure I previously mentioned, or an increase of \$286,046,000, which averaged to \$57,209,000 per year. It is most indicative of the relationships expressed in my earlier remarks where I referred to the Air Force industry family.

Within all of these programs, relationships, objectives, and work performance is the one underlying task—management. In the Air Force we view the management job as that which holds the key to success. When considering that the funds contained in the Air Force fiscal year 1959 budget total \$17,800,000,000, the management within an enterprise of this size must be nothing short of the best. We have made considerable progress toward this objective. Our management program, however, is not confined exclusively to the military structure. Many of the programs of weapons and weapons system development, production, and operation have management techniques which directly involve industry. This, I hope you have gathered, has been implied in some of my previous remarks. But now let me get a little more specific by covering some air defense aspects of the Air Force industry family.

In this connection I would like to discuss the development of the Air Force management approach to the tasks and problems associated with the overall air defense system. The industrial relationship in this endeavor will, I am sure, be self-evident.

Air defense is, within the Air Force and the Department of Defense, perhaps the most technically involved program of all. It is a multibillion-dollar enterprise. The management task involved is a challenge to one's imagination.

So that you may better grasp the scope of the air defense management job let me identify some of its component parts for you. There are long-range search radars and associated gap-filler radars and height-finding radars, subsonic and supersonic manned interceptor aircraft, ground-launched and air-launched air defense missiles, airborne and seaborne radar search

equipment to extend our search boundaries, automatic data-processing equipment for assembling and displaying essential information, and for calculating and directing air defense battle actions, people representing every known skill in the military inventory—bases and installations from which operations must be conducted and supported—a communications network covering the entire Northern Hemisphere and, in some cases, beyond, and the coordination and correlation of all civilian aviation through air traffic control facilities with the air defense mission.

These are the broadest possible expressions of the main components of the air-defense system. The management job involved is concerned with one prime objective—how to get all these things together and make them work.

In recognition of the problem, the Air Force recently established an organization known as the Air Defense Systems Integration Division, which I command. We are located on Hanscom Field at Bedford, Mass., with Lincoln Laboratory as our next door neighbor. Our task is to insure that the overall air defense system is technically compatible. That the implementation of the system and the integration of improvements are properly time phased, and that the system is effective. To do the job we have assigned highly qualified officers and civilian employees from Air Research and Development Command, Air Materiel Command, and Air Defense Command, all working toward the common objective I have just outlined.

This, however, is not enough to get the full job accomplished. The various components, and other related systems requirements are so technically involved that engineering support must be provided from scientific and industrial sources. The Air Force has, for several years, recognized that this situation exists, but, due to the various ramifications of the total management effort required, purposely withheld from making basic decisions until the problem areas could be sufficiently defined and a management course of action developed in line with the total air defense management job. This has now been done. Secretary of the Air Force Douglas recently invited the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to undertake the furnishing of engineering services to my organization. The Air Force Air Defense Systems Integration Division, utilizing professionally qualified personnel and facilities of Lincoln Laboratory.

This arrangement has been accomplished by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and it is now in operation. However, this is only an interim and partial step toward the provision of full engineering support to fully and effectively accomplish the management of systems implementation and integration. The fine talent and capabilities of Lincoln Laboratory must be complemented with other skills and endeavors. It is also interim due to the MIT desire, as an educational institution, to have its Lincoln Laboratory revert to a strictly research activity.

Recognizing the relationship of industry to the air defense system and the extent to which industry participates in the research, development, production, installation, and maintenance of Air Defense Systems, the Air Force has agreed to having MIT sponsor the formation of a separate corporation to be under contract to the Air Force. The purpose of this nonprofit organization is to provide the engineering support required to assist ADSID in solving the intricate and technically involved problems of system compatibility, integration, and effectiveness. The new corporation is called the MITRE Corporation. The chairman of the board of trustees is Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., who is also chairman of the board of the Ford Foundation. The corporation's president is

Mr. C. W. Halligan, formerly head of the military engineering division of Bell Telephone Laboratories. The MITRE Corporation is now being organized and a phased program of personnel assignment and project action is being established.

The MITRE Corporation will be the chief engineering agency for all Air Defense Systems problems which require top-level solutions and management control. In this capacity they will coordinate their studies, and in most cases, actually work with industrial organizations participating in air defense matters. This greatly simplifies the management procedure and that industry can now look to one primary organization within the military structure on air defense integration matters. Many of you who have dealt with the military will certainly recognize that this procedure is one that will promote better military-industrial relations.

Annuities for Federal Employees Engaged in Hazardous Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives to increase the amount of annuity for those employees of the Federal Government engaged in hazardous duties, whose annuities were not increased at the time Public Law 854 was passed October 1, 1956. Included in this class of employees are those of the Federal Government such as FBI agents, members of the Bureau of Prisons, Treasury enforcement officers, Customs enforcement agents, U.S. marshals, and employees of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Immigration Service, whose primary duties include the investigation, apprehension or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, or whose duties involve frequent direct contact with such persons.

In introducing this legislation, I call to the attention of my colleagues that in 1956 when Public Law 854 was enacted into law, the deduction from salaries of all Federal employees was increased from 6 to 6½ percent for payment into the civil service fund. Simultaneously with this increase the annuities of employees of the Federal Government was increased from 2 to 2½ percent. In spite of the fact that the employees performing hazardous duties were obligated to pay an additional one-half of 1 percent into the retirement fund they were unfairly omitted from the law which would increase their benefits the additional one-half of 1 percent.

To compound this inequity further, Public Law 85-157 was passed during the 2d session of the 85th Congress increasing the retirement annuities for employees in hazardous occupations for the District of Columbia. While legislation was introduced in the 85th Congress to rectify this inequity, the bill never saw

the light of day and no action was taken thereupon.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to understand why this kind of injustice should be suffered to continue despite the fact that all other employees of the Federal Government are receiving increased retirement annuities. This bill will simply place those in the enumerated hazardous occupations on a par when they retire with those covered in the act cited as the Policemen's and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act of 1957.

I am completely convinced that no Member of Congress will want to oppose this bill and I most respectfully urge my colleagues to give it a full measure of support.

Keep This Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I am including an editorial, entitled "Keep This Committee," which appeared in the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., on January 13, 1959.

This editorial, concerning the need for continuing the House Un-American Activities Committee, will be of interest to everyone interested in a free America. I commend it to your reading.

The editorial follows:

KEEP THIS COMMITTEE

Whether it is an enforcement arm, like the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a congressional investigative agency—like the Senate Internal Security Committee—any unit of government that challenges subversive conspiracy makes enemies. The House Committee on Un-American Affairs also is distinguished for the foes it has made, some of whom periodically and constantly for 20 years have been after its scalp.

Its chief antagonists of course, have been the subversives themselves. Martin Dies, of Texas, was the chief target of these when this congressional agency started out, as the Dies Committee.

Significantly enough, the loudest critics are the superliberal dupes whose theory apparently is that if Uncle Sam will play ostrich, and stick his head in the ground, internal dangers will just go away.

It is a characteristic oddity of these elements that with the 86th Congress less than a week old—and its work sheet filled with essential business—they leaped to the floor of the House, Monday, to demand that the committee be abolished. It was as if they just couldn't wait; as if, to quote a glib maxim, time was of the essence—for what they declined to say.

That Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT headed this assault is no particular recommendation; nor is his pretext, the glib assertion that in the light of court decisions, the House cannot possibly continue the life of the committee.

Actually it is more than a shade peculiar that he should cite a Supreme Court decision of 1957 as the basis for this conclusion, when the liberal antipathy from which his opposition stems goes back two decades.

Nobody ascribes to the House Committee on Un-American Activities a record of perfection. But it could match for value, and fundamental address to national security, any of the committees that over the years have functioned to that end. It has pulled no punches in sifting and revealing facts; its revelations in case after case have been authenticated.

It has been the target of smear and of frontal assault because of the job it was doing.

It is a needed weapon in the internal security kit. The majority of America knows that and will not willingly consent to its abolishment.

A Portion of a Speech by Abraham Lincoln on "Internal Improvements"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, next month we will be celebrating the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. At the same time and later in this session the House will be considering many bills for increased Federal spending for a variety of purposes. It is timely therefore to place in the Record, a portion of the speech delivered by Mr. Lincoln on "Internal Improvements" on the floor of this House, June 20, 1848. That speech was printed in full on pages 28 to 48 of volume 2 of the "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," edited by Nicolay and Hay. The portion I quote is from pages 47 and 48:

I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose that, at each session, Congress shall first determine how much money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most important objects. So far all is easy; but how shall we determine which are the most important? On this question comes the collision of interests. I shall be slow to acknowledge that your harbor or your river is more important than mine, and vice versa. To clear this difficulty, let us have that same statistical information which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vinton] suggested at the beginning of this session. In that information we shall have a stern, unbending basis of facts—a basis in no wise subject to whim, caprice, or local interest. The preliminary amount of means will save us from doing too much, and the statistics will save us from doing what we do in wrong places. Adopt and adhere to this course, and, it seems to me, the difficulty is cleared.

One of the gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. Rhett] very much deprecates these statistics. He particularly objects, as I understand him, to counting all the pigs and chickens in the land. I do not perceive much force in the objection. It is true that if everything be enumerated, a portion of such statistics may not be very useful to this object. Such products of the country as are to be consumed where they are produced need no roads or rivers, no means of transportation, and have no very proper connection with this subject. The surplus—that which is produced in one place to be consumed in another; the capacity of each locality for producing a

greater surplus; the natural means of transportation, and their susceptibility of improvement; the hindrances, delays, and losses of life and property during transportation, and the causes of each, would be among the most valuable statistics in this connection. From these it would readily appear where a given amount of expenditure would do the most good. These statistics might be equally accessible, as they would be equally useful, to both the Nation and the States. In this way, and by these means, let the Nation take hold of the larger works, and the States the smaller ones; and thus, working in a meeting direction, discreetly, but steadily and firmly, what is made unequal in one place may be equalized in another extravagance avoided, and the whole country put on that career of prosperity which shall correspond with its extent of territory, its natural resources, and the intelligence and the enterprise of its people.

Net Farm Income Has Lost Its Stretch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the Missouri Farmer features an illuminating discussion of inflation and its effect on our farm families.

Under unanimous consent, I include herein this article, as follows:

The "old grey mare ain't what she used to be," and neither is the Yankee dollar. It has just as much silver in it and the same inscription, but when it comes to trading it for things, it just doesn't stretch as far.

Folks in this country have had to learn to live with inflation—to make adjustments here and there. It's been our national policy to help those with fixed incomes. Special tax deductions for those over 65, fast depreciation for big business, capital gains provisions for investors, increases in social security, and so on, tend to soften the brunt of a shrinking-dollar economy.

Farmers have been hit hard by inflation. They are of course entitled to many of the income-tax deductions listed above, but the catch is that farmers' incomes are such that they are not often subject to the income tax. One out of five farm families had a net income in 1957 of less than \$1,000. Three out of 5 farm businesses had a total income of from \$1,000 to \$5,000.

On the other hand, inflation catches farmers square on the chin every time they purchase a production tool or meet a living expense. When you brush aside all the financial statistics and take a close look at the economic position of the Nation's farm-production plant it is certainly not reassuring. * * *

Farm income reached a peak of \$17.8 billion in 1948, fell sharply to \$12.9 in 1949, topped out again at \$16.3 in 1951, and then began the steady decline to the 1957 level of \$11.6 billion.

But there is more to it than that—inflation has further eroded the dollar's value, until in 1957 a total net farm income of \$11.6 billion would buy no more of the things farmers use than would the \$4.5 to \$5 billion income they received in the late thirties. Note the accompanying table. Even in the hard-time thirties there were 2 years—1935 and 1937—when agriculture had a greater purchasing power than in 1957.

It's true, of course, that this income must go for both family living expenses and for farm improvement and upkeep, and there are fewer families in agriculture today than in the earlier part of this period.

But, on the other hand, there is a much greater investment in land, machinery, and supplies to maintain and replace. Farmers now have invested \$177 billion in these items. (Much of this figure is an inflated value. USDA estimates, for instance, that farmers have 6 percent more invested in real estate than last year—but it has also been reported by USDA that farmland prices over the past year increased on an average of 6 percent.) Local taxes are assessed accordingly, and replacement costs continue to increase.

U.S. farmers total net income for years 1935 to 1957 and purchasing power in terms of 1947-49 dollars

(In billions of dollars)

Year	Total net income	Purchasing power ¹
1935	5.3	10.6
1936	4.3	8.6
1937	6.0	11.5
1938	4.4	8.8
1939	4.5	9.2
1940	4.6	9.2
1941	6.6	12.5
1942	9.9	16.2
1943	11.8	17.3
1944	11.8	16.2
1945	12.4	16.3
1946	15.2	18.3
1947	15.5	16.1
1948	17.8	17.1
1949	12.9	12.9
1950	14.0	13.6
1951	16.3	14.4
1952	15.3	13.3
1953	13.3	11.9
1954	12.7	11.2
1955	11.8	10.5
1956	11.6	10.2
1957	11.6	9.8

¹ Calculations based on index of prices paid by farmers, all items, 1947-49 equals 100.

Remarks of the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania on Resolution of the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last August, the Conference of State Chief Justices adopted a resolution, introduced by the Committee on Federal-State Relationships as Affected by Judicial Decisions. The report of the majority of chief justices has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The distinguished chief justice of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Charles Alvin Jones, one of the great judges in the country, in my opinion, made at that time a forceful and convincing statement in opposition to the majority opinion. I ask unanimous consent that the views of this distinguished Pennsylvania jurist be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE CHARLES ALVIN JONES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AS AFFECTED BY JUDICIAL DECISIONS AT THE CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES IN PASADENA, CALIF., AUGUST 23, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the Conference of State Chief Justices, for this intrusion upon your time to speak in opposition to the pending resolution, I shall neither apologize nor palliate. The matter is of such transcendent importance constituting, as it does, an unwarranted attack on the constitutional structure of our Federal Union of such shocking portent in the circumstances as to warrant the fullest and freest discussion before definite action with respect thereto is taken by this body.

My only embarrassment in speaking, as I shall on this occasion, stems from the pleasant social relations I have heretofore enjoyed with the members of the committee, as well as other of the conference, which relationships I trust may continue to endure unimpaired. But, however that may be, a stern duty confronts me which requires me to do all that I can within my limited capacity to help bring about, if possible, the defeat of the resolution now before us.

The committee report, which the resolution approves, concludes that the overall tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court in more recent years has been to press the extension of Federal power; that, to an extent, the Supreme Court has assumed the function of policymaking; that, too often, the Supreme Court has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint, particularly in respect of the extent and extension of Federal power and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment; and that the result of all this is that a study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of the longtime American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men.

These strictures on the Supreme Court are entirely uncalled for and certainly are not justified on the basis of the decisions, which the report cites for criticism, such as *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* (350 U.S. 497), designated by the report as an example of "the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption"; or *Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico* (353 U.S. 232); *Konigsberg v. State Bar of California* (353 U.S. 252); *Watkins v. U.S.* (354 U.S. 178), and *Sweeney v. New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234). Each of the latter decisions afforded appropriate judicial protection to the rights of the individual involved against hostile State action violative of the 14th amendment. Regardless of one's point of view, none of those cases can, in my opinion, be logically cited as an extension of Federal power or a contraction of States rights. Each was merely a judicial application of a long-ordained Federal power to a new set of circumstances.

Judging from the public prints and the agitation in Congress ever since *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* was handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 2, 1956, it has been evident that the doctrine of Federal preemption, as applied in that case, was being made the special *bête noir* of the bitter critics of the present-day work of our Supreme Court. As it happened to fall to my lot to write the majority opinion in the *Nelson* case for the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, whose judgment, incidentally, was affirmed and not reversed, I beg your indulgence while I endeavor to demonstrate that the ruling in the *Nelson* case was in no sense "a wide-sweep of the doctrine of preemption" or any extension whatsoever of Federal power. It was but the enforcement of a power inherent in our Federal

Government ever since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787, namely, the right to protect itself most efficiently and effectively against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

The curt observation with which the committee report dismisses and implicitly condemns the *Nelson* decision derives from a monograph by a law professor whose services, as the report indicates, were specifically enlisted by the committee for the purposes of its work. While the monographer, himself, devoted 14 of his total 28 pages of writing to treatment of the *Nelson* case, the committee report disposes of that decision, as the primarily designated object of its criticism, in one brief paragraph with the palpable and irrelevant nonsequitur that the fact that the Supreme Court's decision was an affirmation of the State court "emphasizes rather than detracts from the wide sweep now given to the doctrine of preemption."

And, while we are considering State complaints of Supreme Court decisions, fairness compels it to be recognized that in the *Nelson* case the Supreme Court of the United States did not ascribe to the Federal Government any greater power than what Pennsylvania's highest court had considerably conceded to be the Federal Government's. But, before getting into the established constitutional principle, which the Pennsylvania Supreme Court deemed to be decisive of *Nelson's* appeal, let me make the following plain beyond misunderstanding.

The ruling in the *Nelson* case will not impede or interfere with the detection, prosecution or conviction of a single Communist or other subversive who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, and no one can authentically assert to the contrary. What the *Nelson* decision did was to recognize in the Federal Government the unrestricted right to control its defense against internal subversion, unhampered by meddlesome or officious interference from any subordinate sovereignties or political subdivisions. At the same time, the *Nelson* decision does not deny to the States the right to condemn sedition against themselves. But, of course, it is fanciful to contemplate sedition against a State which is not at once sedition against the Federal Government, whose constitutionally imposed duty it is to guarantee the maintenance of a republican form of government in each of the several States.

Any information as to possible offenders against the Federal Sedition Act which a State obtains can, and should be, promptly transmitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And, if sedition cases should, perchance, become numerous, Congress can constitutionally confer concurrent jurisdiction on State courts to try such cases in relief of Federal court administration. But—and this is basically essential—information against alleged seditious offenders must be made under the Federal statute and the prosecution of indictments therefor conducted at the direction and under the supervision of the Department of Justice.

In *Nelson's* appeal to our court, he contended that the Pennsylvania Sedition Act of 1939, under which he had been convicted of conspiracy with others to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, had been superseded by the Smith Act of 1940. We accredited the contention on the authority of the Supreme Court's decision some 13 years earlier in *Hines v. Davidowitz* (312 U.S. 52). In that case the Supreme Court had held that the Pennsylvania Alien Registration Act of 1939 had been superseded by the alien registration provisions of title III of the same Smith Act of 1940. The *Nelson* case cannot rationally be distinguished on constitutional principle from *Hines v. Davidowitz*; and no one, so far as I am aware, ever objected to the decision in the *Hines* case. The difference

between the two cases which the monograph advances is a factual immateriality which does not point a legal distinction.

Four of the five members of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court who sat for the argument of the Nelson appeal accordingly held that the Smith Act of 1940 superseded the Pennsylvania Sedition Act of 1939. That the opinion of the court was fully concurred in by all the members of the majority was not left to inference. Chief Justice Stern, joined by Justice Allen M. Stearne and Justice Chidsey, filed the following succinct and cogent joinder: "We concur in the foregoing opinion [for the court] in its entirety. Sedition against the United States is not a local offense. It is a crime against the Nation. As such, it should be prosecuted and punished in the Federal courts, where this defendant has been prosecuted and convicted and is now under sentence. It is not only important but vital that such prosecutions should be exclusively within the control of the Federal Government, and we are of the opinion that this is required in order to harmonize the respective constitutional powers of the Nation and the several States."

Responsible Pennsylvania newspapers of wide circulation understood and approved the Supreme Court's affirmation of the State court's Nelson decision. A Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer in a special article of April 15, 1956, wrote, "In the Steve Nelson case, the court ruled the protection of the Nation against sedition is a Federal, not a State, responsibility, and that, therefore, the State antiseditious laws are unconstitutional [i.e., superseded]. This decision does not mean that the States can't help the Federal Government guard against subversion. It does mean that the responsibility for investigation belongs to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the responsibility for prosecution belongs to the Department of Justice."

The Pittsburgh Post Gazette of April 3, 1956, editorialized that " . . . the Federal Government, having entered the field of sedition control, has preemptory interest in that field and is the agency to prosecute therein. This view is endorsed by the U.S. High Court, which says further that 'a State sedition statute is superseded regardless of whether it purports to supplement the Federal law.' Commonsense as well as law argues thus. The control of sedition is tricky business; it calls for timing, tact, and central direction. The intrusion of State governments in this field could impede the work of Federal agents, confuse the issues, and even discredit laws against sedition."

The New York Times in an editorial of April 16, 1956, entitled "Three Decisions," said: "In the second of this series of decisions, the Nelson case, the court spelled out its view that the area of national security belongs primarily to the Federal Government rather than to the States. . . . The decision, which seems to us to be a simple matter of commonsense, puts the responsibility for internal security where it belongs, and in fact the only place where it can be effectively exercised, with the Federal Government."

Thus far, I have endeavored to prove to those of you who would vote for the pending resolution, in the belief that the Supreme Court was guilty of an unconstitutional extension of Federal power in its decision in the Nelson case, would do so on a fallacious assumption and give aid and comfort to those who are striving in Congress and out of it to curtail the powers of the Supreme Court to interpret, expound and apply the Constitution.

On August 8 last, the New York Times said editorially, "The consistently liberal decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the general area of civil liberties have produced a reaction in Congress which may have been inevitable but can and should be thwarted.

The reaction has taken the form of several bills designed in one way or another to override or to turn back the rulings at which they are aimed. The worst of these bills to have passed the House is the one that would wreck the historic doctrine of Federal preemption by providing that no Federal law could supersede a State law on the same subject unless Congress specifically so stated or unless the two were absolutely irreconcilable." And then, speaking with special reference to H.R. 3, the editorial continued, "This bill grew out of the decision in the Nelson case in 1956, in which the Supreme Court agreed with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in invalidating a State statute aimed at sedition against the Federal Government, on the sensible grounds that Congress had already preempted the field by the Smith Act of 1940."

Whence, then, comes the impetus behind the movement to obviate by congressional action the effect of the ruling in the Nelson case? Is it possible that that decision is the whipping boy (to employ a somewhat mixed metaphor) of those who would flay the doctrine of Federal preemption to extinction? Let us stop beating around the bush about this thing. Let us come out in the open and acknowledge the decision which is the real basis for the current widespread criticism of the Supreme Court. Only in that way can we deal fairly and above board with the recent civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court which share the report's criticism. The preponderant backing of the attack on the decision in the Nelson case is made up of those who would undo the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483). That statement finds confirmation, as lately as night before last, in the vote in the Senate on the motion to recommit H.R. 3, which was admittedly introduced in an effort to nullify the doctrine of Federal preemption as applied in the Nelson case.

It is true that nowhere in the report is the public school segregation decision mentioned. According to reliable newspaper account of the introduction of the resolution and the report whereon it is based, "It was explained that Committee members felt that to inject this into the study would stir sectional feelings and defeat the overall purpose of the study." I readily and wholeheartedly concede the good faith of the Committee's desire and intent in such regard, but the fact remains that no matter how meticulously reference to the school segregation case is avoided, it must be recognized that the principal cause of the present-day criticism of the Supreme Court is that decision. And, thus, the Committee report, quite unintentionally but nonetheless actually, exploits a hostility to the Supreme Court bred of a decision (involved in current litigation) which the report does not, and could not properly, discuss.

Of course, the segregation issue has no proper place in determining whether the decision in *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* constituted an extension of Federal power by the Supreme Court in its application of the doctrine of preemption, or whether civil liberties cases above referred to worked a deprivation of States' rights because of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the protection afforded the individual by the 14th amendment against hostile State action. The segregation issue is here nevertheless, inextricably imbedded in the background of the resolution you are asked to adopt. You might as well face that fact.

If prosecution for sedition against the Federal Government were permitted to State courts acting under State statutes (and that is what the pending resolution envisions), confusion amounting to chaos in the hunt for and prosecution of alleged subversives would result to the detriment and peril of the internal security of our citizenry.

In such a deplorable situation, I would hold with Judge Learned Hand that "Risk for risk, for myself, I would rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust which accepts rumor and gossip in the place of undisputed and unimpaired inquiry."

Coming, then, to the matter of procedure to be pursued with respect to the pending resolution, it is my opinion that the best thing to do would be to dispose of it without reference to its substance. Consequently, I shall move that the resolution be tabled. If that motion should fail and a vote is taken on the resolution, I desire that I be recorded as having voted against it. Indeed, it seems no more than appropriate that, in a matter of such grave importance, a rollcall vote should be had.

I now move that the resolution be tabled.

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Provide a Special Method of Taxation for Real Estate Investment Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts. This particular bill was reported favorably during the last session of Congress by our Ways and Means Committee but unfortunately did not pass Congress. This bill provides substantially the same tax treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. Real estate trusts are organizations specializing in investments in real estate and real estate mortgages, while the regulated investment companies specialize in investments in stocks and securities. Under present law regulated investment companies which distribute 90 percent or more of their ordinary income are taxed only on their retained earnings. Thus, the distributed earnings of these companies are taxed only to the shareholders. This same type of tax treatment is accorded by this bill to real estate trusts.

Mr. Speaker, the equality of tax treatment between the beneficiaries of real estate trusts and the shareholders of regulated investment companies is desirable since in both cases the methods of investment constitute pooling arrangements whereby small investors can secure advantages normally available only to those with larger resources. These advantages include the spreading of the risk of loss by the greater diversification of investment which can be secured through the pooling arrangements; the opportunity to secure the benefits of expert investment counsel; and the means of collectively financing projects which the investors could not undertake singly.

In addition to providing equality of tax treatment between the trust beneficiaries

and the investment company shareholders, I believe it is also desirable and so did the Ways and Means Committee to remove taxation to the extent possible as a factor in determining the relative size of investments in stocks and securities on the one hand, and real estate equities and mortgages on the other. This is particularly important at the present time because of the countrywide complaints about the shortage of private capital and mortgage money for individual homes, apartment houses, office buildings, factories, and hotels. At the present time the financing of these real estate equities and mortgages is dependent largely on Government-guaranteed money, and investments by special groups, such as insurance companies and pension trusts.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter M of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART II—REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

"Sec. 856. Definition of real estate investment trusts.

"Sec. 857. Taxation of real estate investment trusts and their beneficiaries.

"Sec. 858. Limitations applicable to dividends received from real estate investment trust.

"Sec. 859. Dividends paid by real estate investment trust after close of taxable year.

"Sec. 856. Definition of real estate investment trust.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'real estate investment trust' means an unincorporated trust or an unincorporated association—

"(1) which is managed by one or more trustees;

"(2) the beneficial ownership of which is evidenced by transferable shares, or by transferable certificates of beneficial interest;

"(3) which (but for the provisions of this part) would be taxable as a domestic corporation;

"(4) which does not hold any property primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business;

"(5) the beneficial ownership of which is held by 100 or more persons, and no 5 individuals own (directly or indirectly) more than 50 percent of such beneficial ownership; and

"(6) which meets the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—A trust or association shall not be considered a real estate investment trust for any taxable year unless—

"(1) It files with its return for the taxable year an election to be a real estate investment trust or has made such election for a previous taxable year which began after December 31, 1956.

"(2) At least 90 percent of its gross income is derived from—

"(A) dividends;

"(B) interest;

"(C) rents from real property;

"(D) gain from the sale or other disposition of stock, securities, and real property (including interests in real property and interests in mortgages on real property); and

"(E) abatements and refunds of taxes on real property.

"(3) At least 60 percent of its gross income is derived from—

"(A) rents from real property;

"(B) interest on obligations secured by mortgages on real estate;

"(C) gain from the sale or other disposition of real property (including interests in real property and interests in mortgages on real property);

"(D) dividend or other distributions on, and gain from the sale or other disposition of, transferable shares in (or transferable certificates of beneficial interest in) other real estate trusts or associations; and

"(E) abatements and refunds of taxes on real property.

"(4) The amount by which the gains from the sales and other dispositions of stock or securities held for less than 6 months exceed the losses from such sales or other dispositions is an amount less than 30 percent of its gross income.

"(5) The amount by which the gains from voluntary sales and other voluntary dispositions of real property held for less than 5 years exceed the losses from such sales and dispositions is an amount less than 30 percent of its gross income.

"(c) RENTS FROM REAL PROPERTY DEFINED: For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), the term 'rents from real property' does not include—

"(1) any amount received or accrued with respect to any real property, if the trust or association makes any expenditure which is properly allocable to such real property while rented (or to the rentals from such real property), other than—

"(A) expenditures properly chargeable to capital account;

"(B) expenditures for taxes, interest, or insurance;

"(C) expenditures for the collection of, or the accounting for, income; and

"(D) expenditures properly allocable to the entering into, renewal, or termination of any lease;

"(2) any amount received or accrued with respect to any real property, if the amount to be derived from such property depends in whole or in part on the income or profits derived by any person from such property (except that any amount so received or accrued shall not be excluded from the term 'rents from real property' solely by reason of being based on a fixed percentage or percentages of receipts or sales);

"(3) any amount received or accrued directly or indirectly from any person if the trust or association owns, directly or indirectly—

"(A) in the case of any person which is a corporation, stock of such person possessing 10 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote, or 10 percent or more of the total number of shares of all classes of stock of such person; or

"(B) in the case of any person which is not a corporation, an interest of 10 percent or more in the business, assets, or net profits of such person.

For purposes of paragraph (3) of this subsection, the rules prescribed by section 318(a) for determining the ownership of stock shall apply in determining the ownership of stock, business, assets, or net profits of any person. For purposes of the preceding sentence, section 318(a)(2)(C) shall be applied without regard to the 50 percent limitation contained therein.

"Sec. 857. Taxation of real estate investment trusts and their beneficiaries.

"(a) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS.—The provisions of this part shall not apply to a real estate investment trust for a taxable year unless—

"(1) it distributes to its shareholders or holders of beneficial interests an amount not less than 90 percent of the amount by which the real estate investment trust taxable income for the taxable year exceeds the sum

of its net long-term capital gain and net short-term capital gain for such year; and

"(2) the real estate investment trust complies for such year with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate for the purpose of ascertaining the actual ownership of the shares or certificates of beneficial interest of such trust.

"(b) METHOD OF TAXATION OF REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS AND HOLDERS OF SHARES OR CERTIFICATES OF BENEFICIAL INTEREST.—

"(1) IMPOSITION OF NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX ON REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS: There is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the real estate investment trust taxable income of every real estate investment trust a normal tax and surtax computed as provided in section 11, as though the real estate investment trust taxable income were the taxable income referred to in section 11. For purposes of computing the normal tax under section 11, the taxable income and the dividends paid deduction of such real estate investment trust for the taxable year (computed without regard to capital gain dividends) shall be reduced by the deduction provided by section 242 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest).

"(2) REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST TAXABLE INCOME: For purposes of this part, the term 'real estate investment trust taxable income' means the taxable income of the real estate investment trust, adjusted as follows:

"(A) There shall be excluded the excess, if any, of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss.

"(B) The deductions for corporations provided in part VIII (except section 248) in subchapter B (section 241 and following, relating to the deduction for dividends received, etc.) shall not be allowed.

"(C) A deduction shall be allowed for the dividends (other than capital gain dividends) paid during the taxable year computed in accordance with the rules provided in section 562.

"(D) The taxable income shall be computed without regard to section 443 (b) (relating to computation of tax on change of annual accounting period).

"(E) The net operating loss deduction provided in section 172 shall not be allowed.

"(3) CAPITAL GAINS.—

"(A) IMPOSITION OF TAX: There is hereby imposed for each taxable year in the case of every real estate investment trust a tax of 25 percent of the excess, if any, of the net long-term capital gain over the sum of—

"(1) the net short-term capital loss; and

"(2) the amount of capital gain dividends paid during the taxable year.

For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount of dividends paid shall be computed under the rules provided in section 562.

"(B) TREATMENT OF CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDENDS BY SHAREHOLDERS: A capital gain dividend shall be treated by the shareholders or holders of beneficial interests as a gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months.

"(C) DEFINITION OF CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDEND: For purposes of this part, a capital gain dividend is any dividend, or part thereof, which is designated by the real estate investment trust as a capital gain dividend in a written notice mailed to its shareholders or holders of beneficial interests at any time before the expiration of 30 days after the close of its taxable year. If the aggregate amount so designated with respect to a taxable year of the trust (including capital gain dividends paid after the close of the taxable year described in section 859) is greater than the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss of the taxable year, the portion of each distribution which shall be a capital gain dividend shall be only that proportion of the amount so designated which such

excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss bears to the aggregate amount so designated.

"(c) EARNINGS AND PROFITS: The earnings and profits of a real estate investment trust for any taxable year (but not its accumulated earnings and profits) shall not be reduced by any amount which is not allowable as a deduction in computing its taxable income for such taxable year.

"Sec. 858. Limitations applicable to dividends received from real estate investment trust.

"(a) CAPITAL GAIN DIVIDEND: For purposes of section 34(a) (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 116 (relating to an exclusion for dividends received by individuals), and section 243 (relating to deductions for dividends received by corporations), a capital gain dividend (as defined in section 857(b)(3)(C) received from a real estate investment trust shall not be considered as a dividend.

"(b) OTHER DIVIDENDS:

"(1) GENERAL RULE: In the case of a dividend received from a real estate investment trust (other than a dividend to which subsection (a) applies)—

"(A) If such real estate investment trust meets the requirements of sections 856 and 857(a) for the taxable year during which it paid such dividend; and

"(B) the aggregate dividends received by such trust during such taxable year are less than 75 percent of its gross income, then, in computing the credit under section 34(a), the exclusion under section 116, and the deduction under section 243, there shall be taken into account only that portion of the dividend which bears the same ratio to the amount of such dividend as the aggregate dividends received by such trust during such taxable year bear to its gross income for such taxable year.

"(2) NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS: A real estate investment trust to which paragraph (1) applies for any taxable year shall, in a written notice to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests mailed not later than 30 days after the close of the taxable year, designate the portion of the dividends paid by the real estate investment trust during such taxable year which may be taken into account under paragraph (1) for purposes of the credit under section 34, the exclusion under section 116, and the deduction under section 243.

"(3) DEFINITIONS: For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'gross income' does not include gain from the sale or other disposition of stock or securities or of real estate (or interests therein).

"(B) The term 'aggregate dividends received' includes only dividends received from domestic corporations other than dividends described in section 116(b) (relating to dividends excluded from gross income). In determining the amount of any dividend for purposes of this subparagraph, the rules provided in section 116(c) (relating to certain distributions) shall apply.

"Sec. 859. Dividends paid by real estate investment trust after close of taxable year.

"(a) GENERAL RULE: For purposes of this chapter, if a real estate investment trust—

"(1) declares a dividend before the time prescribed by law for the filing of its return for a taxable year (including the period of any extension of time granted for filing such return); and

"(2) distributes the amount of such dividend to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests in the 12-month period following the close of such taxable year and not later than the date of the first regular dividend payment made after such declaration,

the amount so declared and distributed shall, to the extent the trust elects in such return in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his designee, be considered as having been paid during such taxable year, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

"(b) RECEIPT BY SHAREHOLDER: Amounts to which subsection (a) applies shall be treated as received by the shareholder or holder of a beneficial interest in the taxable year in which the distribution is made.

"(c) NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS: In the case of amounts to which subsection (a) applies, any notice to shareholders or holders of beneficial interests required under this part with respect to such amounts shall be made not later than 30 days after the close of the taxable year in which the distribution is made."

Sec. 2. Subchapter M of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended:

(1) by striking out the heading thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Subchapter M—Regulated Investment Companies and Real Estate Investment Trusts

"Part I. Regulated investment companies.

"Part II. Real estate investment trusts.

"PART I—REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES";

(2) by striking out "this subchapter" in section 852(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part"; and

(3) by striking out "A capital gain dividend means" in section 852(b)(3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this part, a capital gain dividend is".

Sec. 3. (a) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate investment trusts" after "Regulated investment companies".

(b) Section 11(d)(3) of such Code (relating to tax on corporations) is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate investment trusts" after "regulated investment companies".

(c) Section 34(d) of such Code (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(d) Section 116(c) of such Code (relating to an exclusion for dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(e) Section 243(b) of such Code (relating to deduction for dividends received by corporations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) A dividend received from a real estate investment trust shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 858."

(f) Section 318(b) of such Code (relating to constructive ownership of stock) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) section 856(c)(3) (relating to definition of real estate investment trusts)."

(g) Section 443(d) of such Code (relating to computation of tax on change of annual accounting period) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The taxable income of a real estate investment trust, see section 857(b)(2)(D)."

(h) Section 1504(b)(6) of such Code (relating to consolidated returns) is hereby amended by inserting "and real estate in-

vestment trusts" after "Regulated investment companies."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

School Legislation in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduced two major education bills on the day Congress convened. I am deeply interested in education and have been since the days when I served on the State university committee of the New Jersey State Assembly—a committee which was concerned with the problems of Rutgers University and other educational matters. In the last Congress I introduced President Eisenhower's own school construction bill, the one he had recommended to the Congress on three separate occasions. This measure had been brought to the floor of the House; it lost by only 5 votes when the President's own party leaders failed to support it. To my mind, however, this was no reason for not continuing to work for it.

One of my bills provides Federal scholarships, which had been recommended by the President. The other bill provides Federal aid for school construction and to raise teachers' salaries. Both are strongly supported by the teaching profession and the leading educational organizations. Federal grants to the States would be on the basis of each State's school-age population and would amount to \$25 per child during the first year, \$50 the second, \$75 the third, and \$100 for the fourth and succeeding years. Written into the bill is the assurance that "no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction or the administration of any school or school system." To make sure that the States and local school districts do not slacken their own efforts, the bill provides for a reduction of the grants if a State's educational program is below the national average. The effective date of this reduction provision would be delayed for 3 years to give State legislatures two sessions to work on their programs.

Federal officials have estimated that we are short 140,000 classrooms and 135,000 teachers. It is a shocking thing to realize that only one-half cent of every Federal tax dollar goes to support public schools. This must be compared with the 43 cents out of every local tax dollar and the 31 cents out of every State tax dollar which goes to public education. Our school children must have the support of the one level of government which to date has been resting on its oars where education is concerned—the Fed-

eral Government. It is time that we began putting first things first. A nation which does not put a top priority on education will not remain a first-class power very long. At the present time we have launched a multi-billion-dollar Federal road-building program; we spend \$40 billion plus on defense, and several million dollars apiece for our missiles. Our citizens spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year on liquor, tobacco, advertising, automobiles and other luxuries. Our materialistic culture can and it must find funds for education which is essential to our survival as a free nation.

I include here an article from the New York Times and an article from the Washington Sunday Star on the subject of education for the information of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1959]

G.O.P. PUSHES AID FOR NEW SCHOOLS—WHITE HOUSE SESSION IS TOLD OF FUND-MATCHING PLANS FOR STATE'S BUILDING

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The projected administration proposal for a deferred-payment school-construction bill was put before Republican congressional leaders at the White House today.

The existence of a school-construction plan that would not affect the current budget previously had been indicated both by Budget Director Maurice H. Stans and Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Details of the plan became known today. As worked out in Secretary Flemming's department, this grant Federal money on a matching basis with the States for payments on debt services, both interest and amortization.

A time-lag of a year to 18 months would be involved between the time a school board asked for a bond issue and the time the first payment fell due.

At the end of the White House session today, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, House minority leader, said that no conclusions on school legislation had been reached.

Whatever proposals the Republicans may make will have to meet the competition of a determined drive by liberal Democrats for school construction.

The plan would run on an amortization basis over a period of years.

Its proposed cost would be about the same as that of previous administration proposals on school construction. It might later be expanded to include the building of college classrooms.

LOAN PLANS SUGGESTED

On the subject of college housing, President Eisenhower recommended in his budget message a limited loan guarantee program to bridge the gap between the current limited Federal building program on college campuses and whatever new plan Secretary Flemming might propose.

Such a drive, however, could be blocked by the conservative majority in the House Rules Committee.

Some of the Republican leaders said today that the President would send up a special education message. This presumably would be for the purpose of starting the new school-construction legislation.

The budget message made few new proposals along this line. It urged Congress to approve two proposals that failed last year, one would have required the States to take over all education costs in nongovernmental areas having large Federal installations, and the other would have had the States take over vocational education through a tax-adjustment plan.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 4, 1959]

CONGRESS TO GET NEW SCHOOL BILLS

(By George W. Oakes)

Passage of significant new education legislation by the next Congress is considered more likely because of the liberal Democratic sweep in the November elections.

As projected now, the school aid campaign will focus on passage of bills for school construction and teachers' salaries and something to help improve the college housing situation.

Friends of school legislation are quick to point out that success of such legislation depends to some extent on the ability of the so-called liberal bloc in Congress to break the power of the House Rules Committee, perhaps the greatest hurdle education legislation has faced at the Capitol.

The House has been the traditional foe of education legislation. In 1957 the administration's school construction bill was defeated on the floor by only five votes. In the last session Senator HILL, longtime leader in the Senate for education legislation, let the House take the lead in passing the National Defense Education Act by arguing that the Senate would adopt any program that passed the House.

HOUSE BATTLEGROUND

This year the House may again be the major battleground but the election has radically altered the traditional lineup of opponents to Federal support of education. For example, of the 62 new Democratic Members, it is estimated that 50 are likely to support Federal funds for school construction or teachers' salaries or both.

In fact, high administration officials concede privately that Congress will certainly pass school construction legislation. The enthusiasm of leading Democratic Congressmen who will direct the fight for school construction and teachers' salaries leads them to the conclusion that the real issue may be whether Congress can override a presidential veto.

The administration's current economy-mindedness in education—as in other things—apparently has reached the point that funds to operate several important sections of the National Defense Education Act signed by the President only last September may be entirely omitted in the coming budget.

When Congress adjourned at the end of August it appropriated only enough money to get most of the program started. Specifically, it is reliably reported that there may be no request for funds to put into effect that important section of the law authorizing payments of \$70 million a year in matching grants to the States for the purchase of equipment to be used in teaching science, mathematics and foreign languages.

Of the two most serious needs for the Nation's public schools—a rise in teachers' salaries and the building of classrooms and related facilities—Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said that he regards the salary structure as our most serious weakness and believes that the teachers' salary scale should be doubled. The average teacher in the public school system earns about \$4,520 a year. This year there are 1,292,000 public school teachers in our elementary and secondary schools to instruct 34,642,000 students. It is projected that the public school population, which rose 38 percent between 1946 and 1957, will probably increase, due to the continuing extraordinary population rise—another 24.5 percent by 1965.

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

For the same reason, the classroom shortage is and will remain acute. There is a present need for approximately 132,800 additional classrooms, even on the assumption that 70,500 instruction rooms scheduled to

be built this year were in fact completed. In the last 12 months it is estimated that an extensive building program could only have reduced the shortage by 9,500 classrooms.

Probably the most comprehensive proposal that will receive massive backing in the coming session is the Murray-Metcalf bill, to be introduced by the Democratic Senator and Representative from Montana. Since Senator MURRAY is close to the leadership, it is probable that priority will be given to early Senate hearings on his bill. He may attract a large number of cosponsors, including his fellow Montanan, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Democratic whip. In the House, the subcommittee of the Education Committee reported favorably a similar proposal during the last session.

The bill, to be known as the School Support Act of 1958, proposes Federal financial grants to the States on the basis of each State's estimated school-age population, to be expended either for public school construction, teachers' salaries in the public schools, or for academic equipment in any proportion the State's education authority may determine.

On the basis of an initial appropriation of \$25 per child of school age, the first annual appropriation would cost \$1.1 billion. The amounts would increase proportionately during the following 3 years to an annual figure of \$4.7 billion, at which rate it would continue. This would mean that the District of Columbia, for example, would receive \$3,657,000 in the first year on the basis of 135,000 children in public schools.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The sponsors state in the bill that there will be no Federal interference in the program of instruction or administration since the Federal Government will merely channel funds to the States which the States will distribute according to their individual requirements.

To provide maximum congressional support, many Democratic proponents of large-scale Federal aid to education, like Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, will withhold separate bills. Also, the National Education Association plans to put the active grassroots support of its 700,000 members throughout the country behind the Murray-Metcalf bill. Postelection inquiries of its national membership reveal that in many election contests, especially in the Midwest, opponents of Federal aid were defeated. For example, Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, South Dakota Democrat, believes that his 14,000 vote margin was due in considerable part to his ardent backing of increased Federal support to education, a clear-cut issue in his campaign.

Authoritative sources suggest that the administration may recommend a Federal-loan program for school construction, perhaps along the lines of the Hobby plan of 1953. The new proposal might provide that the Federal Government guarantee bonds of local districts that have been unsuccessful in floating their own issues so that they could proceed with building programs already planned. Or the Federal Government might support additional financing for local school districts that have reached the limit of their indebtedness.

For colleges, Congress undoubtedly will hear a renewal of last year's demand for federally financed scholarships. However, it appears now that there may be considerably less support for this program than a year ago.

STUDENT LOAN PROVISION

First of all, the administration will argue that at least a year of operation must elapse before there can be a fair test of the student loan provision of the National Defense Education Act. So far 883 colleges and universities already have indicated their desire to seek the full amount of Federal

funds authorized for this purpose under the law or \$47.5 million. Large universities as well as small colleges are anxious to participate. Many institutions are particularly attracted by the "forgiveness" feature which provides that half the college student's loan will be canceled if he enter school teaching full time for 5 years.

Enthusiasm for Federal college scholarships also has waned in academic circles because the colleges and universities have not the facilities to absorb a larger student body. Many programs in recent years have stimulated a rise in the college population—now 3,258,556 or 6.2 percent higher than last year—which is severely taxing college capacity.

Therefore higher education authorities are pushing the Federal college loan program, started in 1950, under which almost \$1 billion has been loaned to the colleges and universities for the construction of dormitories, dining facilities, and student unions at a reasonable rate of interest. Since its inception the program has provided essential expansion on 650 college campuses in 46 of the 49 States, plus Hawaii and Puerto Rico, even though it only serves 5 percent of the current college enrollment in the United States.

In the last session the College Housing Loan bill of \$200 million to finance the program for the current fiscal year was lost when Congress failed to pass an omnibus housing bill. However, applications for \$65 million have been filed since last June 30. The President has said he will request, and Congress will probably approve, the necessary \$200 million in the coming session.

The American Council on Education regards such legislation as the most useful support Congress can give now to higher education. In addition the council will again urge passage of a \$250 million Federal loan program for the construction of college academic facilities, such as classrooms, libraries, and scientific laboratories.

Garnishment of Salaries of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States.

Good government is based upon the theory that through the discipline of all members of a society the individual members of society gain rights and freedoms they did not possess before.

Regrettably many Federal employees have looked upon the power to garnish their salaries for a judgment debt as taking away certain rights and freedom they presently possess. Upon analysis, however, just the reverse is true. Because of the lack of discipline in this area Federal employees enjoy poorer credit ratings than do nongovernment employees who are subject to garnishment proceedings.

The reason for this is very apparent. The Federal employees who exercise self-discipline when it comes to paying their

bills are paying the load for the license exercised by the small percentage of Federal employees who do not pay their bills. All Federal employees lose certain benefits to make up for the shortcomings of this small group.

The attitude of certain governmental bureaus against garnishment proceedings of Federal employees likewise is based upon a misconception of the true nature of the garnishment discipline. Certain bureau heads are of the opinion that handling garnishment proceedings would add to the work of the Federal agency garnished. They state they prefer to exercise discipline themselves over employees who fail to pay their bills. Most business executives will tell them from experience that the mere existence of the power of garnishment provides the best way for them to exercise voluntary discipline; so true is this that the use of the power of garnishment seldom has to be resorted to.

I am satisfied that an objective review of the time and effort spent by Federal agencies in trying to exercise the necessary discipline over their employees to pay their just bills will reveal that they could use to good advantage the existence of the power of garnishment in bringing their employees into line.

Certainly the power to garnish is much less harsh than the present power to discharge a Federal employee for nonpayment of bills. There needs to be this less harsh and intermediate power of garnishment to have a workable system.

Everyone benefits by the discipline of garnishment as we have learned long since in the nongovernmental sector of our society. The creditors will benefit. The Federal employees will find their credit rating is improved. The Federal administrators will find that the administrative time they have to spend on the failure of their employees to pay their bills will be lessened.

The bill follows:

A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees, including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers, of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, shall be subject to the remedies of garnishment, execution, and trustee process in the same manner as may be applicable in the case of wages or salaries due from private employers in the State or Territory in which is located the court wherein such remedies are sought, but said right of garnishment, execution, or trustee process shall be limited to and based upon a final judgment only after personal service upon the debtor and the writ, summons, and other process shall be accompanied by a certified copy of such judgment. The writ, summons, or other process shall be served personally or by registered mail upon the officer by or through whom the debtors wages or salaries are paid and the said writ, summons, or other process shall be accompanied, in addition to said certified copy of said judgment, by a statement under oath of the judgment creditor suing out such writ, summons, or other process that he is an original creditor of the debtor in such proceeding and that the judgment upon which such process is sought does not include interest

in excess of 6 per centum per annum computed upon the original indebtedness. The said writ, summons, or other process shall likewise be accompanied by the sum of \$2.50 if the judgment is \$100 or less, and \$5 if in excess of that amount, to be paid by the judgment creditor at the time of the service of said writ, summons, or other process to the officers so served for and on account of the United States and to be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. It shall be the duty of the officer so served as herein provided within thirty days from the service thereof, to respond to said writ, summons, or other process by causing to be delivered by registered mail or in person to the party designated, or to the officer specified in said writ, summons, or other process, a certificate stating the amount, if any, of the wages or salary due such officer or employee on date of service thereof, which amount shall be held subject to the further order of the court. Said certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the facts therein stated, but in no event shall a person so served be required to leave his office to testify in any proceeding hereunder: *Provided, however,* That there shall be deducted from said amount to be so certified such deductions from such wages or salary as may by law be authorized to be made. There shall also be deducted from said amount to be so certified, such amount as the debtor may have designated for purchase of war bonds under the plan of the department, agency, or organization in which the debtor is employed. It is provided further that such officer shall not be required to respond to more than one such writ, summons, or other process in any one calendar month in respect to the wages or salary of any debtor and that in the event more than one such writ, summons, or other process is served within such calendar month upon such officer in respect to the same debtor it shall be the duty of such officer to respond to the first of the writs, summons, or other process so served.

SEC. 2. (a) That the earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed \$100 each month, of any person residing in such State or Territory, or of any person who earns the major portions of his or her livelihood in such State or Territory, regardless of place of residence, who provides the principal support of a family, for two months next preceding the issuing of any writ or process against him, from any court or officer of and in such State or Territory, shall be exempt from garnishment, execution, or trustee process, upon such writ or process, and the same shall not be seized, levied on, taken, or reached, by writ of garnishment, execution, trustee process, or any other process or proceedings of any court, judge, or other officer of and in such State or Territory: *Provided, however,* That where the husband and wife are living together, the aggregate of the earnings, salaries, insurance, annuities, and pension or retirement payments of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of either in cases arising ex contractu.

(b) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed \$60 each month for two months preceding the date of attachment of all persons residing in such State or Territory, or of persons who earn the major portions of their livelihood in such State or Territory, regardless of place of residence, who do not provide for the support of a family, shall be entitled to like exemption from garnishment, execution, or trustee process.

SEC. 3. The officer served as provided in section 1 shall cause to be delivered and paid over the amount of any wages or salary after deductions as provided in sections 1 and 2 of any such officer or employee afore-

said, in accordance with the order of the court or justice having jurisdiction in such proceeding, and any payment so made shall constitute a complete and valid acquittance of the United States for the amount of the wages or salary of any such officer or employee of the United States so paid.

Sec. 4. That the said right of garnishment, execution, or trustee process shall apply not only to civil officers and employees, including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, but also to employees of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 5. That the term "Territory" as used in this act shall include political subdivisions of the United States of America.

Sec. 6. This act shall not affect, curtail, or in anywise limit the right of garnishment against officers or employees of Government owned or controlled corporations as such right now exists.

Sec. 7. This act shall take effect immediately but shall not apply to a final judgment prior to the date of its approval.

Trading Away Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe the following remarks are important at this time:

There have been some questions put to me lately that are hard to answer. Mainly they deal with the question of foreign and mutual aid, reciprocal trades, automation, and unemployment.

Of course, the question of personal, corporate, and business taxes is inseparable from these questions since it is the money that comes in from taxes that makes the wheels go around, in any of our governmental activities.

I visited a local bank lately and the president asked me a question that many of you would probably ask if I had the opportunity to talk to you.

He wanted to know why a local manufacturer was planning a trip to Europe to set up a production facility to produce the goods now produced here at home. He would be able to ship said goods into the United States cheaper and, with the operations of our income tax schedule, he would make more money with less headaches than he could by keeping his factory operating here.

A side line of his conversation was very interesting. This manufacturer said he could also travel to Europe at will and charge it off his income tax because he would be presumably visiting his business operation.

One wonders how far we can carry this kind of operation. How long can we go on taxing our local industries and people to subsidize foreign production and competition.

All of us want to help our neighbors raise their standard of living, but do we raise their standards by financing their productive facilities if the goods pro-

duced are sold here instead of over there where the people need it?

We do not need glassware, rubber goods, steel products, clothing, and other consumer goods; they need these things.

We can make all the typewriters, hi-fi's, televisions, refrigerators, cars, glassware, dishes, and so forth, that we need.

However, we cannot undersell them in our markets because our producers have to pay taxes to put them in business.

If nothing else, the import duty ought to take into consideration the taxes assessed against our own products, and give protection against subsidized goods coming into our country.

The argument that our wages are too high does not hold water. Our factories could produce goods for our consumption at a competitive level if we were to eliminate the many hidden taxes, and open, those that are assessable against our consumer goods.

It is reasonable to assume that if the Government gives incentive to foreign competition that our own people will believe it to be proper and patriotic to buy foreign made goods in preference to our own productions.

In the old days most of the imports, competing in the bulk consumer goods markets were inferior to our own. That day has passed. With the advent of automation, any unskilled person can soon learn the duties of mechanized production and with labor and taxes at a minimum, the competition is out and the products are equal or better in quality.

I recently purchased a set of heavy, well patterned, stainless steel tableware consisting of five pieces—two forks, one knife, and two spoons for 69 cents at a chain food store.

Just for comparison, I put it along side an American made set of the same pieces. The imports were heavier, better polished and finished, and cost less than half as much.

This may be good, but I cannot see it. The American producer paid higher wages, including hospitalization, vacations, social security, pension funds, paid holidays, time and a half for overtime, full lunch periods, break periods, clean rest rooms, supervised first aid, donations to local and national charity and worthy causes, Government records, real estate, State, and local taxes.

He was supervised, checked on, and kept books for Government deductions made voluminous reports, and a hundred and one other disturbing, costly items that make up numerous production costs today.

We have these provisions, safeguards, and regulations because we believe them to be necessary for both the economic and the employee welfare of our country.

How much did the Japanese manufacturer have to add on his selling price for these or any other Government mandated expense?

One fears the criticism of the well-doers and therefore one does not talk about these things, but if someone does not soon start paying attention to this situation we will surely be without prosperity and more serious—without allies.

Basically, most of our allies and friends

are becoming kept relatives. Kept relatives are not usually your best friends.

One incident I cannot forget is the refusal of Saudi Arabia to allow us to use our own airport and the Israeli ban on flying over Israel with supplies for our Lebanese occupation and our British allies in Jordan.

Kept relations are not always your best friends is again proven by the furor in Cuba and the anti-American sentiments being formed by the rebellious winners. The three main income sources of Cuba are sugar, tobacco, and American tourists. American taxpayers are the mainstay, financially, of Cuba's economic credit.

Out of 89 nations in the world, we have been and are still giving money out of our so-called mutual aid to 72 nations.

Any nation that depends upon mercenary troops for its security will find itself as useless as a ship in drydock; it looks good, but it is not going anywhere.

Our aid to other countries should come out of surplus, not out of deficiency financing.

How long can we keep up going into deficit financing for foreign spending?

I found in Europe and the Caribbean that we are respected about as much as a sheepherder at a western rodeo.

The only reason he was tolerated was because he had the price of admission.

Not all we are doing or have done is wrong, but certainly a closer look at our program is overdue.

We started out in 1948 with the clear-cut assumption that \$15 billion would do the complete job on mutual aid. We are spending \$89 billion and powerful voices are demanding more.

We have heard a great deal about the European free market area and agreement, and yet a close study of the proposal shows that not one competitive article can be imported into any country without a compensating tariff to protect local productive costs.

It seems to me that if a government puts extra costs by way of regulations, supervisions, or taxation upon the costs of any article the least it can do is to see to it that the same extras are put on competitive goods.

No sane person wants to close our borders; yet no sane person can expect to finance his competition and stay in business.

It is still a competitive world; and, if we want to help others have a better way of life, let's do it without jeopardizing our own standards.

If we have war with Russia, we must win; and, if we then build Russia and its satellites up to the economic well-being we have established for Japan and West Germany, the question might come up as to whether we can afford the victory.

Victory today means rehabilitation, not reparations.

It is a good Christian doctrine and would be excellent if we were all Christians and lived up to the credo of the Prince of Peace.

Time may prove our system and program to be right; however, I am reminded of the story my father told of the man with the mule.

He figured if he cut down on the mule's fodder he could have more profit from the mule's work.

He was down to three straws a day, but the inconsiderate mule died.

Let us hope we can be around when we have built up the whole world and our shelves have nothing to sell but foreign subsidized goods.

In a community such as mine, the pressures are getting worse and if it were not for the props built into our economy by unemployment compensation, social security, pension plans, United Funds et cetera, there would be less light on Main Street and more personal misery per square foot than at any time in our recent history.

Recently, I read of a hardware manufacturer who shut his plant in this country, opened up in Italy and is shipping his ware into the United States and selling through his old channels at a greater profit.

Under our new formula he is a very patriotic man.

One of my old friends from days in the labor movement, now associated with a rubber company, called and told me of the serious threat of foreign-made goods to their particular field.

One of their good customers who has started producing raincoats in Japan has cancelled a sustaining order for 1½ million yards of rubber fabric and is now cutting the throat of his American competitors who have not moved to Japan yet.

A few years ago it was clothespins and toys, now it is getting into the heavy consumer goods field.

The time has come for a select committee to look into the apparently chronic unemployment.

I shall introduce such a resolution if a committee now in existence cannot take this matter under consideration.

Voices Raised in Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Advocate, official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, N.J.:

VOICES RAISED IN PROTEST

You're just an ordinary person, an average citizen with little influence, but you do have an opinion or two. You express them on occasion, but to other ordinary persons, average citizens with no more influence than you have.

You follow the suggested pattern of writing letters to your Congressmen and to the editor of your local paper. Yet get a stock reply from Washington and often wait in vain for your letter to appear in print.

Somehow, in some way, you feel, the ordinary person must have his voice heard, his opinion listened to; otherwise he tends to lose interest after a while. What good does

it do to have an opinion, he reasons. Who cares?

Take all this hulkabaloo—public demonstrations, big banquets held in honor of the Soviet First Deputy Premier, Anastas I. Mikoyan. Headlines, feature stories, and press interviews for the "Butcher of Budapest." The leaders in Government, big businessmen, and big bankers laying out the red carpet from coast to coast for this smooth talker from the Kremlin.

But you can't help remembering that this is the man who spawned the famous double-cross of a few years ago. He promised to have the Russian forces withdrawn from Hungary as he endorsed Imre Nagy as the new Premier. All the while the Red Army was being reinforced to crush the Hungarian revolt and plans were being made to have the Communist puppet Kadar take over as Premier.

You want to shout a protest with a voice loud enough to be heard all over the land. But your voice is a small one, and who would listen?

Then you're heartened as two strong voices are raised in protest against honoring Mikoyan. Voices that can be heard.

Turning down an invitation to a dinner honoring the Soviet visitor, Representative Walter H. Judd, of Minnesota, said, "The ghosts of too many enslaved, tortured, and murdered human beings will be looking down on the dinner. Private negotiations with tyrants in power in a country are one thing. Conferring of respectability on them and increasing their prestige and power by acceptance into civilized society is quite another."

And the other, the voice of Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, who charged that American business leaders "now singing the praises of Soviet Russia (are) drowning out the cries for help and sympathy of the Hungarian people, upon whom, in effect, the American nation has turned its back . . . the year 1958 will be recorded in the annals of atheistic communism as a year of great progress within the United States."

A voice from the past might well be recalled at this time—that of the late Pius XII. The statesmen, businessmen, and bankers who are falling all over each other to make Mikoyan's visit among us so pleasant, would do well to remember the words of the late Pontiff: "Our paternal heart is deeply moved by the sorrowful events which have befallen the people of Eastern Europe and especially of our beloved Hungary who is now being soaked in blood by a shocking massacre. And not only is our heart moved, but so too are the hearts of all men who cherish the rights of civil society, the dignity of man and the liberty which is due to individuals and nations."

The Most Unique Plan in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Federal Housing Commissioner Roy F. Cooke:

THE MOST UNIQUE PLAN IN THE WORLD
(By Roy F. Cooke, Assistant Commissioner, Title I)

It is always a pleasure for a Washington Government official to be so pleasantly and generously received.

I find some businessmen outside of Washington are a little skeptical of Government men, but I promise you, I have no forms for you to fill out, at your own expense, nor any inquiries about how you conduct your business.

Instead, I bring you the greetings and warm wishes from Federal Housing Commissioner, Norman P. Mason. We, in Title I, look upon Mr. Mason as "Mr. Housing," because he is the spearhead of our many programs. The FHA home improvement program is only one of a number under his jurisdiction; the others are home mortgage insurance, homes for servicemen, cooperative housing, rental housing, housing for the elderly, military housing, trailer courts, and the urban renewal programs. The outstanding feature about all of these efforts is that none of these programs would be possible without the complete cooperation of private industry in this great free-enterprise system of ours.

On the other hand we are oldtimers in the field of urging better housing for all. The Federal Housing Administration has been tested by time and criticism and this year we are entering our silver anniversary. We have been in business for 25 years, tempus fugit.

My responsibility is FHA Title I. I am here to tell you how FHA Title I—the Government's home improvement loan insurance program—does business, and how you can profit by doing business with Title I. I believe no banker objects to making money, especially when the net proceeds of the loan is insured by the Federal Treasury.

We like to refer to the FHA home improvement program as the "3 R's." These "3 R's" for us in Title I symbolizes three little, but mighty important words: "Remodel, repair, repay."

Wrapped up in these "three little words" is an \$8 billion industry—home improvement. This is not a one-shot expenditure of \$8 billion, but the yearly outlay by American homeowners to maintain their properties. A great portion of this money to maintain homes comes out of savings or income. On the other hand, at least 20 percent of this home-repair investment must be financed by lenders.

The FHA Title I loan insurance program began in 1934. It was a depression device to stimulate our sagging economy. In those days very few lenders, especially banks and savings and loans, had any experience or interest in installment credit lending.

It developed that it was up to FHA Title I to lay down the broad principles of consumer credit and guarantee loans until lenders gained experience. All this was done to induce lenders to make unsecured loans to homeowners to promote our industrial recovery.

Today I am proud to report that FHA Title I is a going business. We have 12,800 approved Title I lenders engaged in installment credit lending in about every county of the Nation and in every possession. We are self-supporting; paying all of our overhead—salaries, claims, rent, equipment, etc.—and have a sizable reserve for insurance. There are more than 60 new lenders entering the FHA Title I program each month.

Title I pays its own way by charging a one-half of 1 percent insurance premium on each dollar of the net proceeds of the loan. This insurance premium has been reduced three times since 1954 when the rate was lowered from 0.75 to 0.65 percent, in August 1957 to 0.55 percent, and in April 1958 to one-half of 1 percent. But the rate to the borrower has remained the same, \$5 discount. This rate gives the lender a good net profit, plus 90 percent insurance on the unpaid balance in event of claim.

During this period of premium reduction, the average loan has increased from \$200 to nearly \$1,000. These larger loans have re-

sulted in bigger profits to lenders because the initial cost of putting sizable loans on the books is the same as for smaller loans.

At this time, Title I has 1½ million active loans in its insurance portfolio valued at \$1½ billion. New loans are being insured at the rate of about 5,000 per day and the amount insured each month often reaches \$100 million. These are all consumer loans.

We consider consumer credit as the most modern advancement in banking and truly one of the greatest creative ideas of this era because it enlarged the buying power of the average man who lacked cash for purchases. Title I is pleased to be one of the outstanding pioneers in this business revolution.

Now what does this huge home improvement market mean to all lenders engaged in our Title I program? Already we have insured 21 million loans valued at more than \$11 billion. There are over 50 million homes in this Nation and more than 1 million new ones are being built each year. This presents an inexhaustible market for home improvement loans because people always want improvements—additions, alterations, decorations, air conditioning, etc.—whether a house is 1 or 50 years old. It is well to remember, "A home is only as modern as the last improvement."

Of the 50 million houses I just referred to, it is of interest to analyze them. The most recent survey shows that 66 percent are from 20 to 30 years old and that 45 percent of them were built before 1920; 30 million have not been painted in 10 years; 16 million have no central heating; 9 million no hot water; 9½ million no bath tubs, but still, 23½ million are owner-occupied. What a market. Let your own good business sense and imagination evaluate this tremendous market especially in view of the new technological developments and the young family formations seeking to establish a modern home.

Many modern families—you, and the families of your sons and daughters—have been reared in the use of consumer credit. We know it's the way to buy and obtain possessions which would otherwise be impossible if it were purely a cash transaction. However, a recent Federal Reserve survey showed that 50 percent of all families have no installment credit obligation. Also, it showed that of families with annual incomes from \$3,000 to \$7,500 per year only 40 percent used consumer credit which leaves a 60 percent market to be developed. The basic function of consumer credit is to aid the purchaser, and in view of these figures there is a lot of pent-up purchasing power available in this country. However, on the other hand, sales promoted by unwise and risky credit use are dangerous to the economy of the Nation.

Often the question is asked, "What rules for granting consumer credit should a good lender use?" The criteria I use, and this is based on experience in both banking and manufacturing, are (1) consumer credit is intended to serve the buyer rather than the producer; (2) consumer credit should be granted on a sound basis to create an asset and not a liability; (3) consumer credit should be sold on a commonsense basis; and (4) consumer credit should be extended in accordance with the accepted code of ethics perfected by industry and the banking profession. Good consumer credit builds character in the borrower; it does not destroy it.

So that FHA title I may keep all fingers on the pulse of its program from a practical operating approach, we have created two advisory committees who meet periodically to give us advice. The members of these committees are appointed by Commissioner Mason.

One advisory committee consists of 25 of the leading consumer credit bankers in the country. These lenders represent each geo-

graphical area of the Nation. We are in constant communication with our Lenders Advisory Committee and find its advice from the practical operating point of view most helpful and useful. We have the same regard and admiration for the local title I lenders groups which have been organized in the larger banking communities throughout the Nation.

Our other committee has a membership of men on the president or vice president level representing business, building material manufacturers, retail dealers, the National Better Business Bureau, and a credit rating organization. This group is known as the Industry Advisory Committee. It advises title I on how the program is working for the dealers and consumers.

All in all, we have a balanced program that operates for the benefit of all—the lender, the manufacturer, the dealer, and the homeowner.

To give an indication of how title I is growing, 4 months ago the Federal Reserve reported title I as insuring 63 percent of all home improvement loans; now their figures show we are insuring 71 percent of all loans. The same reports show that title I business has increased \$100 million in outstandings compared to \$20 million for lenders on their own plan."

The American Bankers Association survey of delinquencies reports "own plan" delinquency at 1.48 percent and title I at 1.37 percent. Our own call report, as of March 31, reveals title I delinquency to be 1.11 percent in 1958 as compared with 1.29 percent in 1957. This low ratio indicates that people have been paying on their title I loans even though there is some unemployment.

To assist lenders in collecting on delinquent accounts, we have begun the use of a communication to delinquent borrowers known as the preclaim letter. This preclaim letter is sent at the request of the lender by the local FHA office to the homeowner advising that his account is overdue and the lender is about to file a claim with the Government for the unpaid balance. The results of this letter have been amazingly successful; 55 percent of all delinquent accounts, where this letter has been used, have been paid in full or made active again. This letter is now in nationwide use and is available to all title I lenders.

Another assistance given approved title I lenders is the policing of unethical dealers and contractors, commonly known as "suede shoe boys" or "dynamiters." After thorough investigation, we have listed over 6,500 such operators who are out to cheat and swindle homeowners by not installing material according to contract or exorbitantly overpricing the job. A disappointed homeowner is not a good payer on a loan. This type of contractor or dealer is put on our precautionary measures list which to all intent and purposes because him from doing title I business because no lender will buy his paper except under certain regulatory conditions.

This precautionary measures list program is most effective because legitimate contractors can serve the homeowner without the shadow of suspicion which a few morally low ones can cast on the 165,000 contractor-dealers participating in the title I program.

To help our contractor-dealers further, we have an educational program underway. Our dealer relations unit and financial representatives, which are spotted throughout the Nation, meet with and address manufacturers' sales meetings, conventions of trade associations, State, and local groups to advise them on the operation of title I.

This program is paying big dividends. It has met with such an enthusiastic reception that the Governors of the States of West Virginia and Vermont have issued Home Improvement Month proclamations urging all

citizens of their respective States to remodel and repair their homes.

About the biggest compliment paid the title I program came by way of a visitor from Australia. After sitting in on one of our title I Industry Advisory Committee meetings he spoke: "I have visited all countries of Europe studying housing but this is the first and only country in which I've seen bankers, industry, and Government sit down together and work for the common good of the homeowner."

"It is truly 'the most unique plan in the world,'" he said.

A Good Year—And Its Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal on Friday, January 2.

The thought-provoking editorial calls attention to the good year experienced in 1958 by the livestock farmer. It well points out that the solution to our farm problem lies in affording the farmer freedom and not in the imposition of rigid and penalty-bearing governmental controls.

The editorial follows:

A GOOD YEAR—AND ITS EXAMPLE

Before turning the ledger to a fresh, clean page marked "1959," the livestock farmer pauses for a look at the totals on the page representing his 1958 efforts.

"A good year," he notes with satisfaction. Costs were high, but returns on cattle, sheep, and hogs were higher.

Almost never in his memory has the ratio of feed costs to livestock prices been as favorable for an entire year as in 1958. Seldom has the margin between purchase price and selling price of livestock been as wide. Rarely have the markets been stabilized at such relatively favorable levels during a year. Hardly ever has there been so little red ink in evidence on a year's page.

Seldom, too, he notes, has there been a time when the position of livestock farmers contrasted so sharply with that of grain farmers. Swamped in the heavy seas of record production despite everything the Government did to hold down output, the grain producer eyes cost-price ratios that look anything but good. The comparison of results with livestock and with grain emphasizes once again the frustrating difficulties which lie in wait for him who would "substitute artificial control of an industry for the natural control imposed by supply and demand."

Livestockmen, by refusing to be stampeded into submission to Federal aid and control when prices have tumbled in the postwar years of cyclically heavy production, have paved the way for years of really profitable operations like those of 1957-58.

Grain, on the other hand, enmeshed in the web of controls and artificial stimuli designed to guarantee producer prosperity, has struggled along painfully in surplus-influenced markets that never had a chance to show their true colors.

Several times in the last 10 years, when the production of livestock had exceeded demand and forced prices to temporary new

lows, a clamor for Government price supports and production controls arose. But wiser heads staved off the help.

There was financial hardship for all livestock producers while the economic penalty was being paid, but always it resulted in adjustments which brought the market price level back to normal. There is every good reason to suspect that had the livestock industry exchanged its freedom for Government largess, it might today be in exactly the same position as the grain industry.

These thoughts seem particularly appropriate as the farmer begins a new year, inasmuch as experiences of the past seem to offer some reliability as guidance for the future. There are those who scoff at the archaic system of supply and demand, often referring to it in scornful terms as "the law of the jungle." They conveniently overlook the sterling examples which prove the wisdom of reliance on the free enterprise system. And they will be in the forefront of those who will demand of the new 86th Congress, soon to be organized, that new schemes be formulated to guarantee prosperity for the farmer.

During the year just ended, advocates of firm Government control of agriculture took several setbacks at the hands of a Congress convinced that controls were discredited and would never be feasible. Although jolted severely, the diehards have by no means given up. They regrouped their forces and, bolstered by a seeming vote of confidence in the November election, are ready for a fresh onslaught against free enterprise. They are prepared to overwhelm the new Congress with suggestions of panaceas of every sort, including subsidies, quotas based on bushels and pounds instead of acreages, marketing orders two-price plans, and whatnot.

But the weakness that has characterized all such similar schemes in the past will still be there—inability of any man or group of men to devise controls that can supplant and suppress natural economic forces. All will lead to renewed dominance by Government over the farmer and lead eventually to greater socialization of agriculture.

It is argued that all they want is for the farmer to have the same chance that other segments of the American economy have. That is, indeed, a proper goal. The farmer is the No. 1 producer from the standpoint of primary importance. But has he been given any real help toward that goal by Government programs of the past 25 years? Have those programs improved his lot in comparison with others? Or have they merely led him into a straitjacket of regulations that prevented him from realizing his fair share from the abundance he has produced?

A noted farm leader said recently that the way to a healthy, prosperous agriculture is not to make farm income dependent upon congressional appropriations. He declared that 175 million people must eat and wear clothing—they will pay prices that will return a good income to farmers if we produce what they want and keep farmers free to make the changes that are indicated by changing demand.

The need for pliability to permit needed changes is something politicians and farm programs never recognize. In the last 25 years the rigidity imposed by Government programs has caused farmers to produce large quantities of crops for which there was no market. Under the guise of helping, such programs actually slowed farm progress and reduced farm income. They have kept the farmer from adjusting to meet the changes of his market and, instead of giving him a fairer shake, have helped keep him at a disadvantage with other segments of the economy.

One has only to look at the vigorous free economy of livestock production and compare it with those of commodities that have been under Federal (and political) control to see the truth in this statement.

It's time to turn the page in the ledger to "1959." Will we forget the lesson that 1958's page conveys?

Russian Invasion of Hawaii Evident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1959, I inserted for the information of the Members of the Congress the statement of the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, junior Senator from Idaho. I include for printing in the RECORD a news item from the Washington Star of January 18, 1959, which is most interesting from the point of view of the statement of the able and distinguished junior Senator from the State of Idaho, as well as from the point of view of the psychology of the Russian whose operations in the 1800's bear remarkable resemblance to his undertakings today, the middle of the 20th century.

The Members of the Congress will find the article of interest in relation to the many problems before them.

The article follows:

RUSSIAN INVASION OF HAWAII EVIDENT

WAIKOA, ISLAND OF KAUAI, T.H.—The only evidence of a zany Russian's scheme to seize the Hawaiian Islands for the Czar, a century and a half ago still stands near this sun-drenched town on the south coast of this island.

It is the ruin of one of two Russian forts built in the area by a Dr. Yegor Scheffer, who came to Hawaii ostensibly to retrieve the cargo of sandalwood from the wrecked ship *Bering* belonging to the Russian-Alaskan Co.

Dr. Scheffer turned out to be a sort of "Man Who Came to Dinner" with a Russian accent. At the time, King Kamehameha the Great had unified all of the Hawaiian Islands by conquest except Kauai. There was no love lost between Kamehameha and the Kauai king, Kaumuali.

The latter fell in with the doctor's grandiose scheme to recover the Hawaiian Islands for Russia. This was at a time when several of the great powers were interested in Hawaii. The doctor began purchasing land, building forts, and changing names of Hawaiian villages into Russian. Waimea (red water) became Alexandrovsk and Hanalei (most beautiful) became Yelisabetinsk.

FAST TALKERS

In 1816, King Kaumuali was talked into trying to put his little domain under Russian protection and agreed to try and conquer Kamehameha's domain on the island of Oahu in return for the *Bering* and 200,000 rubles.

This agreement suddenly fell apart at the seams as the Russian trading company repudiated Scheffer and his scheme and King Kamehameha ordered him to move on and to stay away from the major part of the kingdom he ruled. That ended the doctor's dream of conquest. Kauai later was united with the rest of the kingdom, which became a Territory of the United States in 1898.

Today, Waimea basks in the warm Hawaiian sun and the reflected glory of its historic past. Long before the advent of the white men, it was the seat of island government.

Capt. James Cook made his first landing in the Hawaiian Islands at Waimea. The final union of Kauai with the Hawaiian kingdom took place there. It was the favored port of the sandalwood traders.

MAGIC PEOPLE

Nearby is visible evidence of the magic of Hawaii's legendary little people, or elves, called Menehunes. Alongside the highway is the Menehune ditch, a watercourse of cut stone blocks reportedly built by the Menehunes in one night to bring water to taro patches.

Some 200 feet of the wall remains intact. Archeologists maintain that the carefully cut stones were not hewn by early Hawaiians, but by a race that preceded them, possibly the Menehunes.

On this south coast of the island there are dozens of interesting and scenic spots which are part of regular tours. These include the Spouting Horn, a geyser in the shoreline rocks that trumpets as it spouts forth water, sands that bark, and the "Grand Canyon of the Pacific" called Waimea Canyon.

The south side of the island is part of a 2-day itinerary on Kauai. The lushly tropical north shore, a favorite location for motion picture companies, provides the second day's tour. There are two resort hotels on Kauai, which is one-half hour by air from Honolulu.

Proposal To Increase Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I disagree most emphatically with President Eisenhower's proposal to increase first-class postal rates to a rumored 5 cents.

As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I will not go along with another first-class postal rate increase; I think it is unfair to ask the average American, the small taxpayer and small businessman, who are already overburdened with taxes, to assume this additional tax load. This proposal of the President's is another clear indication of his complete subservience to the big business interests.

Take a look at the following statistics showing the differences between first-class mail, which is used by the average American when he writes a letter, and second-class mail, which is used by the big magazine publishers. The figures are for fiscal year 1958:

	First-class mail	Second-class mail
Pieces handled -----	32, 218, 319, 000	7, 147, 956, 000
Total weight -----	921,402,000	2, 695, 076, 000
Total revenue -----	\$1,092,441,000	\$65,622,000
Total income from all classes of mail, \$2,314,038,000.		

Therefore, of the total income to the Post Office Department in fiscal year 1958—which, incidentally, was before the 4-cent rate went into effect—first-class mail was already producing over 47 percent, while the big business users of second-class mail contributed only a little over 2 percent. Add airmail revenue of

\$136,580,000 to first-class mail revenues and you will see that the everyday users of the 4-cent and 7-cent stamps are the ones who are carrying the burden of postal costs, while the postman who delivers your mail has to shoulder the burden of one-third of a pound on an average for each piece of second-class mail, but only one-thirty-second of a pound for each average piece of first-class mail.

I think that President Eisenhower would do well to devote his efforts toward closing the tax loopholes and special concessions to big business in order to get additional revenue for the Federal Government, instead of constantly trying to milk the small individual taxpayer and small businessman.

Reactions to Visit of Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call attention to the following ably written editorial, entitled "Mikoyan's Tour of the United States and Nikolai Lenin's Prophecies," which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on January 18, 1959:

MIKOYAN'S TOUR OF THE UNITED STATES AND NIKOLAI LENIN'S PROPHECIES

Nikolai Lenin, father of Russian communism, wrote a book around the turn into the 1920's telling Red leaders of that day and days to come how to bring about communism's dream of world conquest.

Lenin specified that weak and backward countries of Europe and Asia could be overcome and held beneath the Red heel by murder purges and military might. But, he wrote, Russia must never enter into a shooting war with the United States for, no matter how bright the prospects of Red victory, Red annihilation would be the result.

Lenin pictured the American people, in effect, as a big fat sow rushing always to the slop trough of greed for easy life, quick wealth, and disregard of national or personal responsibilities. Such a nation, in Lenin's view, should be encouraged to spend itself to death, to psychologically disarm itself through viewing with less and less discernment the dangers to itself from the world Communist movement.

That has been and is the Soviet policy toward the United States—to force this Nation into peacetime spending beyond any previous wartime spending; to thus compel it to maintain peacetime taxation beyond previous wartime taxation; to seem to be constantly crying "Wolf!" in a manner to lull the people into belief that no external danger existed; to create shooting wars or threats of shooting wars involving the United States but with Soviet participation only in cold war.

As Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan completes his tour of the United States, he well may be mulling in his mind the possibility of reporting back to Premier Khrushchev that the United States is doing quite well in psychologically disarming itself. Mikoyan may be dead wrong, yet much has

happened on his tour to justify serious thoughts along this line.

Mikoyan has been greeted with some eggs and tomatoes and jeering pickets here and there. Mostly they have been from Hungarians who were driven from their native land and their relatives slaughtered by the Kremlin murder crew in which Mikoyan is and has been, since the first days of Stalin, a leading factor. But there has been much to offset those comparatively minor demonstrations.

Mikoyan has been a feted guest of honor at banquets and luncheons in such cities as Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

His hosts have been some of America's leading industrialists. In California, university students gathered to cheer him. Everywhere, some of the finest people of business, industry, and politics—and often of culture—have formed his audiences and given him applause which seemed to be more than perfunctory.

Quite a few movie stars in Hollywood were described in one press dispatch as virtually "going wild" in the warmth of their greeting to the Soviet second-in-command.

All of this seems to have gone far beyond desire to be courteous to a visitor who is the second highest official in a powerful foreign nation. It has gone beyond the point of mere curiosity of people to look upon a man belonging to a group operating a political dictatorship built on murder or willingness to commit it.

Some press dispatches have described fellow guests of Mikoyan at some of these banquets and luncheons as openly approving Mikoyan's views—meaning, presumably, the views he professionally expresses as he travels. But, there is the seeming inference that these people seem to think—or at least give the impression—that if President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were not such stupid old fatheads, and if all the American people could understand Mikoyan, the troubles between the Soviet and the United States would end.

Against this welcome for Mikoyan are these facts:

Only 2 years ago Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia had to cancel his planned trip to Washington because of uproar in Congress and in the press over letting a Communist dictator come to this country. Tito has played footsie-footsie with Moscow even as he played footsie-footsie with Washington, but he never conducted or ordered mass murder of Hungarians or any other people; he has not instigated wars between nations or persuaded and backed any nation to war against the United States—as the Soviet did with Red China and Korea in the Korean war. He has not attempted to bring new war in the Middle East nor does he conduct a spy system covering the globe.

Yet, Tito was told by the government of this country that he should not come here, while, only 2 years later Mikoyan comes and gets, to a certain degree, an open-arms welcome.

Only 6 months ago Khrushchev made it plain that he would like to come to the United States. But the threats of demonstrations, and the reported warnings by the U.S. Government that it could not be certain of guaranteeing his physical safety, caused cancellation of the planned visit.

Even as Mikoyan walked the streets of Washington, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report on the Russian spy system in this country which a few years ago would have had eight-column headlines all over the nation and indignant outbursts from political leaders of both parties. It has gained virtually no attention anywhere.

Many of the Nation's self-styled liberal newspapers have greeted Mikoyan with editorial warmth; as have many of the press and air commentators.

So far as available press dispatches show, only one man in public life has arisen in blunt protest. He is GOP Representative WALTER JUDS, of Minnesota, who refused to attend a wining and dining of Mikoyan by a big American industrialist, publicly stating that he refused because:

"Only harm to our country and to humanity can come from entertaining here men whose hands drip with the blood of millions already dead, still dying, or being crushed in slave camps."

Perhaps America is psychologically disarming itself in a manner to fulfill the Lenin prophecies and to make happy such as Khrushchev. Mikoyan should be greeted with official courtesy, but not as a man decent people should admire.

It Was 1947 and the Pope Spoke of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an excellent article written by the distinguished editor of the Nashville Tennessean, the Honorable Coleman A. Harwell, following the death of Pope Pius XII.

Mr. Harwell was 1 of 10 American newspaper editors and writers touring Allied-occupied areas at the time of the audience with the Pope. The memorable experience is indelibly stamped on the mind of Mr. Harwell and he now shares it with everyone. He said of the late Pope Pius XII:

I felt strongly, and still do, that his personality was enough to make him stand out in any place among any group, though he had been unknown and unheralded.

I believe you will want to share Mr. Harwell's experience.

The article follows:

IT WAS 1947 AND THE POPE SPOKE OF FAITH

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

Looking back to 1947, it seems much longer ago than 11 years.

Italy was still on its knees, groping for a place to stand and for light with which to see. Rome was a dark, quiet city.

January of that year was the coldest in modern history. This, added to hunger, created great misery in a land that loves sunshine and laughter.

We were a group of 10 American newspaper editors and writers on an Army-conducted tour of Allied-occupied areas.

There were still many American soldiers on duty there. There were signs of war in the ruins of Cassino and in the lines of white-faced children who gathered around the kitchens of American Army units and held out their cups and plates hopefully for morsels of food.

Even the luxurious surroundings of the Excelsior Hotel on the Via Veneto seemed drab that chill postwar day.

We bundled up in heavy overcoats and mufflers and shivered into the American limousines which were to take us on a notable assignment.

As we followed the staff member of the U.S. Embassy through the chill halls of the Vatican's great museum, up the vast marble

stairway, we continued to experience a sense of unreality.

These were not the scenes of war we had known 3 years before, nor was this the happy land we recalled from any almost forgotten era of the 1920's.

We were ushered from the great hall into a small, simple but beautiful room, in which ancient tapestries hung from the ceiling. There was 1 chair toward the center of the room and 12 or so others in a small circle facing it.

We stood about for a few minutes, chatting quietly.

The huge doors opened and a man walked in. He was simply dressed in white cassock, a cap upon his head. He had the kindest and yet the most penetrating eyes I ever saw.

His presence seemed almost a benediction in itself. His serenity suggested great strength.

I realized then and do now that all I had known about Pope Pius XII was in my mind as much as was my impression of him at the moment. I also realized that what I knew of his spiritual power and his high place in the worldwide Catholic Church came to bear upon that scene. And yet I felt strongly, and still do that his personality was enough to make him stand out in any place among any group, though he had been unknown and unheralded.

He sat down and beckoned to us to do likewise.

He picked up a piece of paper about letter-size, adjusted his plain spectacles, and began to read in English. His voice was thin but very firm. When he came to the bottom of the paper he turned it to the other side and continued to read.

This was surprising to me because I would have thought his every word was put upon paper by a precise secretary. I would have expected it to be on engraved paper, large and impressive. But this paper was plain. At a distance of several feet, it was clear that the typing was not professional.

(It was explained to us later that the Pope writes every message he delivers on his own typewriter whether it be in Italian, French, Spanish or Portuguese.)

Suddenly the war was forgotten. The fact that we had flown in less than a day from bustling Washington to awestruck Rome was unimportant. The scene we were witnessing was as much of the past as it was of the 20th century. The man might have lived a thousand years ago or he might be facing the problems of today. This was the Vatican, the center of a church that encircles the world and spans 20 centuries. Here was the successor to those who had kept Christianity alive through the Dark Ages, one to whom millions look for spiritual guidance.

The message we were hearing suddenly brought me back to reality. I realized that Pope Pius was not speaking of something in the long ago but was dealing with the world today.

He said to us, "Ruthless persecution of man's civil and religious rights has not ceased."

He praised the generosity of the American people who were aiding Europe's war sufferers in the struggle to revive.

"Yet Americans who came to the assistance of the victims who survived the appalling holocaust little thought that the food and clothing which they were so lavishly shipping overseas would be in some countries tagged with a price—the price of adherence to a political party," the Pope read.

"Denial of men's civil and religious rights has not ceased," he continued. "Ruthless persecution of men's conscience has not abated. Nor is it surprising. But it is tragic."

"But one dare not be discouraged. Leaders will not be wanting, they are not wanting, men of sterling character, not self-seeking but genuinely devoted to the physical and social betterment of all classes, who

in the light of Christian principles will gladly and effectively recognize that religion and morality are the indispensable supports of political prosperity."

"You have come," he said to us, "desirous of getting first hand knowledge of postwar conditions . . . little is of greater interest to the millions who compose your reading, listening public than to get at the facts."

"Must you tell them that their hope has been shattered against a succeeding tyranny?"

At that time, the cold war was being intensified. We saw evidence of this in several places, such as Austria, where Soviet officers were placing obstacles in our officers' way constantly. The Pope's great concern, of course, was the growing persecution of the church in Communist areas.

He emphasized that there was hope in the world—the hope of Christian faith.

After he completed his message, the Pope chatted affably with each of us, recalled his visit to the United States while he was Vatican secretary of state, and asked that his greetings be conveyed to President Truman and the American cardinals.

One of our group asked if we might have copies of the statement. Yes, he said, he would have copies made available for us as soon as possible.

Then he answered questions and sent messages of affection and blessings to all of America. As he spoke to us I could not let pass unnoticed the appearance beneath his white brocade frock of a warm woolen undershirt, which served to remind me that to him all these ornate surroundings were historic rather than personal, and that he lived the sparse life of a priest dedicated to leadership of a vast following.

These recollections come alive today, as the world mourns one of its great religious leaders.

Milwaukee Police Aid Program Solves Department's Recruiting Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee, Wis., has developed a sound means of recruiting able young men to serve on its police force. The plan, Milwaukee's smoothly operating police department apprenticeship program for high school graduates, benefits both the force and our city.

The apprentices become familiar with the full scope of the department's activity by serving for a time in its various offices. They are initially trained for and assigned to clerical tasks allowing the city's experienced officers and men to devote full time to their law enforcement assignments. In addition the apprentice program gives the city an exceptionally well-trained manpower pool for its police force.

Much of the credit for the program must go to Richard Block, chairman of the fire and police commission in Milwaukee in 1952 when the police aid program was established.

Mr. Block described its inception and development in an outstanding article for the October 1958 issue of Public Personnel Review. May I suggest to my

colleagues that the police departments in their own constituencies might find this article an extremely valuable source of ideas.

The article follows:

MILWAUKEE POLICE AIDE PROGRAM A SUCCESS—APPRENTICESHIP PLAN OFFERS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN THE POLICE SERVICE

(By Richard Block)

Because of entrance-age requirements in the police service, many well-qualified young men who have indicated an interest in entering law-enforcement work as a career have been forced to take up other employment. Later, when attaining the age necessary for police-entrance examinations, these young men have become entrenched in, and satisfied with, the positions they occupy, and thus have been lost to the police profession. The problem has long been recognized by many police authorities.

In 1952 a group of Milwaukee citizens was called together by myself, then chairman of the fire and police commission, to discuss the problem and to consider a proposal to establish an apprenticeship program within the police department. The committee consisted of John W. Polcyn, then chief of the Milwaukee Police Department; Dr. William Rasche, director of the Milwaukee Vocational and Adult Schools; Judge Robert Hansen, then secretary and chief examiner of the commission; and Robert Garnier, classification examiner of the commission. As the result of this and other meetings, the police aide program was set up as operative in the Milwaukee Police Department, the first of its kind in the United States. With 6 years of valuable experience now behind it, the Milwaukee Police Department has been able to help other police organizations throughout the country in adapting its successful apprenticeship plan.

Originally the number of candidates was limited to 2 boys from each of the 20 high schools in the city of Milwaukee; the principals recommending the boys who were to be considered. These candidates were given an aptitude test and a thorough medical examination, and the 12 highest qualifiers in these examinations were appointed to positions in 1952.

OFFICE SKILLS ARE IMPORTANT

Because of the vast amount of clerical work necessary in a police operation, the police aids are assigned to this function. During the first year of their service they attend school half days at the Milwaukee Vocational School, where they take courses in typewriting, shorthand, business English, office practice, etc. Afternoons they report to their respectively assigned police offices where they perform varied tasks, dependent upon the office involved.

The program provides for a rotation of the police aids, each 6-month period, so that they obtain a broad knowledge of the functions of the various police divisions in which they work. Upon completion of their 1 year of service, and upon obtaining a passing grade in their vocational school courses, they are assigned to full-time duty, again on a rotating basis, office to office and shift to shift.

"Today," observes Chief Howard Johnson, "a young man entering upon a police service career has the opportunity of learning about the detective bureau, traffic, youth aid, identification and records."

"He understands communications because he has worked there; he understands criminal procedures because he has worked in detective clerical; he understands criminal process and court procedures because he has worked for the city attorney preparing warrants and briefs."

"It is the apprentice program in this country that has elevated the American workman

to his position as the best skilled worker in the world. Why not a similar program for young men who might want to become policemen?"

METHOD OF RECRUITMENT CHANGED

Each succeeding year a new group of aids has been recruited and our present authorized strength calls for 48 positions in the department. To further expand the program, a change in the method of recruitment was inaugurated in 1956—the field was thrown open to all Milwaukee high school graduates of the current year on a competitive basis. Also, at this time, the entrance exam was expanded to embrace all the requirements of intelligence tests, medical examinations, physical agility tests, and an oral examination comparable to the entrance examination for all police officers.

This action resulted in a broader selection of candidates, and created increased interest among the young men in our high schools.

BENEFITS

The 1958 Police Aide salary begins at \$3,251.16 annually, with increments each 6-month period of the 4-year apprenticeship to a maximum at the fourth year of \$4,191.36.

While at work in the offices, the aides wear a regulation Milwaukee Police Department uniform shirt and a special badge for police aides with a number designation. In addition, they wear a black four-in-hand tie and blue serge trousers.

They are members of the city employees pension unit and, after completion of one year of service, are entitled to two weeks' vacation. They also participate in the Blue Cross insurance plan and other departmental fringe benefits. They are required to live up to the rules and regulations laid down for employees of the Milwaukee Police Department and are expected to set the proper example in all of their on-duty and off-duty associations.

PROGRAM'S PROGRESS

The original group of police aides completed their 4-year apprenticeship on June 24, 1956, at which time eight of the original group were appointed as regular police patrolmen in the department. In 1957, a second group completed the program and have graduated from the recruit school with other candidates for the police service.

The administrators of the Milwaukee Police Department report that the young policemen who completed the police aide apprenticeship have adjusted remarkably well and are competent officers. It is anticipated that the knowledge they acquired in their work in the rotation plan through the various police offices and bureaus has given them a background of information, that will be of tremendous value to them in their police careers, and that this background will give them many advantages in promotional examinations as they progress in the department. Their knowledge of shorthand and typing is of tremendous value to them as police officers, the quality of their reports and their increased knowledge of the reports' functions will, in time, greatly increase the efficiency of police operations.

During the apprenticeship period the police aides perform a valuable and necessary function in the department. Many clerical positions in the clerk-stenographer and clerk-typist classifications have been eliminated and the work carried on by police aides. Their work in the offices also enables many policemen to return to the field duties for which they were intended.

SOME OF THE PROBLEMS

Some of the problems we have encountered in the police-aide program might be of interest. Probably the largest of these is the matter of military service, in that a large percentage of the young men have been called to serve their 2-year military obligation dur-

ing the apprenticeship period, and this interruption has handicapped both the department and the individual to some extent.

Another problem that, at the present time, has been largely overcome, was the acceptance of the police aids both by the regular police personnel and our civilian clerical force. As mentioned, the boys have largely overcome this problem by carrying out their assignments satisfactorily and being of great value to the operation of the office to which they are assigned.

FOLLOWTHROUGH

The police training school staff is generally charged with the broad responsibility of overseeing the police aide program. During the first year of service, they are in close liaison with the vocational school instructors and assist in setting up situation examinations, etc., to provide a realistic program. After the first year in the program, all of the aids are called to the training school semiannually and are given typewriting and shorthand tests to insure that they are maintaining a satisfactory performance level. In addition, the rating reports of their immediate supervisory officers are received in the training school and the police aids' progress is carefully noted in this area also.

In a few instances it has been necessary to terminate a police aide for cause. It is necessary from time to time that all persons be reminded that the program must be looked on as a training and development program, and in order to be successful, must have the full cooperation of all supervisory officers of the department in that regard.

The training division carefully watches the transfers and adjustments of the police aides, as the interest of the candidate sometimes varies with his assignment. In some offices the opportunities and diversified activities are more interesting than others.

It is our belief, in the Milwaukee Police Department, that the police aide program is a valuable asset to our department and that similar programs should be valuable to other law-enforcement agencies. We feel that the program, as operative in Milwaukee, will eventually improve the quality of personnel and will, to an extent, solve a portion of our recruitment problem. As a result of this program, the citizens of our community will have the benefit of better informed and more efficient police officers.

The Late Bernard Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the late Assemblyman Bernard Austin, who represented the 4th assembly district of Brooklyn in the State assembly in Albany since 1935, was a very dear and close friend of mine. His assembly district was a part of my congressional district, and we often not only campaigned together but collaborated in helping constituents and the community in general. His passing is a great personal loss to me.

Assemblyman Austin died under very tragic circumstances. His death occurred on January 6, 1959, in the city court of Kings County—Brooklyn—during induction ceremonies for our former colleague, the Honorable Louis B. Heller, who was being sworn in that day as city

court justice. Assemblyman Austin had just completed a congratulatory address, when he collapsed and within moments died of a heart attack.

On Monday, January 12, 1959, memorial services were held at the city court for the late Bernard Austin at which Justice Heller presided. I wish to insert into the Record the proceedings at these services as published in the New York Law Journal:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ASSEMBLYMAN AUSTIN—CITY COURT, KINGS COUNTY, N. Y.

Memorial services were held last Monday in the city court, Kings County, for Assemblyman Bernard Austin, who died of a heart attack the previous Tuesday, a few minutes after having delivered an address at the induction ceremonies for city court Justice Louis B. Heller.

Justice Heller presided at the memorial services. The speakers were Assemblyman Max M. Tursen, domestic relations Justice Nathaniel Kaplan, former Deputy Comptroller Abraham L. Doris, Raymond Reisler, vice president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, and Harold Jacobs, president of the Crown Heights Yeshiva.

The proceedings, in greater part, follow:

"Judge HELLER. It is my sad duty to record a great tragedy which occurred in this building on January 6. While induction ceremonies were being conducted for me that day, as a justice of this court, and within a matter of minutes after he had delivered a beautiful congratulatory address, Assemblyman Bernard Austin died of a heart attack.

"As soon as the veteran assemblyman collapsed, county Judge Nathan R. Sobel, who was chairman of the ceremonies, brought them to a close.

"The sudden and untimely death of Assemblyman Austin, whom we all so fondly called 'Bernie,' took from our community a man greatly believed in and most highly esteemed. For a quarter of a century he had the complete and unswerving confidence of the people of the Fourth Assembly District of Kings County, whom he so ably represented in Albany.

"They came in droves to his funeral to pay their last respects to their trusted and dedicated representative.

"He was a very dear and personal friend of mine for over 20 years. We worked together in the State legislature in 1943 and 1944, when we served on the Commission Against Discrimination, which is credited with laying the ground work for the introduction and passage of the Ives-Quinn law, commonly referred to throughout the country as the F. E. P. C. Bernie, in his remarks at my ceremonies last week, briefly touched upon this law, which was close to his heart.

"And I can bear witness to the magnificent contribution he made in the many deliberations, debates, and conferences the commission conducted. He missed not a single meeting. He put his heart and soul into this labor of love, for he was deeply concerned with the elimination of discrimination in every field of human endeavor, in employment, in housing, in education, and in the realm of public accommodations. Working closely with him on this commission, I could observe that he was a foe of intolerance; that he was intensely human in all his aspects of life. He looked only for the uplifting and the welfare of all the people of the State, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

"Over the years many honors came to him. Bernie wore his honors modestly, without arrogance or ostentation, and humility and kindness marked his course. He can best be described as a true friend, a man of dedicated public service, of gentleness and com-

passion, and of selfless devotion to the welfare of his fellow men. He was a man without cant, without hate. He was a wise man, and a good man, a man of much learning. He had an intense love of God and His law.

"It lifts my spirits to recall today that I was honored to be the last man to shake his hand, and as he looked into my eyes I could sense that deep in his heart Bernie felt that he would rather be a servant in the House of the Lord than sit in the seat of the mighty.

"When this court adjourns today, it will do so out of respect to the memory of Assemblyman Bernard Austin.

"Assemblyman TURSHEN. The State of New York has lost a very distinguished citizen. It was my privilege to know Bernard Austin for upward of 22 years. He was a great patriot. He loved his country with an intensity that was only matched by his love for his fellow man. He was an organizer of the American Legion post of the Williamsburg district.

"He was a follower of that great army that has the utmost faith, and many a time in the intimate walks and talks that I had with Bernard Austin, that faith came to the fore. He was a brilliant Talmudical scholar. He knew every book of the Old Testament by heart. He was extremely well versed in the Hebrew culture. His wisdom was enormous. But he sought no rewards, and, as the judge has already said, he was a man who sought no ostentation and no publicity and no limelight; but he loved his fellow man with a great intensity.

"He came to this country as a young immigrant. He mastered the language and he was so intense an American that not only did he enlist in the First World War but he was in the frontline and was decorated for bravery; when the war was over, he went back to the frontlines in the fight between Russia and Poland, in order to save human beings. And the experiences of Bernie Austin—and it was almost impossible to get him to talk about them—were something remarkable to hear, how he risked his life time and time again to save a fellow human being.

"The same spirit of valiance and valor and brilliancy for others was manifested in all his work and doings. He was a cosponsor of the Austin-Mahoney bill, which was a bill to prevent discrimination in public accommodations. He was the most ardent sponsor in working for the first State university and first State medical school.

"Bernard Austin was one of the most conscientious and hard-working legislators that Albany ever knew. That man stayed up nights and days, long after his fellow legislators had left the capitol, working on legislation and humanitarian work for human beings.

"And you could never get from him a word of self-praise or a word of self-satisfaction. He sought no rewards, except the pure reward of seeing beneficence performed for the human race.

"Yes; his district, and the county of Kings of the State of New York, is greatly impoverished in the loss of this great man, this great citizen, this great legislator. It is not going to be easy to fill that great void. We have lost a dear friend, a great American, and I know that the community, State, and Nation, and the human race, will be poorer for his passing.

"Justice KAPLAN. I join today in this tribute to a departed friend, both as a personal friend and as a justice of the domestic relations court.

"It was my good fortune to know Bernie for many years, as a personal friend—warm, simple, kindly—one who sought no praise, but whose friendship really meant something. And as we go through life, the only assets that we really gain are our friends, and we suffer a real loss when one of them departs. As a personal friend, I have lost

someone that I cherished deeply, and as a justice of the domestic relations court, we in the court have lost a true friend of that court.

"Every year Bernie used to come to the judges of the domestic relations court and ask: 'Is there anything that the legislature can do to help your court?' He was deeply interested in the unfortunate youngsters and others who came into that court, and it was for that reason that Bernie always sought to do something by way of legislation to improve the lot of those people.

"Not only we in the court, but many thousands and thousands who appear there, have lost a true friend; and we mark this sad occasion with the consolation that Bernie had lived a useful life.

"Former Deputy Comptroller DOBBS. I appear here today not only on behalf of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Williamsburg, of which Assemblyman Austin was a director for many years, but as an old friend.

"In 1934, when Assemblyman Austin was elected from his district here in Brooklyn, it was my privilege to have been a deputy comptroller of the State for approximately 7 or 8 years. And, like others in the legislature, Bernie, as I came to know him, used to meet with me for aid of one kind or another; because the State comptroller was, as he still is, the chief fiscal officer of the State, and has always been in a position to help on many occasions. I got to know Bernie very intimately. And very frequently, when I was invited to attend a meeting of the brotherhoods of various congregations in Albany, I would take Bernie by the hand, and he would regale the brotherhoods of these various congregations with the law in the Talmud, with the fine stories in the Perek, the Ethics of the Fathers, in the vernacular.

"It was Assemblyman Bernard Austin who always stole the show in Albany. Yes, he did deserve higher honors, and if he had lived, I have no doubt they would have come. But, as the previous speaker has said, Bernie Austin was a modest man. I think the poet Gray, in his 'Elegy in a Country Churchyard' put it very aptly when he said:

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,

"And all the beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,

"Await alike the inevitable hour,

"The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

"We in the YMHA knew Bernie Austin as an indefatigable worker, not only on behalf of our project for the aged, because he was deeply interested in that during his official career, but we can note that during a long span of official life in Albany he was, for approximately 18 years, a member of the important committee on ways and means, which is the committee that initially passes on the approval of the budget of the State of New York.

"Judge Heller has alluded to the fact that he was very active in the committee on discrimination, which ultimately led to the unit known as SCAD. I note, too, that Bernie was a member of the important committee on rent control.

"But beyond that, I think it is even more noteworthy that during the course of approximately a quarter of a century this man served his community, served the State, and served people of all races and creeds.

"He goes to his Maker not only with an excellent record, officially, and as a good citizen, but as he, perhaps, undoubtedly would have liked it, to earn his eternal reward.

"And so I conclude by paraphrasing William Cullen Bryant in that great poem of his entitled 'Thanatopsis.' I believe that Bernie has lived so that when the summons came to him to join the innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm where each finds his chamber in the silent halls of death,

Bernie Austin went, not like the quarry slave scourged at night to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust, he approached his grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

"Your Honor, I thank you for this privilege of paying my tribute to Bernie Austin."

"Vice President REISLER: A lawyer of distinction, of ability, of integrity, and with all quiet dignity has passed to his reward, and on behalf of the Brooklyn Bar Association it is my privilege and my wish to join in the sorrowful tribute to him here today, and in an expression of deep sympathy to the members of his family.

"Bernard Austin's sudden passing brought not only a great shock but a very real sense of loss to all who were acquainted with him and, particularly, I think, to the many members of the bench and bar who knew Bernie so long, and so favorably, and so well, not only socially but professionally.

"I have lapsed into referring to this great man as Assemblyman 'Bernie' so quickly because that is indicative of Bernie's character, his genial and warm personality. I think we all thought of him that way.

"Bernie Austin had a vitality of presence, a warm smile and that wonderful character that makes it difficult to realize that this shining light has been extinguished. Indeed, in a very real sense, I think we can say that it burns on, for Bernie has influenced many for the good, as you have heard here this morning, and these will influence others, as a ripple in the water seems never to end.

"It is customary to think that the encomiums and eulogies that are embodied in most services sometimes overstate the point, as in a great drama, for emphasis; but in Bernie Austin's case, it is not true. What we heard here this morning does in reality bear justice to his true merits, his very fine qualities, for Bernie was a distinguished legislator, an able lawyer, a devoted worker in many philanthropic causes, in many communal causes, and a loyal member of the organized bar, and of the Brooklyn Bar Association, of which he was a member for a long, long time.

"I had the privilege of knowing Bernie personally for many years, as a friend, as a fellow lawyer and bar association member, and as a fellow director and officer of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Williamsburg. I know in my own heart and in my own knowledge that genial smile, that modesty, that warmth, that fine character, that ever-ready willingness to help all who called upon him; and I know that those many fine qualities that you have heard referred to today will form a memory that will live in the hearts and mind of Bernie Austin's associates at the bench and the bar.

"May his soul rest in peace.

"HAROLD JACOBS: I speak as a layman not working with Bernie Austin in the field of law work or legislation, but in the field of communal work for all races and creeds, and particularly members of his own faith.

"Those of you who were here last week remember that a somber silence ruled the courtroom last Tuesday. It was a silence of impending doom which enveloped all of us who were gathered here to participate in the induction ceremonies of a distinguished jurist. For, in the midst of the festivities, a fire booted out from heaven and struck with stunning suddenness one of our most respected and distinguished civic leaders, Bernard Austin, who served his people with distinction for more than a quarter of a century.

"When the sad news finally reached us, everyone was shocked beyond words, for here was a man who had endeared himself in the hearts of all who were privileged to know him. He was blessed with those rare qualities of leadership that commanded the

admiration and affection of the entire New York community. These qualities spring from the richness of his life, the wealth of religious inspiration which he absorbed in his childhood, and which throughout his life constituted the core and bulwark of his unflinching and unswerving loyalty to his God and to his people.

"There is no better way of describing the essence of his short but distinguished life than by referring to that Biblical chapter that was read during the very same week in which Bernie was torn out from our midst. It describes the growth and development of a great leader of men—Moses. Moses grew up and went out among his brethren. The popular concept today of growing up, of becoming big, is one that implies climbing on the ladder of success, from which one looks down with disdain upon his humble origin and beginning, refusing to mix with old friends, trying to avoid his brethren, rather than becoming a part of them. But Moses, we are told, became great because he went to his brethren, not away from them. He saw their sufferings, and what did he do? Did he just preach words of comfort and hope? No—he did something more. He put his shoulders to everyone's load. He ran from one unfortunate to another, and helped to carry his burden, and bear his suffering, and when he saw his fellow men persecuted, hurt, humiliated, he championed his cause and helped to redeem him from his plight. Whoever had a heavy heart and was crushed under a heavy burden knew that he would find a receptive ear, a tender heart and helping hand, in Bernie Austin—a man who was ever ready to put his shoulder to someone's burden.

"In the years of Nazi tyranny, when waves of refugees were seeking a haven from their tormentors, he plunged headlong into this adventure of rescue, disregarding personal convenience—risking popularity and position to save his fellow men.

"Many a man who enjoys today the blessing of liberty and freedom will look back with undying gratitude to Bernie for enabling him to live in the land of the free.

"Here was indeed a man worthy of leadership. He won his following not by preaching of the lips, but by noble deeds. He will be remembered as a leader of his synagogue, as a parton of institutions of learning and charity, and as a singularly effective leader of his party, where his deep and abiding love for his country found a wholesome expression. His constituents, irrespective of color or creed, will long remember him as a leader of men whose services will be enshrined forever.

"May his soul rest in peace."

Confusing Their Enemies Is Main Communist Tactic—Only Clear and Courageous Leadership Is Adequate for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Sign of November 1958:

CONFUSION AND LEADERSHIP

There are two ways to paralyze a man's will to action. One is to throw him into

jail. The other is to throw him into confusion. The latter is the more effective way. It is as old as mankind. Jungle tribes used it when they sneaked up on the enemy camp, howled and screamed and beat their drums in order to collapse the enemy's will to resist. Roman statesmen did it with the programs of divide and conquer. Moscow does it today, annually pouring billions of dollars into world propaganda schemes.

Confusing their enemies is the special business of contemporary Communists. They do not use language as a means of communication between intelligent people. They use language as a weapon of deceit, deliberately designed to confuse and divide all who oppose their drive for world conquest. Such books as J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," Louis Budenz' "Techniques of Communism," and recently Lin Yutang's "The Secret Name," describe the inhuman system.

How successful the Soviet strategists have been is, in some measure, attested by the periodic fumbling of NATO in presenting a vigorous united front to Communist arrogance; the uncertainty in the foreign policies of Britain and France; the general scarcity of great statesmen in postwar Europe; the periodic markdown of the United States in many areas of world public opinion.

Communist Party conquests of Russia and China, Russia's conquest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe, were not won from positions of strength. They were won by wresting easy victories from people who were misinformed, divided, and confused. At times, the Communist victories were aided and abetted by the miscalculations and indecisions of the strong Western nations.

America needs a clear and definite voice as she finds herself passing through her gravest hour. It is not merely a political defeat we face. Nor is it merely a matter of a military defeat. It is a question of losing our way of life to an enemy which is ruthless—an enemy that boastfully operates in defiance of law, of morality, of international agreement, of decency, honor, and truth. Annually the Nation sweats to pay up \$45 billion of tribute to hold this menace in check. Thousands of American boys are ready and poised to meet this enemy at any point on the globe. Yet too many statesmen are acting like mere politicians—intent on telling the people how wonderful everything is—that business is not merely as good as usual but even better—that they should eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow social security will take care of them.

The people need great leadership. It is not leadership that sickeningly follows popular whim or artificially cooked up public opinion. It is not leadership to make wild and rosy promises (never to be kept) merely for the sake of votes. Leadership is of sterner stuff.

True leadership knows what to do when some arrogant labor leaders threaten the common welfare of the Nation. True leadership knows what to do when the decisions of the Supreme Court open up gaps in the law, to the aid and comfort of Communist conspirators in our midst; true leadership knows what to do when business executives show no desire to cooperate in holding down inflation; true leadership knows what to do when the national debt keeps mounting dangerously while people are encouraged to live ever more comfortably, charging it up to the future generations. True leadership knows what to do when the moral fiber of a nation is weakening; when crime overruns the land.

America is passing through her most critical hour. Wise leadership and not political cunning; firm leadership and not demagoguery, are the great needs of the hour.

Diplomacy Cannot Remain Static

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, probably never before in our history have the people of this country felt the need of clarity in everything related to our foreign policy. They want a clear explanation and sane comment. In the Christian Science Monitor of January 12, the editor, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, has given a very thoughtful presentation entitled "Diplomacy Cannot Remain Static." Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, as follows:

DIPLOMACY CANNOT REMAIN STATIC

(By Erwin D. Canham)

What is the Soviet Government up to? On the one hand, it proposes a peace conference and treaty on Germany which might have been drafted—and in important respects probably was—by V. M. Molotov 5 years ago. It is a stiff, unchanging note which would perpetuate the division of Germany and imperil the freedom of Berlin. But the Soviets dispatched a second note today: a proposal that the Geneva Conference on Surprise Attack be resumed although Soviet policy at that Conference had also been unyielding. The American Government agrees the Conference should be resumed. Perhaps its own policy will be more creative on the second time around.

On the other hand, the Soviet Government's No. 2 man, Anastas Mikoyan, continues to sing a song of peace and sweet reasonableness in California, after his journey across the American Continent. In the words of Governor Brown, of California, the first State executive to greet Mikoyan, "he seems to be fighting hard for understanding." Whether this is really what Mikoyan is fighting for may well be doubted. Just how significant is his trip if the Moscow Government remains unyielding on the fundamentals which the West must have to reach agreement?

SALESMAN MIKOYAN

It is very easy to overestimate the job of salesmanship Mikoyan is performing. He is being received politely by the civic groups he addresses. At press conferences, reporters sometimes applaud his skillful debating and shrewd dialectic. Americans are flattered and pleased at his interest in their typical institutions, such as supermarkets and middle-class homes. But all this does not go very deep. Americans know Mikoyan was one of Stalin's right-hand men, through the blood purges and repressions of the past 40 years. They know he must be very skillful to have survived. They know he is in the United States for one purpose alone—to serve the interests of the Soviet Union. And most of them are determined not to fall into any traps, however amiably and hospitably they may react to Mikoyan the tourist and even to Mikoyan the salesman.

In informed circles there are many questions: Is the Mikoyan visit more than a diplomatic and public relations stunt? Apart from being an effort to cultivate American good will, to gather firsthand information about the United States, and perhaps to confuse American policymakers, is there any more important motive? Are the Soviets really prepared to negotiate seriously and reasonably about the grave issues which di-

vide East from West? Of that there is no tangible hint. But perhaps that is the unexpressed meaning of the Mikoyan visit.

The only way to tell would be to negotiate. It would seem, therefore, that some kind of negotiation on Germany is both inevitable and desirable. Safeguards are necessary. It is vital that the United States does not get drawn by the Soviet Union into a two-power peace conference to solve the world's problems. The strength of the Western World depends upon understanding and co-operation between all the western powers. Thus, Washington is keeping the allied western capitals fully informed of all Mikoyan says to American officials.

NO TWO-POWER SUMMIT

There is going to be no two-power summit. Moscow has long sought the beguiling prospect of the two great powers settling the world between them. That would be one way to destroy western unity. A second safeguard is that no settlement on Germany should neglect the interests of the German people. Those interests will best be served by free elections.

This position, on which the United States has long insisted, can be approached in various ways. If we accuse the Soviets of inflexibility, we must watch our own rigidity. If the price of free elections and free choice for the Germans were to be limitations on German armament, especially on nuclear armament, this is an agreement that should be very seriously considered. German unification, on anything like acceptable terms, would automatically solve the Berlin question. And the possession of atomic armaments by Germany becomes decreasingly important if (a) long-range missiles take over the defense job or (b) we obtain any enforceable limitation on armaments. As Chancellor Adenauer has freely said, a general agreement on armaments would certainly preclude German rearmament. And perhaps limitation on German armament might be a first step on the road toward general agreement. There are many in Germany, as well as in the West, who have their doubts about extensive German rearmament, especially with nuclear weapons.

For the West to agree to a peace treaty which perpetuates the division of Germany would also perpetuate communism's present penetration to within a few miles of Hamburg. It would perpetuate grave injustice to the 17 million Germans who must now live under Communist rule. There are better ways of contributing to a peaceful role for Germany than by continuing its division any longer than is unavoidable. So it is up to the West now to produce forthright and vigorous approaches to the question of Germany.

Diplomacy cannot remain static. Moscow has entered a highly volatile phase of its diplomacy. The West should be equally effective. Instead of merely reacting to successive Soviet stages—notes, visits, ultimatums, speeches—it is time the West came up with strong and persuasive plans of its own to solve German problems. The status quo is no solution.

Mikoyan's San Francisco visit began with egg throwing and ended with apologies from Governor Brown.

Soon we shall see what he has to say to President Eisenhower, after he returns to Washington. Is there any serious content to his visit? Will he propose a Khrushchev visit to the President? And what will we say then? Can we refuse the No. 1 man what we have granted the No. 2 man? And should we especially if we keep a Khrushchev visit from turning into an effort to divide the world between the two great powers?

Is this kind of contact wrong? Surely it is not, if it does not produce illusions and misunderstanding and public or diplomatic confusion. A precept of American thinking and action has always been the value of contact. This we believe. Can we repudiate that belief now? And can we turn whatever is delusive in the Mikoyan or prospective Khrushchev visit into sober realism? Beyond such visits, can we negotiate seriously and realistically for the peace agreements to which Mikoyan is giving abundant lip-service?

A CONSERVATIVE CONGRESS

Congress is underway with some rather sound defeats for the liberals in both parties who wanted to change leadership or rules. Clearly there is a conservative majority in this Congress, as there were in the last ones, when it is organized and manipulated by as skillful a political operator as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

President Eisenhower's message was, also conservative, in the true sense of the term, and directed toward constructive policies. Though Democratic leaders criticized it, the President's position may in general be one which will readily gain congressional majorities.

Moreover, the President and Vice President intend to take the administration's program to the country. They plan a series of dramatic television-radio programs on such key issues as cost of living, adequacy of defense and space programs, and other controversies. Indeed, the Vice President asserts the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union in developing military missiles, and is catching up fast in other aspects—such as the power of rocket engines—in which the Soviet Union is now admittedly ahead.

There is wide divergence of authority on this question, but the Vice President's views are not to be dismissed lightly. His position is in sharp opposition to the report of the committee headed by JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the House Democratic leader. That report, to which Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the recent Republican leader did not dissent, pictured the United States as being behind the Soviets in the struggle for space mastery by a year or more, and said it might take 5 years to catch up.

The President and Vice President apparently seek to convince the country that utmost efforts are being made, both in missile and in conquest of space, and that no new and expensive crash programs are required.

In more general terms, the Democratic majority as led by Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN is unlikely to dissent far from the Eisenhower program. The Democratic left will break away sharply, but the heavy majority, including most of the Republicans, is with the more conservative position.

According to all evidences, this will not be a do-nothing period for administration leadership. The President cannot run to succeed himself, but he is deeply committed to the country's well-being. He knows that a vigorous program will not only help the country but his party as well. And the crux of the program is not merely the national defense. It is also the Nation's defense against value-destroying inflation. A balanced budget, a curb on marginal spending, an improvement in administrative practices and expenditures—all these things are essential. But above all policy is needed which can help to hold down the mounting wage-cost spiral. Here the combined efforts of both political parties will be needed if the deeper inroads of inflation are to be checked.

A Report Mikoyan Could Well Make to Khrushchev as They Proceed With Their Plans To Bury Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Michael Padev, foreign editor of the Arizona Republic, published in Phoenix:

MIKOYAN MAY WELL BOAST OF UNITED STATES VISIT

(By Michael Padev)

An important diplomatic dispatch must have reached Moscow late last night. Marked "urgent and top secret" and addressed personally to the Soviet Prime Minister, the dispatch must have said in part: "Most Esteemed Comrade Khrushchev:

"The first week of my visit to the United States can only be described as an unqualified success for the Communist cause and for foreign policy of the Soviet Government. Here are its most notable achievements:

"First, nobody paid any attention to the so-called unofficial character of my visit. As you had anticipated, Comrade Khrushchev, I was treated with the greatest possible official courtesy by every top-ranking U.S. official, and I have been able to conduct official business all of the time. On the first day of my visit, I saw Secretary of State Dulles for an official talk lasting 90 minutes. Dulles had been stricken by a virus infection the previous day, but in spite of the fact that he had a fever and was confined to bed, he came to the State Department especially to welcome me. Yet a few hours before he met me, Dulles had canceled his long-awaited official trip to Canada, on the grounds of ill health.

"I also had official talks with Vice President Nixon and practically every top-ranking congressional leader, especially those interested in foreign affairs. I am seeing President Eisenhower next week. Only one congressman refused to meet me. He is Representative Judd, a reactionary Republican from Minnesota and a well-known friend of that Fascist beast Chiang Kai-shek. Nobody paid any attention to Judd's unfriendly act, however. It was barely noticed in the press and only a handful of newspapers throughout the United States supported his anti-Soviet behavior.

"Second, generally speaking, the U.S. press has welcomed my visit. Unfavorable comments against me personally and against the Soviet government have been very, very rare. You can literally count on the fingers of one hand the U.S. papers that took an editorial position against my visit. By contrast, President Eisenhower's public request that I be greeted everywhere with courtesy and attention was given the greatest possible publicity and most newspapers have endorsed it. You remember the vicious capitalist press propaganda against your visit to London in 1956? Well, the situation has very much improved now, from the Communist point of view. On the whole we have every reason to be very satisfied by the attitude of the capitalist press toward my visit.

"Third, the only people who protested against my visit and staged demonstrations

against me in several of the cities I visited were Hungarian warmongers and former East European landlords and capitalists now living in the United States as refugees. No American organization of any importance supported these anti-Communist refugee activities. On the contrary, in every city where these demonstrations were organized, the local community leaders went out of their way to disassociate themselves from these anti-Communist refugee outbursts. Many important Americans asked me not to pay any attention to these protests, pointing out that most of the demonstrators were not even American citizens.

"Fourth, I have proved a great success with the American capitalists, and this includes not only such dear friends as Cyrus Eaton, of Ohio, and Eric Johnston, of Washington, D.C., and Hollywood, who have been really wonderful to me. Everywhere I go, the leaders of big business, among them the presidents and owners of some of America's biggest corporations, do their utmost to wine and dine me and to organize sumptuous receptions in my honor. This development was really unexpected, for, frankly, I feared that these people might perhaps remember what we Communists do to capitalists everywhere we come to power. The more I watch the behavior of American capitalists toward me, the more I am convinced that Karl Marx was quite right when he said that most capitalists are so stupid that they could easily be made to work for their own destruction.

"As Communists, we should certainly welcome and encourage the efforts of U.S. capitalists to destroy themselves. For this reason I have made many speeches requesting the immediate increase of Soviet-American trade. What could be better than to enlist the help of American capitalists in the building up and strengthening of Soviet industrial and military power? If American capitalists continue to show such friendly feelings toward us Communists, the day will not be far, Comrade Krushchev, when, in your own memorable and prophetic words, we shall, indeed, be able to bury all capitalists in the world.

"As ever, your obedient,

"ANASTAS MIKOYAN."

Sounds fantastic? Hardly.

Mikoyan may not have sent the above dispatch in the form you have just read it. But the sad truth is that a similar report must have been sent by him to Moscow over the weekend. And the sadder truth is that more and more such dispatches, reporting Mikoyan's success in capitalist America, will be forthcoming—to the comfort and delight of the Kremlin bosses.

We Farm Folks Must Take the Lead Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States will soon receive the annual report and recommendations on America's agricultural situation from the administration.

The report, if it follows the form of other such promulgations of the past few years, will focus on the light in the center of the room and will not peak into the dark corners of American agriculture. It will speak of favorable trends,

of challenging goals to be met and of farm prosperity which is just around the corner or across the barnyard. But nowhere, using candid facts and figures, will a showing be made that the farm policies of the present administration have been anything other than a wretched failure.

In the February 1959 issue of the *Missouri Farmer*, an accurate appraisal of the farm situation is given by one of the clearest thinkers on American agriculture, Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Heinkel's editorial:

WE FARM FOLKS MUST TAKE THE LEAD OURSELVES

Unless its purpose is to lift the standard of living of farmers, a farm program is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Yet our farm laws continue to be so directed as to reduce farm prices and the incomes of farmers.

If you could have known 10 years ago that by 1958 the population of this country would increase by 25 million, that the national level of prosperity would be the highest ever known, and that farmers would make heretofore unparalleled strides in cutting costs and improving efficiency, would you have predicted a dismal decade for agriculture?

Would you have guessed that with nearly 20 percent more persons to feed, the prices of meat, milk, and grain would be sharply reduced?

Could you have believed that despite this boost in efficiency, profits from farming would become so slim that 1 million farm families would find it necessary to give up the job for which they had been trained and go elsewhere in search of a living wage?

Would anyone have imagined that during a period of such unprecedented prosperity, this Nation would continue to wrangle over whether or not to aid agriculture and would pile up millions; yes, billions, of bushels of grain while hungry nations restlessly looked on?

It has happened.

It is history that from a peak of \$17.8 billion in 1948, total agricultural income has fallen to an annual level of about \$12 billion. Inflation has further eroded this until presently total farm income will buy scarcely more than one-half of what it would in 1948.

There can be no doubt about the effect of this lack of purchasing power on the financial condition of the Nation's rural economy. The Census Bureau reports that 2.8 million families in this Nation have total earnings of less than \$1,000 per year—and 60 percent of them live in the country.

Some have said that this has nothing to do with farm prices, because these low-income families don't sell many products anyway. But in order to net \$1,000 a farm would have to produce, say, \$3,000 worth of farm products. If prices to the farmer were but 10 percent higher—and this would be substantially below their value 10 years ago—the farmer selling \$3,000 worth of commodities would receive \$300 more.

It does not take a lot of imagination to think up ways in which such families would put this additional income to use. It could mean a water system in the home, better medical care, needed farm tools, etc.

All of us recognize that wherever found, poor living conditions stunt the physical, mental, and spiritual growth of people. We have made little attempt to eliminate poverty in our rural areas, and have too long tolerated this condition.

It is time to end the bickering in Congress, time to conclude the debate among economists and college professors, time to

stress unanimity between farm organizations.

Events of the last decade make it obvious that conditions will not right themselves until farmers force through badly needed reforms in farm legislation and take the lead in seeing to it that this Nation develops a national farm policy which will assure full prosperity to agriculture.

There Will Never Be Another Curley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *RECORD*, I include the following article from the *Boston Sunday Globe* of November 16, 1958:

THERE WILL NEVER BE ANOTHER CURLEY

(By Richard D. Grant, former secretary of J. M. Curley)

I saw James M. Curley at close range. I've seen him riding the high clouds of happiness and I've seen him racked by grief.

I saw him angry, in those towering rages that sweep away perspective. And I've seen him so softly sympathetic in the presence of tragedy as to completely forfeit his composure.

Dealing with Curley, it is difficult to write subjectively—to separate the myriad human qualities from the bronze legend of the demigod.

When I was stranded with him for 3 hours on a tiny island on Eagle Lake, in the afternoon shadow of Mount Katahdin, I was sure he was the most charming and approachable man I had ever met.

At other times, I have thought he might be Brian Boru, or Cond of the Hundred Battles, or some other legendary Hibernian—a throwback of the age of giants.

In his prime, nobody ever looked twice at Curley to be sure of his identity.

As was said of Maurice Barrymore, the actor, if they didn't know who he was, they asked.

I heard of him for the first time 43 years ago, as I sat in athletic costume on the floor or rickety old Mechanics Building, waiting to race. Tall and faultless in form, with the blue-black hair and high color of the fair-skinned Irish, Curley was impressive enough before he began to speak.

But that voice—ranging from deep organ quality to the screaming crescendo of a whip-crack—that could only be a gift direct from the gods.

As in the case of most controversial men, a mass of mythology has grown up about Curley—some of it invented by himself, some by detractors, but all, or nearly all, so apocryphal as to distort a true image of the man.

Actually, James M. Curley was an intensely human kind of fellow, one who loved a good time, who was fond of a joke, who was dedicated to his family—one who, in other settings, might have been a great actor, a world-famous promoter, perhaps a cardinal.

I remember something said by his Jesuit son, then little Franny, 11 years old, as the governor was dashing away from the dinner table to some official function, attired in cut-away and high silk hat.

"You may not realize it, father," said the deadpan youngster to the first citizen of the commonwealth, "but in that outfit you're wearing, you look just like W. C. Fields."

If I were asked to rate Curley as a politician, I would have to say he was the most

dynamic campaigner of an era that began without loud speakers, without quick transportation, and which ended with television, jet plane travel and audiotape commercials.

No one in our time ever brought to the field of campaigning the boundless energy with which Curley hurled himself into every fight that commanded his attention.

The Old Man must be chuckling in his grave over the self-assurance of those who take satisfaction from the fact that the overwhelming success of the Democratic Party was achieved this year without him.

In my opinion, present Republican weakness has come about because, for 50 years, the Republicans made Curley their only target—exhibit A in the chamber of political horrors.

What they forgot to notice was that the Democrats meanwhile were spawning a whole new generation of leaders, a new organization of voters, a new order of objectives in Massachusetts.

Jim Farley's memory for names and faces is legendary, but Curley's was no whit inferior.

Forty-three years ago, a red-headed kid named Arthur L. Palmer delivered milk to the Curleys in Mount Pleasant Avenue, Roxbury. It was a brief acquaintance.

Recently, Mr. Palmer, now 70 and completely gray, met Mr. Curley passing the Parker House, said "Hello, Governor," then moved to one side.

Curley turned around, his eyes flashing recognition, put his hand on Palmer's shoulder and replied, "Why hello, 'Red', how's the North Dorchester A.A.?"

There's a sequel to this.

The North Dorchester club was Clarence H. DeMar's first sports affiliation and "Red" Palmer rode the bicycle behind DeMar when he won his first Boston Marathon on April 19, 1911.

As a fellow reared in the newspaper tradition, to me, Governor Curley's most outstanding gift was his appreciation of news values, his wonderful sense of timing, and his flair for the dramatic. No Governor, before or since his time, has made more news.

I recall one press conference at which Curley told statchouse reporters he knew of nothing that might be of special interest to them.

Nevertheless, they hung around in casual conversation for half an hour.

Then, just at the breakup, the Governor observed quite casually that he had just notified Eugene C. Hultman, chairman of the metropolitan district commission and former Boston police commissioner, that he was removing Hultman from office.

The gallery was so stunned that, for a moment, nobody moved a whisker. Then they dashed back to their seats and the ensuing interview made headlines for weeks in every newspaper in the State.

Curley's sense of humor was extraordinary and broad-gaged, like everything else about him. Some people would have you believe he had an appreciation only of slapstick, but that was not so.

While Governor, he had for a legislative secretary a well-tanned, baldheaded lawyer who wore gold spectacles, usually pushed back on his forehead. His name was John H. Backus and he was forever trying, without much success, to direct the Governor's attention to bills enacted by the legislature.

One day, when the Governor's chamber was full of visitors, Backus made his usual move, with the usual result. "No, John, no—not now," said Curley with a regal wave of the hand that commanded Mr. Backus to shuffle out again behind a gently closed door. Curley turned to his company. "You know," said the Governor, "he's getting to look more like an old Spanish cardinal, every day."

I wonder how many remember the day reporters begged Mr. Curley for a story to fill what was apparently a news vacuum on the hill, and the boss came through with

the smasher about the two \$100 million luxury liners he was planning to get from Roosevelt.

Yes, indeed, these immense ocean greyhounds were to be built with Government help, would sail from the port of Boston and would carry 5,000 passengers each to Europe for \$50 a head.

The boys all nudged each other—what a yarn.

Typical Curley promotion stuff.

Right now, a corporation has been formed and financed, headed by a New York hotelman, which seeks to do just that.

Build two huge, oceangoing ships with Government aid, carrying at least 5,000 passengers each at a rate just about as low as the tourist rate pegged by Curley 23 years ago.

Mr. Curley's long foresight was uncanny.

His critics scoffed at this ability to see beyond the present, they said Curley was just a big blowhard who was lucky enough to have some of his daffy schemes land right side up.

Frankly, I don't agree.

I've seen too many of his pipedreams realized, with credit for Curley's ideas going to people who were not fit to hold his coat. If space wasn't so tight, I could expand this to book length.

Tell about Curley's distribution of silver dollars, for instance—not in the manner of largess, like the Duke of Burgundy to the peasants, as has been claimed, but as a morale builder for the ladies during the great depression.

With a pocket full of cartwheels, the Governor never was at a loss in meeting women voters.

Pressing a dollar into the hand of an admirer, he would say: "There are two things, dear lady, that every woman needs and now you have both—money and good looks."

One day on the way to lunch, we were walking down Beacon Street past the old Houghton and Dutton Building when an ancient female panhandler popped out and barred the way.

For sheer decrepitude and filth, her appearance would be hard to match.

Her age might have been anything from 75 to 100.

The Governor reached for his pocket, the one in which he kept the silver, and I found myself flinching from what was apparently about to happen.

"Oh, no," I groaned in nearly audible tones. "Not this one."

But I had underestimated Curley. He gave the old dame the dollar with the usual flourish and she followed us all the way to the Tremont Street corner shouting, "God bless you, Governor. God bless you and keep you. I'll pray for you every night for the rest of my life."

There'll be a lot of epitaphs suggested for this intensely human, rugged individual but, having in mind Mr. Curley's favorite author, the Bard of Avon, I can't think of a better one to signalize his passing than to quote Hamlet's familiar comment from the first act—his observation on the passing of his father:

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
"I shall not look upon his like again."

The Space Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, while I am deeply pleased to be a member

of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am also greatly sobered by the gravity of this assignment. I believe that this committee, despite its newness, bears one of the heaviest responsibilities of our time.

Overtaking the Russians in space will be no easy task, but I am confident the United States has the capacity to accomplish it. We will not do it with the checkbook alone. We will not do it with anything short of a maximum effort in every relevant area of human activity.

The astronautical challenge has been widely described as the space race. This is an apt expression. We Americans must realize that what we are engaged in is, in every sense of the word, a race.

Speed and time are essential elements of every race. We must recognize their particular importance in this race.

A distinguished Philadelphia scientist, Dr. I. M. Levitt, said, in an Associated Press story which appeared in the Washington Star, that by 1980 men may be living in the plastic-domed villages on the moon. Imagine, if you will, how quickly 1980 will be upon us. In my memory I find it no more than a quick step back to the outbreak of World War II, which was almost 20 years ago. Within a similar span men could be living on the moon.

Dr. Levitt, who is the director of the Fels Planetarium at Franklin Institute, said, in fact, that his estimate of 1980 may be too conservative. With another breakthrough in our progress in nuclear energy, and with atomic fuels installed in space vehicles, men, he said, could put settlements on the moon even sooner.

This is indeed a sobering possibility.

It is even more sobering to ponder the possibility that the men who settle the moon might be Russians—perhaps only Russians. We do not need Dr. Levitt to tell us—as he has—that control of the moon by a hostile military power will give it an alarming logistic advantage.

Clearly, time has favored the Russians up to now. Experts agree they have a substantial lead in space. Exactly how wide the gap is, no one knows. But certainly the Russians, believing as they do about the importance of space leadership to their goal of world supremacy, will never willingly allow that gap to be closed, and their advantage lost.

In a race which runs just 20 years, and perhaps less, in its first important heat—in what actually may be the only important heat—a handicap of a year is plainly critical. A gap of 3 years could be insurmountable.

I see a parallel between the race in space and the contest on the seas which engaged the world in the 15th and 16th centuries, climaxed by the colonization of the Americas.

The exploits of Columbus and Magellan, which proved the earth round, opened great frontiers to exploration and development. Spain and England had the imagination to recognize the political, military and economic importance of these frontiers, and set out to conquer them. By their unremitting efforts to colonize and develop the New World, England and Spain became formidable sea powers, and fixed for them-

selves places of eminence in global affairs for several centuries.

The New World today is space.

Concern about whether the American people are taking this challenge seriously enough is not mine alone. I am certain it is shared by my congressional colleagues, as well as by many other American citizens. Unfortunately, there are, however, many who do not share it.

Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, has voiced deep concern about American apathy toward the space race. In a United Press International story carried by the Washington Post, Mr. Waterman was quoted as saying:

As a Nation, we appear to forget that we live in a competitive world and shall continue to do so. It seems abundantly clear that we shall rapidly lose in competition unless we can show more determined and constructive efforts than we have during the past years.

Mr. Waterman deplored the post-sputnik response of the American public. He warned that other countries, and especially Russia, are showing a determination and a national spirit on the part of the people which seems to be relatively absent from the American scene.

We do not seem to understand—

He said in the article—

that it will be impossible to maintain our own prosperity and world peace unless we do and do promptly the things necessary to compete in a modern world.

He went on to say that American educators who have toured Russia have been alarmed at the clarity of purpose they find there. He said the Russians believe that by winning the race in space, and by emphasizing science and education, they will achieve leadership over the entire world, and without the cost of a destructive war.

As Mr. Waterman points out, the Soviet challenge really is more than a race in space. It is a contest in technology, whose fruitage is not only better space vehicles, but better bathtubs and better automobiles. This reflects, of course, a more basic contest in education.

Our answer to this challenge must be the effective use of those qualities and resources which have enabled Americans to successfully meet every other crisis in their history; namely, imagination, initiative, and ingenuity.

These qualities are inherent in, and cultivated by, our democratic way of life. They are the bread and butter of our free enterprise system.

The society which cultivates and nurtures these qualities in the greatest abundance is, in reality, the truly liberal society. I am confident our society has, and always will have, these qualities in greater abundance than is possible in any regimented Communist society.

And with them, Americans can win the space race.

We will win it, if we will but cease to grumble about the challenge, put aside our partisanship and our doubts, and apply our best brainwork and teamwork—along with the proper measures of elbow grease and midnight oil—to the task.

Business and Government Meet at the Cleveland Department of Commerce Field Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the December issue of the *Cleveland*, monthly magazine of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, Arthur W. Zimmerman says:

If Ed Higbee has anything to say about it—and he does—the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce is one Government office where the taxpayer will get a dollar's worth of information and help for a tax dollar spent.

Col. Edwin C. Higbee has been manager of this hard-working office since 1957 and heads a staff of 12. As evidence of the work handled by this small group, Mr. Zimmerman points out that between 2,500 and 3,500 personal contacts are made with business people each month by telephone calls, letters and personal visits. In addition, Manager Higbee makes an average of three speeches each month and attends as many meetings of special groups as he possibly can. The office personnel, aside from their regular duties, run booths at trade shows, such as the recent Metal Show, and put on educational programs.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading Mr. Zimmerman's article, "Business and Government Meet at the Commerce Department Field Office," under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks.

The article follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT MEET AT THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT FIELD OFFICE

(By Arthur W. Zimmerman, secretary, Cleveland Seaway Committee, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce)

If Ed Higbee has anything to say about it—and he does—the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce is one Government office where the taxpayer will get a dollar's worth of information and help for a tax dollar spent.

"We can be of great assistance to business people of all kinds in supplying the information necessary to back up management decisions," says Mr. Higbee. "We want not only to help the local businessman select precisely the facts he is seeking from our vast storehouse of information, but we want also to act as his personal spokesman to the Federal bureaus, telling them in Washington where Government studies can be made more useful to private interests."

"This is a two-way street we're running. One of the major obstacles to better use of Commerce Department facilities, however, is that so often the private citizen simply doesn't realize what a large mass of aids is available to him."

Edwin C. Higbee became manager of the Cleveland field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce on March 25, 1957. He heads a 12-man office where the workload is divided approximately in half between domestic and foreign business.

Lendall E. Jones is chief of the domestic commerce division, assisted by John D. Kishler, business analyst, and Miss Helen Kostuk, secretary.

Charles B. Stebbins, heads the world trade division, with Miss Ann G. Semer, business analyst, and Miss Helen Green, secretary, assisting.

Mrs. Zeldia W. Milner carries the title of library and research division chief, but actually she is Girl Friday to anyone seeking a specific piece of information among the maze of statistics always on tap in the office.

Miss Margaret Farrel is head of publication sales for the office. As such, she administers one of the most valuable services offered by the field office. Here, for a matter of pennies, the businessman can buy the study which bears on his particular problem, take it back to his office, work with it, pencil it, cut it up, tear it apart, or file it—a great advantage over getting only a hurried look at it some place outside his office.

The staff of the local field office is rounded out by Miss Betty Lenahan, librarian, Miss Edith Mashman, secretary to Mr. Higbee, and Mrs. Ellen Hannon, secretary to Mrs. Milner.

One benchmark of the amount of work handled by this small group is the 2,500 to 3,500 personal contacts made each month. That includes only telephone calls, letters, and personal visits. In addition, Manager Higbee makes an average of three speeches every month and the office personnel runs booths at trade shows, such as the recent metal show, and educational programs.

Besides that, Mr. Higbee makes a definite effort to attend as many meetings of special groups as he can. "I catch a meeting practically every noon, sometimes two or three in a day. When you get to three meetings in a day, that can be pretty rugged," he admits.

It's all part of Mr. Higbee's personal conviction that the community should be alerted to the help awaiting it at the end of a local telephone call or a short visit. But it's not a one-man show.

In truth, no one person could know the details of everything the Commerce Department has to offer. Within this Federal department is the Business and Defense Services Administration, Office of Business Economics, Bureau of the Census (largest single factfinding agency in the world), Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Maritime Administration, and Federal Maritime Board, the Patent Office, Bureau of Public Roads, National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and, just recently, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

All this makes the Commerce Department sound awesome and overpowering but it's not. The one irreplaceable advantage offered by the local field office is that, while they have an inside access to the marble halls of Washington, the field office personnel are here, on the local scene, knowing the importance of information to the consumer of that information.

Just two examples.

A producer of brick and common clay products was wiped out by fire. To collect damages from his insurance, he had to support his claim that he lost a certain amount of business during the time he was out of operation. Commerce Department indexes give the month-by-month production rate of these products for years. The claim could easily be verified.

Dr. U. T. Greene, assistant director of commercial development, Diamond Alkali Co., says: "Information, such as your field office has furnished us on many occasions, is so much a part of our regular stock in trade that we use it almost continuously in the market analysis part of our work. It is really part of the warp and woof of the fabric from which we assemble many of our studies and reports. Perhaps one report that was of outstanding help to us was the special bichromate report in the October 1955, Chemical and Rubber Industry Report. That article, issued at a time when we were assembling end use information on our own sales, was

especially helpful to us in setting up categories and giving us an overall check on U.S. sales of bichromates."

The man sitting on top of the world trade division in Cleveland, which threatens to mushroom in the next few years, is Charlie Stebbins. A graduate of Ohio State University with a major in foreign trade and one-time employee of the combination export managing firm of Curtis E. Wagner, Akron, Mr. Stebbins has been with the Commerce Department for 12 years, long enough to pick up a lot of know-how in foreign trade matters.

"We can be and are of help to the little company just considering entering world trade and to the large corporation with years of background in the field," says Mr. Stebbins. "One reason is that we are the local outlet for information being funneled back to the United States by the American Foreign Service. The American Foreign Service is a sort of on-the-spot overseas observer for domestic businessmen."

This on-the-spot reporting is demonstrated by the World Trade Directory reports, designed to furnish American firms with sales information on overseas companies. The obscure titles of the reports, plus the relatively cheap price of \$1 per copy, are misleading. Information in the World Trade Directory reports is not more than a year old and obtained by trained American personnel in the country where the foreign firm operates. There are close to 500,000 such reports on individual overseas companies on file in Washington.

"We find information in these World Trade Directory reports to be very helpful," states C. D. Newcomer, export manager, Harshaw Chemical Co., "especially in that they disclose the relative size of the foreign firm, number of salesmen, number of branches, and number of technical employees, if any."

Trade Lists, available for \$2 each, give names and addresses of all known importers and exporters in a given product classification for a particular country. Trade Contact Surveys, costing \$10 per investigation, dig deeper for prospective overseas agents or distributors or licensee firms.

Besides these tailored reports, there is a growing practice of having American consular officials and commercial attachés from foreign countries visit the Cleveland field office to talk directly with businessmen. One such visit was made recently by A. Guy Hope, American consul at Istanbul, Turkey.

Among the industry delegations to meet with Mr. Hope was one from Thompson Products export division, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge Inc. Says Frank L. Williams, of Thompson Products, about the visit: "Our discussions with Mr. Hope were mainly concerned with the present and future import and dollar exchange situations, the size of the market, their sources for automotive, truck, and industrial engine spares, and other matters. Mr. Hope's firsthand information from an American businessman's point of view is, we feel, the next best thing to actually visiting the market ourselves."

Next such overseas visitor scheduled to come to Cleveland is J. L. Dougherty, consul and commercial officer at Sidney, Australia, who will be here at the local field office, January 21-22, 1959.

Often the Department of Commerce is the only source for certain types of information on world trade matters. More frequently, the local field office is simply the most convenient and efficient place to get it.

That's why Cleveland is among the top five offices in volume of World Trade Directory reports in the country.

That's why Manager Higbee of the Cleveland field office, says: "The development of the port of Cleveland and all international trade will have a major effect on the work of this office in the years immediately ahead."

Delawareans Support McDowell Resolution To Investigate High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to receive numerous letters from my constituents in Delaware approving House Resolution 42 introduced by me on January 7, 1959. It is my sincere belief that it is the responsibility of the Congress, as well as the President and the executive department of our Government, to do something, and do it now, about the high cost of living and inflationary prices. It is not enough just to issue reports and to make glowing statements about the necessity to stop the threat of further inflation. It is the duty of the Congress to find out, to get the facts, and then to act intelligently to combat this evil threat to the economic well-being and security of the Nation. I submit as example of the correspondence I am receiving from the wonderful people of my State who support my position on this important question the following letters, also a statement appearing in the Wilmington Journal-Evening under date of Thursday, January 15, 1959:

STATEMENT APPEARING IN THE WILMINGTON, DEL., JOURNAL-EVENING, THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1959

Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Democrat, of Delaware, on the first day of the new session of the 86th Congress introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution to investigate the reasons for the high cost of living. The proposed act, now known as House Resolution 42, titled "Creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests," calls for the appointment by the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of a seven-member committee, one of whom shall be designated as chairman.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation by means of research and investigation of all problems affecting consumer interests in the present national emergency and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the House from time to time the results of such studies and investigations, together with its recommendations.

In carrying out its duties the committee shall give special attention to prices received by the producer and to prices charged the consumer for food, fuel, and clothing, and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods and their component parts.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned; to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies

such special assistants, and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Congressman McDOWELL issued the following statement with regard to his resolution:

"House Resolution 42 is the answer to my campaign pledge to fight the high cost of living and inflation. I am going to do everything I possibly can as a Member of Congress to urge my colleagues to pass this proposed act in this session of Congress. There is much talk today of the danger of inflation. The President in his state of the Union message had this to say: 'We will not tolerate inflation in the years to come. But history makes clear the risks inherent in any failure to deal firmly with the basic causes of inflation. * * * It strikes hardest those millions of our citizens whose incomes do not quickly rise with the cost of living. When prices soar, the pensioner and the widow see their security undermined, the man of thrift sees his savings melt away; the white collar worker, the minister, and the teacher see their standards of living dragged down.'"

"I agree with this statement by President Eisenhower, but by and large the public knows little or nothing about the causes of inflation and too many of them think the consequences are desirable. Even among some businessmen and professional people, there exists an alarming state of ignorance and apathy as to its consequences and yet a rather fatalistic acceptance that continuing inflation is inevitable. As I see it, the battle against inflation must be waged on the educational front. We shall win the battle only when the mass of our voters come to understand at least the fundamentals of the causes and consequences of inflation."

"Obviously a great need exists for ascertaining, analyzing and interpreting the facts bearing on inflation. Both the executive department and the Congress have a great responsibility to the Nation at large to present and analyze these facts for the general public. This is not going to be an easy task. Inflation is a mysterious phenomenon, both in its nature and its source. Experts violently disagree. We must try to isolate and focus attention on the fundamental causes."

"If we can all recognize even mild inflation for what it is—a symptom of failure—failure on our part to govern ourselves wisely. If we can all recognize that for the community as a whole there is no hedge against inflation, and, finally, if we can all recognize the price paid to avoid inflation is much less than the price exacted by further inflation, then, and only then, shall we have laid the groundwork for a successful anti-inflation campaign."

"It is my belief that House Resolution 42 is the best approach to a need for factfinding in order to share our experiences and to discuss the best ways and means for Congress to carry the fight forward against the high cost of living and inflation."

LETTERS INDICATING APPROVAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 42

WILMINGTON, DEL., December 30, 1958.

DEAR HARRIS: I want to take this opportunity to wish you a happy and successful session in the U.S. House of Representatives. I know you will live up to your campaign promises and I'll be rooting for you in your

all-out battle to stem the high cost of living. No doubt you are well aware that the cost of living is still soaring and being unchecked. Everyone seems to be concerned about it, but no one seems to be doing anything about it.

As a father who is trying earnestly to raise three young children, I find it quite difficult to make ends meet. The price of children's shoes and clothes is outrageous. Why should you have to pay the same price for a child's outfit as you would an adult's? To prove that this pricing business is dishonest just let me cite an example for you. When buying tires for an automobile you pay less for size 600 by 15 than you would for size 700 by 15—why? Because naturally the manufacturer uses less material and time to make same. It seems this theory does not apply to children's clothing. The legalized crooks claim it takes just as long to make children's shoes and clothes as it would for an adult's. To me this sounds like a plain lie. Also, Harris, I wish you would check into the price of drugs. A previous investigation down in Washington in reference to drugs discovered that the drug companies were making 200-percent profit on their pills and medicines. It seems the drug lobby was successful in killing this investigation as according to the newspapers no action was taken.

Your efforts in stemming the tide of inflation will be noted and appreciated by the voters who supported you in the recent election. Upon closing may I wish you a happy and prosperous New Year, and when you find time, keep me posted on what is going down there in our Nation's Capital.

Best regards.

NICHOLAS (MICKY) FIGUR.

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 15, 1959.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: From the news item in tonight's Journal Evening, you are certainly making an auspicious start.

As one of many thousands of retired persons in Delaware, I know what inflation has done to my life insurance and savings and pension. You have attacked the most dangerous problem facing us today.

Instead of Democrats being the spenders, which creates a cheaper dollar, your action creates confidence in the American dollar here and abroad, and keeps this country first in world stability.

I wish you success in the continuance of your career.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. MALONEY.

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 17, 1959.

DEAR MR. McDOWELL: As a member of that group of your constituents whose incomes are fixed, we wish to express our appreciation of your efforts to combat the high cost of living and inflation through the introduction of House Resolution 42, and we pray for the success of your efforts.

While you are familiar with this situation in Delaware, we mention a few that seriously affect the lives of those of us in the fixed income groups.

Foods: Especially all meats.

Telephone and tax: A telephone almost a necessity to pensioners. Recently increased, with another further increase in prospect, further increasing the Federal tax we are paying, which for benefit of all should be repealed.

Hospitalization: Now almost prohibited for persons in our group.

Home upkeep: Repairs, etc.

Bus fares: All transportation.

Miscellaneous items: Hair cuts, shoe repairs, postage, papers, service charges, fuel, etc.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. ALEXANDER.

The Real Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the television program on Sunday, January 18, when members of the press queried Mr. Mikoyan, I am in complete agreement with the views of Mr. David Lawrence and commend to you his editorial, which appeared in the news on January 20:

U.S. PEOPLE SEE REAL MIKOYAN—RED'S INTERVIEW CALLED DEMONSTRATION OF TACTICS AMERICAN OFFICIALS FEAR

(By David Lawrence)

The American people were given on a television program Sunday a vivid demonstration of what the U.S. Government is up against in its relations with the Soviet Union.

Evasion, indifference to truth, arrogance, and brazen misrepresentation of facts came from the Soviets' Deputy Premier, Anastas Mikoyan, along with a very plain implication that, if the U.S. Government wants peace, it must surrender unconditionally to the Soviet Union on all issues now in dispute. Never in all history has any high official of a foreign government visiting this country displayed such effrontery and defiance of the American Government and its policies.

Not a single question asked on world policy was answered forthrightly or with the slightest regard for what the past record shows. To the Soviet Deputy Premier, the brief and limited stay by a small detachment of American forces in Lebanon—where not a single native citizen was killed or injured by American troops, and where withdrawal came in 3 months—is the same thing as the continued occupation of Hungary by Soviet troops, who have killed nearly 20,000 Hungarians in the 2 years since the people rose up in an attempt to regain their liberty.

Again and again the panel members of the Meet the Press interview, which was televised over a nationwide network of the National Broadcasting Co., tried to get Mr. Mikoyan to answer whether any American high official would be allowed to go to the Soviet Union and speak as directly to the people of Soviet Russia in criticism of the Soviet Union as he has to the American people about the U.S. Government. The evasive reply was that the visitor would be given the best reception.

When the Soviet Deputy Premier was asked why, inside Russia, criticism of the men in the Kremlin is not permitted and there is such a rigid censorship maintained on all the newspapers and radio stations, he replied—without even a smile—that, of course, there is nothing for anybody to criticize, as the Soviet Government is working well. This is the stock answer of Communist officials.

Did Mr. Mikoyan really think his listeners in America were so gullible or so naive as to accept such an untrue statement? He would have been more logical if he had said frankly that, under the Communist system, the policy calls for censorship and that other countries may do it differently. He did try to explain away the censorship of Khrushchev's lengthy speech denouncing Stalin which was read to a Communist meeting 3 years ago but never published in the Soviet press. Mr. Mikoyan inadvertently conceded that the Government seemed to be afraid of the people, since, as he said, there were some enemies who might get argumentative

material out of the speech and cause internal difficulty.

The American audience, indeed, learned far more about the troubles of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in talking with Soviet officials from watching that television show than they will learn from the speeches of those luminaries on Capitol Hill who insist that all that's needed to deal with the Soviets are bold and imaginative ideas and policies.

The fact is that the dictators in the Kremlin are as cruel and inhumane, as indifferent to the wishes of human beings for freedom, as were Hitler and Stalin. Far from reassuring the American people that the Soviet Union really wants peace, there was a frightening aspect in Mr. Mikoyan's attitude. He seemed totally indifferent to the possibility that a world war could break out some day because of the difficulty of coming to any agreement with the inflexible Communist mind as some untoward incident arises or some adventure in bluffing strategy—like that now enveloping the status of Berlin—is undertaken by Moscow.

Mr. Mikoyan—the No. 2 man in the Kremlin—sits adamantly across the table, making no concessions but demanding counter proposals, which can be only of one kind—surrender—if the Soviet Government is to be appeased.

Under the circumstances, any suggestions of disengagement or negotiation or of reaching an agreement at a summit conference seem worthless. The only policy apparently that will succeed in deterring war is one that keeps up American armament to full strength while refusing to be bluffed by Soviet maneuvers in Europe or Asia.

It's a game of watchful waiting. It means a stalemate that can last for years unless misguided persons here, weaken and cause the policy of the United States also to weaken. It is firmness alone that will win out. For, in the end, appeasement only brings on war.

Address of Samuel Rose, Chief Contact Officer, Veterans' Administration, Before Delegates of 31st National Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBEINSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FARBEINSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Samuel Rose, chief contact officer of the Veterans' Administration before the delegates to the 31st national convention of the Fleet Reserve Association:

I am happy to be here today—my shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association—to take part in this 31st national convention of your fine organization. I feel that we are old friends as well as shipmates. None has made this feeling stronger in my heart than your splendid national officers. I treasure their friendship.

These are some of the deeply felt personal reasons why each year I mark the Fleet Reserve Association's national convention on my calendar as a must. But there is another reason why I derive pride in coming here to greet you, and to assist you so far as VA benefits are concerned.

Yours is a very special organization. Your qualifications for membership are truly unique. Tom, Dick, and Harry may be nice people—but Tom, Dick, and Harry can't get into the Fleet Reserve Association unless they have completed 6 years of active service in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Another thing, there's no use knocking on the Fleet Reserve door for admission, unless you were that king among men when you were afloat on the salty sea—an enlisted man.

Does anyone think that's the whole story of how you are dedicated to Uncle Sam and to your shipmates and their dependents? No sir. Your key officials know their business. The record proves it. Schuyler Pyle, 15 years of active service; Russell Langdon, 27 years of active service; Charlie Lofgren, 21 years of active service; Charlie McCarthy, 30 years of active service. That's an impressive record.

Yes, yours is an exclusive organization, yours is a growing organization, yours is a willingness to fight for the best interests of your shipmates, their widows, their orphans, and their families. You have also fought for measures to keep America free, to keep America strong, to keep it growing. I think you can take a great measure of pride in the fact that you have never made membership in the Fleet Reserve Association a requirement before you extend a helping hand to a shipmate.

I want to pay personal tribute to your national secretary, Russell Langdon. "Lucky" Langdon we call him. I don't think that happy nickname has a thing to do with him. I think it means that whoever gets to know and to work with Russell Langdon is truly fortunate. I know it is so in my case.

It's the same story with Schuyler S. Pyle, your national financial secretary. We've known each other a long time. And the longer we know each other, the more we like each other. He radiates sunshine in your executive offices, and I've seen him on some cloudy days.

And let's not forget Charlie McCarthy, your editor of naval affairs. To come to any anchorage of the Fleet Reserve Association, and not see Charlie around—well, that would be almost like going to a World Series and not seeing the Yankees.

And Charlie Lofgren. We might as well have a Navy without an ocean, as to come here for a Fleet Reserve convention and miss him. If a seagoing outfit like this can be said to have a cornerstone—Charlie is it.

And may I tell you this: Your zeal for the good of veterans everywhere is matched by the zeal of the Veterans' Administration for that all-important cause. I know, because I know the zeal that inspires our dynamic and hard-working Administrator, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier.

I wish Mr. Whittier could have been here in person. His warm and magnetic personality would have thrilled you. He has a big task. There are many calls on his time and energy. I hope the day may come soon when both of us—Mr. Whittier and myself—may be privileged to stand together on this platform to assure you that the VA is in business to serve veterans and their dependents to the best of its ability.

I said that Sumner G. Whittier is doing a marvelous job. Let me shoot a few machinegun facts at you, to show you I'm not using words carelessly.

VA's budget today—\$5 billion. Number of employees, fellows just like me, trying to do our best to serve you—over 170,000. And the cost of operating the VA during the fiscal year 1958 was less than 4 cents of each tax dollar that the VA spent in that year.

The VA operates the biggest hospital and medical program in the Nation, and the largest ordinary life insurance business in the world. We administer a multi-billion-dollar compensation and pension program.

We conduct a bigger home-loan mortgage operation than any private institution in the country. We operate the greatest education program ever undertaken with Federal funds. These programs have had a profound effect on the national welfare.

Think of what America is today as the result of VA-sponsored education—hundreds and thousands of desperately needed scientists, engineers, doctors, schoolteachers—making America mentally and morally strong, because the benefits the Congress has provided war veterans have proved to be a gilt-edged investment. The billions of dollars spent have resulted in social and economic advantages to the Nation that will return the cost many times over, both in this generation and in generations yet to come.

The Administrator's recent announcement of a liberalization of Korean GI bill regulations gives many thousands of Korea veterans, who were forced to interrupt their training for more than 12 consecutive months, the chance to complete their GI education.

And think of what VA hospitals and clinics mean to the veteran who needs medical help—prompt help, real help—to treat an ailment, suffered by many through no fault of their own, except patriotic desire to help our country.

During this very year of 1958 the Congress has passed, and the President has signed into law, many measures of benefit to veterans and their dependents. These laws have broadened direct benefits. They have increased compensation and pension rates. This year, in a warm action that symbolizes America's evergrowing unity of freedom, we have provided pensions for Confederate veterans and their widows. Further, the hundreds of veterans' laws have been codified into a single act.

This year Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed the law extending the loan guaranty program for World War II veterans to July 25, 1960.

I can report to you with pride that net claims paid on defaulted home loans actually amounted to only about 7 cents out of every \$100 of the mortgages guaranteed. What's more, our veterans have already repaid in full more than 1 million loans having a face value of more than \$8 billion. One more proof of the A-1 credit risk of veteran home-loan borrowers.

Our 171 VA hospitals, serving every area and section of the United States, now care for the highest number of veterans in history, nearly 111,000. We have an alltime high in the number of doctors, nurses, technicians and others, to restore our veterans to health, so far as human skill can help. And to seek divine guidance in our healing mission, we have many dedicated, hard-working chaplains, of all faiths, serving in our hospitals.

And so—as the days pass, and the years follow one another, our work at VA goes on. Soon, more than 685,000 Korean conflict veterans will be able to convert their previously nonconvertible term GI insurance to permanent plans. Over 5 million World War II and Korean conflict veterans who hold G.I. insurance, may now attach a new type of total disability income provision to their policies, in return for a small additional premium, provided the insured is in good health and under 60 years of age.

The past year has also witnessed liberalization of social security laws regarding certain veterans receiving disability payments. There has been an increase in VA disability compensation rates. VA benefit checks may now be forwarded under certain circumstances to your bank for deposit to your personal account. The term "widow" has been redefined for VA benefits. There have been increases in the pension rates for certain widows of wars before World War I.

Also enacted was an increase in the Government allowance toward burial expenses for certain deceased veterans.

To every shipmate present, as well as to all who are not present, I want to assure you that the VA stands ready to extend every assistance to veterans and their dependents, and to do it in a cheerful, warmhearted, and sympathetic manner. Your shipmates in your executive offices in Washington, D.C., will tell you so.

We don't manufacture anything at VA. We're in business to serve. What's more, we are in business to serve human beings. And we are at all times aware that the human beings we serve are veterans—men and women who have displayed the highest type of citizenship in a free nation.

Whether you have a question or not, will you do me a favor? If you meet me anywhere, in this hotel or on the street, will you please say "Hello"? I know a great many of you, but even though I may not know your name I do hope you will stop me and say "Hi" whenever we may meet. I am proud of my shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association.

May God bless all of you, my shipmates and my friends.

"Dear Mr. Mikoyan"—An Open Letter to the Deputy Premier by the Spring Valley (Minn.) Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 there appeared in the Spring Valley (Minn.) Tribune an editorial which, I believe, admirably summarizes the feelings of millions of Americans to the visit here by the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Anastas I. Mikoyan.

The editorial, which appears in the newspaper edited by Bob Lind and published by Walt Babineau, certainly reflects what should be the view of this Government as it agrees to discuss policy at any time with the Soviet Union—but which, nevertheless, keeps careful scrutiny on that Nation's actions due to a history of broken pledges and dishonored agreements.

The editorial reads as follows:

DEAR MR. MIKOYAN

MR. ANASTAS I. MIKOYAN,
Deputy Premier of the U.S.S.R.,
Somewhere in the United States.

DEAR MR. MIKOYAN: While traveling around our country last week, you said we Americans don't trust you Russians enough.

Mr. Mikoyan, we don't trust you Russians at all.

We wish we could, of course. We Americans are generally a trusting crowd of optimists. We're usually ready to think well of the other fellow.

But you and all your comrades-in-atomic-arms have done everything possible to make us doubt every word you utter and every promise you make.

You have talked about free elections in East Germany; but they haven't taken place.

You've talked about stopping atomic bomb tests; then you tested some more bombs.

You told the people of Budapest you were pulling out; then you sent tanks back in to slaughter them.

You've violated promises, treaties, and law with flagrant disregard.

Yet, Mr. Mikoyan, you wonder why we don't trust you, Mr. Khrushchev, and the other Soviet leaders "enough."

Now you're spreading the Soviet cry for peace while you tour America.

If we had real peace, could you be trusted to keep it?

Mr. Khrushchev has expressed extreme displeasure over our bases which encircle your country. He doesn't approve of our placing missile bases, airfields for long-range aircraft, and large numbers of troops all around your homeland.

This is evidence of the deep lack of trust we have for you, Mr. Mikoyan.

A father will tell his 2-year-old son to keep his fingers out of the candy bowl—but, nevertheless, he keeps a wary eye on him.

We're keeping a wary eye on you, too.

Because, to date, you're just about as trustworthy as that 2-year-old boy.

Sincerely,

Right-To-Work Laws Hurt the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the elections of last autumn the reaction of the electorate to the so-called right-to-work laws was the most significant development.

As a matter of fact, the greatest Democratic victories occurred in those States in which right-to-work was an issue. The voters of these communities manifested their understanding of this complex issue in spite of confusing argument and unprecedented pressures.

The following article from the Democratic Digest of November-December 1958, entitled "Right-To-Work Laws Hurt the GOP," expertly analyzes the election result. Those who think in terms of a Federal right-to-work law should give the election results careful consideration:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS HURT THE GOP

When Republican leaders picked right to work as a winning issue in 1958, they demonstrated anew how completely out of step they are with the 20th century. In all but one (Kansas) of the six States where the issue was on the ballot November 4, the voters overwhelmingly rejected the antiunion measure along with a healthy majority of the Republicans who spoke out in favor of it.

Before the election opponents of the so-called right-to-work bill admitted that the title was going to be difficult to overcome. Far from providing the right to a job, which the fraudulent phrase implies, the so-called right-to-work law denies both organized labor and management the right to negotiate a union shop and opens the door to the unfair practices of an earlier era that fostered hostile labor-management relations, sharp conflict, and sometimes violence.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, enacted by the Republican 80th Congress, the union shop is permitted; that is, contracts requiring union membership after employment are legal. But

as a result of this same law, which the Republican Congress enacted, the door was opened to flagrant antiunionism by giving State laws precedence over the Federal law, thus permitting the States to ban the union shop by State statute.

Antilabor forces which backed the measure, recognized that what they could not accomplish in the U.S. Congress under the glare of national publicity, might well be achieved on a local level. These forces included the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, Big Business Republican supporters along with GOP leaders.

IKE HEDGES

While politically astute Labor Secretary Mitchell termed the right-to-work law unwise, President Eisenhower hedged on the controversial issue in the 1958 campaign. "I have never urged any State to vote for the so-called right of work law," Mr. Eisenhower told his October 1 press conference, "for the simple reason that I believe it's the State's business, and I'm not going to get into it."

When a news reporter tried to question the President further, he turned the newsman away abruptly with a "thank you very much. I have answered it."

Vice President Nixon continually double-talked his way around the delicate issue—especially in California where GOP Senator Knowland based his gubernatorial campaign on the State right-to-work law, while GOP Governor Knight, running for the Senate, opposed it. Mr. Nixon begged off, when asked for his stand, explaining that he did not want to influence California voters and then proceeded to try to influence them on two equally controversial issues on the California ballot.

Former President Truman, who vetoed the Taft-Hartley law in 1948, and was one of the most outspoken campaigners against right-to-work laws in this year's campaign, warned of their danger.

"To outlaw the union shop," Mr. Truman told a Cleveland, Ohio labor audience on October 3, "will undermine the responsibility and the standing of the great unions on whom the stability of our productive industrial life depends."

Further, he pointed out, "the union shop is good for the employer as well as the workers—and enlightened employers know this."

Recognizing that the title was designed to deceive, Mr. Truman said that "some people will tell you that they are against the union shop but they are for unions. That is like saying you are for motherhood but don't like children."

Mr. Truman's claim of support for his stand from enlightened employers was verified in more than one instance. For example, in Colorado, one of the States where the issue was on the ballot, leading representatives of industry opposed the right-to-work amendment with their plea to the voters that Colorado has experienced a minimum of strikes and labor strife over the past several years and management preferred to keep it that way. The measure went down to defeat—315,683 to 200,027.

THE COUNTRY AGREES

Democratic political leaders and candidates, respected labor leaders and rank-and-file union members around the country were in agreement. Religious and community leaders joined in speaking out in support of a healthy union movement and its contributions to a democratic society, including the National Council of Churches, the Methodist Church, leading Catholic clergymen and rabbis. The National Conference for Industrial Peace, with such distinguished members as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Herbert H. Lehman, mobilized public opinion through a nationwide educational campaign, hammering away at the fact that banning the union shop would open up a long period

of labor unrest and social conflict which the Nation could ill afford.

National Chairman Paul M. Butler saw the real purpose of the right-to-work law as an effort "to bust unions—once and for all time, with the result that wages will suffer, working conditions will deteriorate. And in the long run we all will suffer, because the welfare of all of us in America is interdependent with the welfare of working men and women."

The national chairman warned that if Senator Knowland of California, campaigning on a right-to-work platform, were elected, the cause of organized labor in this country would be set back at least a generation. The stunning defeat of the amendment—2,903,309 to 1,934,911—and the overwhelming victory of Democratic Gov. Pat Brown, clearly indicated that California's citizens want no part of Republican Old Guard policies.

The story was repeated in Ohio, where Democratic candidates and organized labor were joined by all six bishops of the Catholic Church to help defeat the anti-union measure on the ballot—2,007,291 to 1,080,266. Unseated were Old Guard veterans Senator John Bricker and Gov. William O'Neill.

A similar drive in the State of Washington, where a right-to-work proposal was defeated 2 years ago, again was slapped down by a healthy margin—2,106,055 to 1,303,882.

In Idaho, where the right-to-work proposal was defeated 124,147 to 117,923, a Republican Governor was victorious, while in predominantly agricultural Kansas, the right-to-work measure won approval—369,511 to 280,325—and Democratic Gov. George Docking who opposed it was re-elected to his second term.

While there were both national and State issues contributing to the sweeping Democratic victory nationwide November 4, the defeat of the right-to-work measure in five of the six States where it was on the ballot points up the fact that the majority of the voters reject 19th century policies for 20th century problems.

Location of Federal Prison in Southern Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following news release:

GRAY OPTIMISTIC ABOUT CHANCES FOR \$10 MILLION FEDERAL PRISON FOR AREA—FUNDS INCLUDED IN BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman KENNETH J. GRAY, Democrat, West Frankfort, said today that chances for locating the proposed \$10 million Federal prison in southern Illinois look good.

GRAY said the new budget presented to Congress to operate the Department of Justice for the next fiscal year contains a \$10 million request for funds with which to construct the new maximum security, escape proof, prison. He said he will go before Congress early next month to urge that southern Illinois be given the new prison.

According to GRAY, the site selection has narrowed down considerably and southern Illinois is one of the remaining favorable locations.

"I believe our area has more to offer than other sites still under consideration and I feel very optimistic about our chances," GRAY said.

"If we can get the prison for our area, it will mean hundreds of jobs during construction and several hundred permanent jobs in the operation," he said.

GRAY said the prison will be a model institution and a great asset to the area.

GRAY said he expects some definite word as to a location within the next 30 days.

The Responsibilities of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the following message is one in a series of programs being prepared and presented by the Christian Amendment Movement. I commend it to the attention of Members of this body:

"THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP"

(By the Reverend R. J. G. McKnight, D.D., Ph. D.)

From our studies of the preamble to the Constitution four things are apparent:

1. It ignores God the Father as the source of all authority.
2. It ignores the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations.
3. It assumes for the people the powers and the functions that belong to God alone.
4. It retires the Bible from its rightful place in our national life as the only standard of civic morality.

We cannot excuse ourselves on the ground that the preamble simply says nothing about these matters. The trouble is that it says nothing about them at the place where it ought to state all of them definitely. The fatal thing is that it leaves them out.

A man who leaves God, Christ, and the Bible out of his life is not a Christian. He may be a gentleman. It may be possible to say many nice things about him. But whatever else he may or may not be, he is not a Christian. And a nation that leaves God, Christ, and the Bible out of its fundamental law is not a Christian nation, however much we may praise its legal excellencies.

Many years ago Japan sent out a delegation to various countries to study the different religions of each country. In their report they said that Christianity was the best religion but that there were no Christian nations. How did they arrive at this conclusion? Manifestly not by reading the individual statements relative to divine guidance in national affairs such as were made by such outstanding men as George Washington who said in his Farewell Address: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

The Japanese did not base their conclusions on the words of John Adams, Washington's first successor, who said in his inaugural address: "If a veneration for the religion of a people who profess and call themselves Christians, and a fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for the public service," I can accept this responsibility.

Noble utterances such as these can be found by the dozens in the speeches and writings of strong Christian men who have served in high places in our Government. These are but personal opinions of men whose vibrant Christian faith found expression in their lives and service. The Japanese

did not consider these things as evidence that the Nation was founded on the Christian religion or pervaded by it. They rested their verdict on the written Constitution of the country, and in it they read: "But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." So, notwithstanding the part Christianity had played in laying the foundations of our great Nation, our Constitution—the supreme law of the land—the legal instrument which is the standard by which all national political actions are to be determined, did not regard the Christian religion as worthy of mention.

The judgment of the Japanese was right when they said: "There are no Christian nations." They could find in our Constitution—the supreme law of our land—no acknowledgment of Christianity as a factor in our growth and development as a nation. If the Japanese had found in our Constitution the acknowledgment that God is the source of all authority, that Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations, and that the Bible is the infallible guidebook for men and nations—and if they had recommended to their people the doctrines of Christianity as indispensable factors in the growth of a nation, and if Japan as a nation had embodied these principles in their instruments of government—would there have been a Pearl Harbor attack?

No man liveth to himself, and in this world which is daily growing smaller, no nation liveth to itself. The United States has reached the position of leadership in the world. This high position involves great responsibilities. If there is ever to be a Christian world order, some nation must lead in the movement to establish it. To lead in the movement, some nation must take the first step by establishing a Christian government within its own borders.

Despite our failure to make Christian acknowledgments in our Constitution, the United States has a social order in which the Christian belief dominates. The majority of our people, in some form, profess the Christian religion. It is true, of course, that many who profess the Christian faith do not live up to the high ideals of Christianity. But, on the other hand, the majority of our people sing the sentiment of the song: "Faith of our fathers, living still, we will be true to thee till death."

Now, it is axiomatic that in the long run a nation will have the kind of government the majority of the people in that nation want. It may be a long, long run, but ultimately, if a majority in a nation wants a change in government, the change will come. They may have to break the shackles of a dictator. It may take a like a long time. But in the end it will come. Not only so, but the character of the majority of the people will be reflected in the character of the government.

But someone may say, "What about minorities?" Well, there is this to be said about minorities who disagree with the Christian belief in the United States of America: In no other nation under the sun are the rights of minorities, whether religious or political, so legally protected and morally safeguarded as in this land of liberty we call the United States.

Why is it that the oppressed of every nation on earth yearn for the day when they can set foot on American soil? They know they will be minority groups, but they know also that here, regardless of race, color, or creed, they will have unlimited possibilities for advancement in every way. And they know their rights will be protected, their schooling will be provided, and they may live as freemen. This is what America has to offer to the oppressed. But why does America offer it? The answer is plain. It is because the predominant religion of America

is Christian, and the religion that is dominant—Christianity—is the religion that fosters the spirit of brotherhood as no other religion can do.

Minority groups regard America as the safest haven because of the prevalence of the Christian religion.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Inaugural Address of Gov. Ralph Herseeth, of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the excellent inaugural address of South Dakota's able new Governor, the Honorable Ralph Herseeth:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. RALPH HERSEETH, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, 36TH SESSION, SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE—CONSERVANCY DISTRICT LAW, STRICTER CURB ON MOTORISTS IS PROPOSED

President of the senate, speaker of the house and members of the 36th session of the South Dakota Legislature:

In keeping with a provision of the South Dakota Constitution it is now my privilege and duty to address this distinguished body. To share with you some of my thinking on the affairs of a great State and to make such recommendations as are deemed advisable.

In the tradition of election years our two political parties have again engaged in a contest for the voters' favors to determine in the true pattern of a democracy who the men and women should be to represent the people in government. That is now history of 1958. Much of value was attained in the old year. Some scars and some bruises were also acquired, not all of which have any connection with political struggles. As I give you my hearty wish for a wonderful and productive 1959, I also ask that you take with you from 1958 those memories which showed profit and contained a good moral. By the same token, in the name of progress and for a better tomorrow, we should leave behind that which has shown a loss or divided our efforts toward making South Dakota a better State in which to live.

During the weeks that have intervened since you choose me as your chief executive I have become increasingly aware of the responsibilities we face together. I am sure that as legislators you have experienced a similar reaction. Let me assure you that I am today a most humble and grateful person. Also, that my most earnest desire is to conduct myself in a manner which will command the esteem of all South Dakotans, not just those who may share my political views. I am aware, as you are, that we will make mistakes. May we discipline ourselves to the extent that such mistakes as are made will be completely honest. I am convinced that there has never been, nor will there ever be, a good substitute for constant vigilance in any business. This is most certainly true in the State's business where many people are involved. I ask you to alert yourselves to the need of assessing your own performance in this respect, as well as that of our fellow men.

This being our attitude, I am confident that with the divine assistance I shall earnestly seek, and with a genuine humbleness of spirit, a desire to adhere to the abiding principles of the Golden Rule, our State will

move united toward the high destiny a merciful God has provided for us.

With these preliminary statements I shall discuss with you in a general manner some of the paramount problems facing us in this session. We have reached the point where we must, to the best of our ability, interpret tangibly what the majority of our voters spelled out in the past election. No one can dictate nor guarantee results. However, I am obligated as you are to accomplish some reforms and some new endeavors. In this respect conflicts of interest and thinking will be encountered. In the final analysis I do not anticipate a perfect score. I am most hopeful for a high average as a testimony to honest efforts and the wisdom of our legislative process.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

An exciting challenge confronts this 36th legislature and this new administration. We have a golden opportunity to increase the efficiency of the executive branch of the State government and at the same time achieve substantial savings for the taxpayer. The people of our State want their government operated in a businesslike manner and they have a right to expect that we will promptly and aggressively move toward real progress in that direction.

The challenge to all of us lies in the fact that for the past 35 years there has been talk of this problem, but for the most part very little has been done about it. Approximately 30 years after statehood and partly as the result of the experience and actions of other States, it was realized that the organization structure of the executive branch was defective. Thus, during 1921-22, consultants were engaged, at a cost of \$25,000, to study the executive branch and to recommend a plan for improvement. Few of the many recommendations arising from that study were ever adopted. In 1925, however, two Departments, Finance and Agriculture, were established and several independent offices and boards were abolished.

During the intervening years, the volume and variety of functions have increased greatly and, largely by statute, there has been a piecemeal, uncoordinated enlargement of the State government. The new study of the executive branch authorized by the 1953 legislature revealed the extent to which our governmental structure has overgrown. The 90 State agencies, boards, and commissions of the 1921 study had by 1954 increased to 125. The 1900 State employees of 1921 had by 1958 increased to over 7,000. The 1921 general appropriation of about \$6½ million had by 1957 increased to about \$32½ million. Thus, if the 1921 legislature saw a need for reorganization, it is crystal clear that the need has by now become a necessity. The time has come when the consideration of measures designed to improve the efficiency of State government can no longer be delayed. While every reasonable effort must be made to maintain and improve the quality of essential governmental services, the State of South Dakota cannot move forward under the handicap of obsolete governmental structures, nor can the taxpayers be expected to continue indefinitely to provide increased financial support for duplicative activities and overlapping functions. As a result of the 1954 study, we have the benefit of the recommendations of the "Little Hoover" committee drawn from the membership of the 1953 legislature. This committee was, of

course, named after the National committee which pioneered this work in our Federal Government, a committee headed by former President Herbert Hoover, who accepted his post as a civic service at the request of President Harry Truman. Too, we have the benefit of the report and recommendations of the bipartisan efficiency and economy committee, whose membership came from the 1955 legislature. The entire reorganization program is, in my view, completely bipartisan and one which has only the objective of reducing the cost of operating our State government by increasing its efficiency. In order to provide improved public service and to promote efficiency in State government, I earnestly recommend that this legislature:

1. Establish a State department of commerce which would consolidate the existing functions of the insurance department, the banking department, the securities commission, the fire marshal, the aeronautics commission, and the corporate supervision function of the secretary of State. This in brief would bring the regulation of business agencies into one department. I think you would be interested to know that former Gov. M. Q. Sharpe made practically the same recommendation in his 1945 inaugural message. I now quote from that part of Governor Sharpe's message wherein he recommends consolidation of the department of banking, insurance, and securities: "This would be a propitious time, therefore, to unite these two departments into one single State department to be designated as the department of banking and insurance and headed by a single commissioner of banking, securities, and insurance. I have held conferences with officials of both departments and have found that this can be done with a considerable saving of expense and at the same time an increase of efficiency in both fields of regulation and inspection. The plan has been in effect for years in other States and, in my opinion, would be advantageous in South Dakota. It can be effected with one or two simple amendments to present laws and without interfering with operations of either department. The last session of the legislature authorized placing the securities commission in the insurance department and this was effected and is now operating with saving of expense and increased efficiency for the State. The three departments are closely related to one another in their operations and should now be united into one."

NO ACTION

Unfortunately, this excellent recommendation was not favorably acted upon by the 1945 legislature and has not since been re-submitted in any subsequent inaugural message.

2. A reorganization of the department of agriculture is in order. It must be strengthened to become a real force in aiding the welfare of agriculture, our No. 1 industry in South Dakota. The new department of agriculture should consolidate and centralize the many different boards, agencies, and commissions now dealing with various agricultural phases but without any real coordinating or executive direction from any source. I therefore recommend that you give full consideration to bringing into the department of agriculture the horticulture agency, the office of State veterinary, the South Dakota State Horticultural Society, the dairy industry commission, the State brand board, the State weed board, the State soil

conservation committee, the State weather control commission, the State livestock sanitary board, the seed certification board, and the State fair board. The incorporation of the administrative functions of the above agencies into one department and the merger of the several boards will simplify administrative direction, coordinate the work, and eliminate duplication of effort. It will reduce much of the current confusion in the minds of the farmers and ranchers served by these agencies and make for savings of administrative costs. A replacement of the above-mentioned boards by a single board of agriculture upon which were represented leaders in all of the different phases of farm and ranch activities, would insure that the viewpoint of all interests affected would be fully and adequately considered.

3. I recommend that the duties of the State bond board, the South Dakota Rural Credit Board, the State surplus property committee, and the State travel commission be included within the department of finance and that these boards be abolished. This recommendation places before you one of the reforms suggested by the 1954 executive branch study authority by the 1953 legislature.

4. The need for executive branch reorganization is a continuing one. Thus our Federal Government and several of the State governments have already vested in the executive the authority to institute such further reorganization measures as may seem advisable, subject, however, to the right of the legislature to disapprove such administrative reforms. A statute of this nature recently passed in the State of Michigan has been hailed by students of State government as a model step in the right direction. I therefore recommend for your consideration a statute patterned after the Michigan law but tailor made to fit the special needs of our own State of South Dakota in the field of governmental reform.

FISCAL AFFAIRS

It is my firm belief that our people want State Government operated on a pay-as-you-go basis. However, we are now spending more than we are taking in. Last month's printed report of the State auditor covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, reveals that the State's general fund balance of about \$13 million, June 30, 1957, had dropped to less than \$10 million, June 30, 1958. A study of figures and public records now available in the offices of the State treasurer, auditor and comptroller further indicates that the general fund balance at the end of the present biennium, June 30, 1958, will be \$6 million or less.

While we view the long range future of our great State with confidence, we must also be on guard against the time when our tax revenues and other receipts may be temporarily decreased by a period of drought or business depression. If we continue spending beyond our income until all our reserves are gone, only to run unexpectedly into a period of general economic distress we could conceivably find our State in the unhealthy position of paying 6 percent interest on unpaid State warrants, unpaid because of a lack of money in the State treasury to pay them. In short, the time has now come when we must consider most seriously the question of whether the general fund of our State can in safety be permitted to go much below the expected \$6 million mark of June 30, 1959.

It is obvious that we can operate under a balanced budget for the next 2 years only if the total appropriation for the coming biennium do not exceed receipts and revenues conservatively estimated for the same period. To put it another way, we have now come to the point where we cannot any longer spend the State's money unless we have already provided for the raising

of revenues sufficient to meet such expenditure. No one is more anxious than I to see our institutions, departments and functions of State Government adequately and reasonably supported. This desire, however, can never be used as an excuse for retreating from the fundamental principle that any unit of Government can spend only such funds as it exacts from its citizens by way of taxes and that for every tax dollar spent we must insist upon a dollar's worth of services or goods.

TAXATION

Monumental problems face us in the general field of taxation. Property taxes have been carried to dangerously high levels, with recent sharp increases in many cases exceeding 50 percent, particularly on real estate. On the other hand, demands upon State and local governments for new services and for drastic increases in services traditionally rendered have sent governmental budgets to new highs in this inflationary period in which we now live. Surely the time has come to take a long, searching look at the whole structure of taxation in South Dakota. Our taxpayers are willing to pay for those States, local, and educational services they consider essential, but only if the tax law is one generally considered fair and equitable, properly assessed and economically administered. The complexity of the problem and the lack of a ready answer from any legislative source is pointed up by the report of the assessment, taxation, and finance committee of the legislative research council, drawn from the membership of the 1957 legislature, which report is dated October 1958. In point 1 of the summary of the report, the committee gives this summary of its study and I now quote from the report:

The committee concludes "that at this time it cannot present any satisfactory recommendation for a tax that would be either in lieu of or provide any relief for personal and real property taxation and recommends that the matter of property tax relief again be studied in the light of actions taken by and demands made on the 1959 legislature." Clearly, the time has come to take a new look at the whole field of taxation, both State and local, in South Dakota. This thorough, comprehensive, year-long study can best be made by a bipartisan citizens committee representing all walks of life, such group to receive the fullest cooperation of all sources of State government, but to be completely free to reach its own conclusions from its own independent study. I am sure that many of you know that this form of tax study by an independent citizens group has already been successfully conducted in the State of Minnesota. It is most interesting to note that although the citizens of this committee came from all types of business, agriculture, and industry that after thorough study the committee was able to unanimously recommend to the Minnesota Legislature a number of worthwhile and needed reforms. The same method has been successfully followed in at least one other Midwestern State.

Sometimes we of the executive and legislative branch can be too close to the problem. A citizens committee of leaders in the various fields, having no connection with the State government, can bring a new approach or a keen reevaluation of our present revenue-raising methods.

I, therefore, respectfully suggest that legislation to carry the foregoing recommendation into effect be enacted by this legislature and that such legislation carry an emergency clause with the provision that the group begin its studies by April 1 and that the full report of the group be placed on file in the office of the Governor by January 1, 1960. At such time I will carefully study the report and if the report contains recommendations having the support of the great majority of the committee and recommen-

dations which can be of immediate value to our State and its taxpaying citizens I will give full consideration to the question of immediately calling the legislature into special session for the purpose of enacting such recommendations into law. I do believe that out of a thorough tax study now we can bring forth in the future, when and if they are needed, taxation measures that will find true popular support because they are as fair and equitable as possible to all taxpayers.

Up to know I have not seen the proposed budget for the next biennium. I am therefore unable to make any statement concerning any of its items at this time. Our law provides the incoming Governor a period of 10 days after receipts of the budget message of the retiring Governor, within which to send a supplemental budget message to the legislature. In the short period thus allotted to me, and after the fullest consideration possible, if necessary, I will send to you my supplemental message on this vital part of State government.

EDUCATION

The people of South Dakota are justifiably proud of our State's educational achievements. The public school system and the institutions of higher education, together with the many excellent private educational institutions, have established an enviable record in training the youth of our State for positions of leadership in South Dakota, and in the Nation. But the needs and standards of education are constantly advancing and South Dakota must move forward with other States, or see its school system relegated to an inferior position.

The contribution of the real and personal property taxpayer in South Dakota for education on the local level is substantially greater than the national average. While I know that South Dakotans want better than average education for the children of this State, we must make renewed efforts to achieve all possible economies, consistent with sound educational practices. The presence of inefficiencies in the South Dakota public school system is suggested by the fact that we have a higher number of school districts, and a lower average number of pupils per district than many of the other States. The resulting high cost per pupil is perhaps responsible for the fact that even with property taxes at an extremely high level a number of South Dakota school districts are still operating in the red.

In order to maintain and improve the quality of educational services in South Dakota, to equalize the costs of education among the several categories of taxpayers, and to promote economy and efficiency in the operation of our school system, I earnestly suggest that this legislature consider:

1. Revision of the appropriate school laws to achieve a more workable plan of school district reorganization, always keeping in mind the traditions of local control and the right of appeal to the courts.

2. I recommend the adoption of a minimum foundation program which will establish formulas for the distribution of school aid, which will encourage adequate educational standards, efficiency in operations, and a more equitable distribution of public school costs. The quality of education and the efficiency with which educational services can be provided are not exclusively and uniquely determined by the size of the school. Area, transportation, distances and time, adequacy of the tax base, and the population density—as well as number of students enrolled, must be taken into account in the determination of the ideal size of school districts. However, there is rather clear and unmistakable evidence that costs per pupil are excessive in very small school units, particularly in the smaller high schools. The extent to which all of the people of the State should be required to subsidize the continued operation of such

high cost units through existing or increased State aid is a debatable question. But I respectfully suggest that the time has come when the chosen representatives of all the people should arrive at a clearcut policy decision on this vital matter. In considering the general matter of the minimum foundation plan, this legislature should undoubtedly be mindful that one of the objectives of such a plan is the relief of local property taxes and any such plan should contain safeguards to insure attainment of this goal.

No school system is any better than the quality of the teachers comprising its faculty. The exodus from South Dakota of well-qualified teachers is truly alarming. While most of our schools cannot establish salary schedules as attractive as those found in other States, we can provide other inducements for teachers to remain in South Dakota. Therefore, I recommend that this legislature give full consideration to adoption of a teacher retirement system. Such a system could be financed jointly by the school district, the participating teacher, and the State.

Defense Education Act

I also suggest that this legislature consider adoption of measures necessary to implement the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This act recently passed by Congress provides for loans to college students, grants for equipment, national defense fellowships, the screening of exceptionally well qualified students, guidance counselor training, technician training centers, and foreign language training programs. South Dakota's allocation for the current fiscal year is estimated to be nearly \$220,000. For the State appropriation of only \$30,000, approximately \$237,000 would be available for student loans among our colleges.

We are happy to note the steady enrollment increases at our State institutions of higher learning even though this may indicate a need for more staff and physical plant. We must meet this challenge to provide a college education for all South Dakota youth who desire it. I think there is no area of governmental activity where we can more truly think of our expenditures as investments rather than expenses, than in the field of education. In training the leaders and citizens of tomorrow, in research, and in the development of agricultural and industrial improvements, our institutions of higher learning repay the people of the State many times what they invest in them.

During the campaign and since the election I have visited most of our State institutions, in order to gain firsthand knowledge of their needs and problems. Recently I was surprised and shocked to learn of the loss of accreditation of the Engineering School at South Dakota State College. I intend to immediately inquire into all of the facts surrounding this matter, and to do everything possible to bring about prompt reinstatement of the school.

In connection with the administration of higher education I have always felt that our board of regents should be composed of the best qualified persons in South Dakota. I'm sure we all realize that under present law, no resident of a county in which any State institution of higher learning is located may be appointed to the board. This means that by residence alone, nearly one-fourth of the citizens of this State are denied the opportunity of ever serving on the board, even though they may otherwise be eminently well qualified. I recommend that this statute be amended and that the board of regents be reconstituted so that the new board membership can be selected from the most qualified persons over the entire State.

The need for relocation of the school for the blind has been apparent for some time. The easy way would be to sidestep this knotty problem or simply make no mention of it. But these young people are entitled to better

than that—from those of us fortunate enough to be blessed with good health.

I therefore recommend that appropriate legislation be enacted to relocate the South Dakota School for the Blind.

NATURAL RESOURCES

One of the oldest resources will soon become our newest frontier. As such it offers our State virtually limitless possibilities for power, irrigation, industry and recreation. I refer to what will be when completed one of the largest bodies of fresh water in North America. This chain of lakes in Central South Dakota will be formed by the Missouri River dams, stretching in one continuous line from our northernmost tip to our southern boundary.

It is perhaps even more noteworthy that when these reservoirs are filled South Dakota will rank fourth in the Nation in the amount of usable water in storage. The price we have paid for this is the loss of one-half million acres of agricultural land. Whether or not this sacrifice has been worthwhile will in considerable measure depend on the action taken at this legislative session and upon the action taken by this administration. For simple logic will tell us that there will be a great demand from all the States to our south for the right to use and appropriate this vast water supply. Unless we move immediately and vigorously to lay claim to our rightful share of the river water we will awake one day to find that while we slept our water rights floated down the river.

I therefore earnestly recommend that this legislature enact permissive water conservancy district legislation to prove unmistakably to Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior that we intend to claim and utilize water rights for all of the water we will need within our State. The legislation enacted should be enabling legislation. It should provide a given area or group of people a choice between irrigation or dryland farming. It should give cities and towns a right to reject or accept municipal water supply from the reservoirs. At the time it should protect the rights of all the people of our State to use the water for any desirable purpose.

As the sponsor of a Senate bill early in the 1955 session calling for creation of a strong industrial promotion agency with a full-time director and staff, I can assure you that my interest in business and industrial promotion in South Dakota is not something which has developed overnight. I am keenly aware of the fact that this new water supply and electric power source could make our State far more attractive to industry than ever before. To my best ability I will make the office of Governor the spearhead and coordinator of all State offices working on any phase of Missouri River development, whether it be power, irrigation, industrial, or recreation. If this legislature will provide the tools, including a conservancy act, and adequate funds for carrying on the work of industrial promotion, we will rise to the inspiring challenge of South Dakota's new frontier. This, of course, is not to say that we should neglect other aspects of the business and industrial potential of the State. We must shape our development program to give technical and marketing assistance to the hundreds of promising small business firms in the State, aiding them to expand their out-of-State markets in the knowledge that all of our citizens will benefit, directly or indirectly, from the new money thus brought into South Dakota.

The outdoor recreation potential of our State is certainly one of our greatest natural resources. We must make the benefits of our mountains, our lakes, our parks, and other game and recreation areas readily available to the greatest possible number of our own citizens. Let us also recognize that South Dakota can become the vacation land

of ever-increasing numbers of visitors from other States, for the recreation potential of our new lake system is as yet practically untapped. Vacationers leave millions of dollars annually in our State and make substantial contributions to our sales and gas tax revenues. But many other States are competing with us in the tourist field. Thus we must use all legitimate means to invite our fellow Americans to visit and vacation with us in South Dakota. In this connection, it appears that a closer coordination of our recreational and industrial advertising program can eliminate costly duplication of effort and advertising space, and at the same time fully acquaint the Nation with South Dakota's attraction in both important fields.

HIGHWAYS

There is plenty of elbow room in South Dakota and that is one of the things which makes our State a fine place in which to live and raise a family. But with our "wide open spaces" we need good roads, not only to get farm products to market but for many other business and recreational purposes today considered a necessary part of modern living. It is therefore important that we provide adequate funds for both our primary highway system, and our farm-to-market road program.

As a part of the national military road network inaugurated by our Federal Government approximately 2½ years ago, all of the 48 States of the Union are now busy with the construction of their assigned share of this Interstate Highway System. Ninety-one and eight-tenths percent of the cost of construction of the Interstate Highway is paid by the Federal Government. Fifty-six percent of the cost of construction of the State primary and secondary system is borne by the United States. If South Dakota should ever fail to provide sufficient funds for matching the Federal funds allocated to this State, there is no doubt that our share would simply be passed to other interested States. It is for this legislature to determine whether South Dakota shall secure its share of this increased Federal aid for highway purposes.

As chairman of the State highway commission I intend to commence a close study of the administrative and engineer operation of the State highway department to determine whether savings can be effected within the department. Full consideration will be given to the adoption of advanced methods of highway planning and design which I am informed other midwestern States have already instituted, with a substantial saving in operation costs and an increase in efficiency. Among other things, this can include the fullest use of aerial mapping, and installation of electronic equipment in the planning section. Study will also be given to the question of letting major maintenance projects to the lowest bidder, the same as new construction. This might make it possible to reduce the number of large, expensive road machinery units presently maintained by the State, but in use only part of the time.

From inquiry which I caused to be made, it appears substantial savings can be achieved in the purchase of materials used to reflectorize our motor vehicle license plates. Use of an alternate material which would apparently be just as effective could save the State of South Dakota \$161,000 in the manufacture of these plates, under the present system. I recommend serious consideration of a return to the annual license plate. Originally South Dakota went to the 3-year plate because of the high cost of reflectorizing. Economies which we believe can now be effected in the method of manufacture, would be sufficient to enable a return to the annual plate system.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The tragic loss of lives on South Dakota highways is a matter of grave concern to all

of us. It is a shocking fact that South Dakota's 1958 traffic death toll was the highest in the Nation. Actually, the rate of deaths per mile traveled on South Dakota highways is nearly double the national average, and more than twice that of many of our neighboring States. While there is no way of measuring the grief and anguish of the family of the traffic victims, the total cost of all traffic accidents in South Dakota in 1958 was estimated by the National Safety Council at more than \$31 million, in other words, more than our entire State budget for a 1-year period. The public has now rightly come to expect that this legislature will move resolutely to curb and punish careless driving and to promote and encourage highway safety. Yet there is no magic formula or single piece of legislation which will automatically make our highways safe. The problem is a complex one and a satisfactory solution requires a coordinated attack along the following lines: First of all, any serious scheme proposed for reducing the traffic toll must include education and the educational tools we possess. We must expand our drivers education program to make the licensing of drivers under 18 years of age contingent on their successful completion of an approved course in drivers education in one of our public or private high schools. The value of this training is best shown by the fact that insurance companies grant a 15-percent premium reduction to all persons who have completed such a course. We should emphasize traffic safety education in primary and secondary schools and expand teacher preparation for such courses.

2. South Dakota is the only State in the Union which does not require any sort of drivers examination as a condition to driving on the public highways. We need a drivers licensing law which will provide for a knowledge test of traffic laws and safe driving practices, a vision test, and a behind-the-wheel driving test. This should and will improve traffic safety by upgrading driver quality and by eliminating certain drivers who cannot be trusted with the privilege.

3. The establishment of a point system of driver improvement and control. The average person will make a special effort to drive within the law if he realized the penalty for not doing so could be the loss of his driving privilege. This program is already in successful operation in many of our neighboring States.

4. In the field of engineering, traffic safety should become an even greater factor in our planning and construction. Prompt construction of the Interstate System to adequate standards in the shortest possible time without neglects of the other rural and urban systems will help make driving safer.

For the present, at least, I make no recommendation for any further increase in the size of the State motor patrol. It is my belief that the utilization and deployment of this force in the most efficient manner will enable us to do the job without an increase in their numbers.

LABOR

The adaptability of South Dakota's labor force is one of our greatest resources of economic expansion. The contributions made by organized labor to the welfare of our entire community are too little recognized. South Dakota labor has a record of working consistently for the extension of educational opportunity, for the raising of our standard of living and the mass purchasing power on which business prosperity depends, and it has been in the forefront of the battle to safeguard the processes of democratic society.

In the field of workmen's compensation, the obligation toward the injured worker has long been recognized. But South Dakota has failed to keep up with the established standards in this field, as our economy and our industry have moved ahead. Our workmen's

compensation law must be modernized and brought up to date with a liberalization of benefits in accordance with the formula which was stated as the objective of this program when it was created many years ago.

WELFARE

We are all indebted to the hardy pioneers who led in the early development of our great State. Now in the sunset of their life, many of these senior citizens need our help and unfortunately the spiraling increase of living costs has far outdistanced the modest increases we have granted in assistance payments. The result has been in far too many cases substandard living quarters and too little to eat. And worst of all our assistance program has actually penalized them for helping themselves; when one of our older people was able to earn an extra dollar or two, the State has in effect taken it away from him by reducing his allotment an equal amount.

I recommend that consideration be given to amending this law so that they will have more opportunity to help themselves by earning a little extra money.

Many of these elderly citizens are in need of medical care and attention. When it is provided, under the present system, the burden is upon our counties to bear the cost. Recognizing the acute need for better medical care for our indigent senior citizens, and in an effort to give some relief to the local governments, the Federal Government has had in effect for several years a grant-in-aid program in this field. Twenty-six States now participate in this program.

I recommend that thorough consideration be given to the question of our participation.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Our Indian people are America's first citizens. As such they leave some special problems which are not much closer to solution today than 25 years ago. Our South Dakota Indian Affairs Commission is the logical agency of State government to study this field. The membership includes both persons of white and Indian blood. Unfortunately the statute creating this body has in the past tended to handicap its operations. I suggest that the Commission be revitalized and given all necessary means to thoroughly consider the area of the State's responsibility to our Indian citizens. This Commission should make and file its report by January 1, 1960 for the appropriate action.

I have by this message sought to outline the fundamental program of the new administration. The desirability of keeping my remarks within reasonable time limits has made it impossible for me to cover all of the wide range of subjects with which you will be concerned during the legislative session. Therefore, I may from time to time during the session submit for your consideration one or more special messages on subjects of paramount interest which could not be fully treated at this time.

In conclusion I wish to express to Governor Foss and members of his administration, my personal thanks for the courtesy and cooperation they have extended. Having been on opposite sides in two recent political campaigns has not interfered with our desire and ability to be friendly and to view important matters with regard to the greatest good for the people and our State. I maintain that no problem which may divide us into separate groups can withstand solution provided we approach it with reverence and determination. My ancestors have imbued me with a sincere and deep conviction that it is man's prerogative and duty to determine, to some extent, what his destiny may be, so long as he shows respect for others concerned. The words which are spoken during this inauguration are intended to provoke constructive thoughts along the lines of some legislation which I

feel merits your consideration. Ultimately the combined efforts of your joint meditation will write the lasting record from which historians will determine the extent to which the 1959 South Dakota Legislature gave the greatest benefit to the greatest possible number of our people. You have obligated yourselves as I have to carry out great responsibility with honor and with adherence in your decisions to the principle of the Golden Rule. May we never be too proud or confident to counsel together or to seek the aid of divine providence. I have profound confidence that you will enact a program which will reflect favorably on the two-party system of government. As we proceed from here, let us pledge to protect and promote this State and its government. Let us be guided in word and deed by the motto which has stood the test of time: "Under God the people rule."

The History and Development of the Louisiana Civil Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as is well known Louisiana is the only State in the Union governed by the civil law, as embodied in the Louisiana Civil Code. The Louisiana Civil Code was modeled after the code Napoleon, and the latter, in turn, was based on Roman law, as exemplified by the Justinian Code.

The first Louisiana Civil Code was promulgated in 1808. A very impressive ceremony was held in the new supreme court building in New Orleans on October 13, 1958, celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Civil Code. On that occasion I was privileged to hear an address by Hon. John T. Hood, Jr., judge of the 14th judicial district court of Lake Charles, La., on the subject of the "History and Development of the Louisiana Civil Code." I commend the address of this eminent jurist to all my colleagues in this body and especially to students of law and history, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD for permanent future useful reference and historical research material.

The address of Judge Hood follows:

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOUISIANA CIVIL CODE

The Louisiana Civil Code has been called the most perfect child of the civil law. It has been praised as "the clearest, fullest, the most philosophical, and the best adapted to the exigencies of modern society." It has been characterized as "perhaps the best of all modern codes throughout the world." Based on Roman law, modeled after the great Code Napoleon, enriched with the experiences of at least 27 centuries, and mellowed by American principles and traditions, it is a living and durable monument to those who created it. After 150 years of trial, the Civil Code of Louisiana remains venerable, a body of substantive law adequate for the present and capable of expanding to meet future needs. At this sesquicentennial it is appropriate for us to review the history and development of the Louisiana Civil Code.

The event which we celebrate is the passage of an act by the Legislature of the Territory of Orleans, approved on March 31, 1808, promulgating a compilation of laws, now commonly referred to as the Civil Code of 1808. To adequately appreciate the significance of this legislative enactment, it is necessary to review the circumstances which existed at that time, and the events which led up to the adoption of this code.

Civil government actually began in Louisiana in 1712. The French laws governed from that date until 1769, when O'Reilly abolished those laws and established in their stead the Spanish law. The United States took formal possession of the province of Louisiana on December 20, 1803, about 8 months after the Louisiana Purchase had been concluded. France had assumed sovereignty for a period of only 20 days prior to that date, during which time nothing was done to repeal the Spanish laws or to establish the laws of France, so at the time the United States assumed sovereignty the laws of Spain were still in force.

The first official act performed by William C. C. Claiborne, 1 of the 2 commissioners appointed by the President to take possession of this Province, was to provide for the retention of the "laws heretofore in force," which of course were the Spanish laws.¹

The laws of Spain at that time were multitudinous, composed of 11 different codes, and containing more than 20,000 laws, with many conflicting provisions. Even in Spain there was a great diversity of opinion as to which of these codes or laws should prevail in case of conflict.² Relatively few civil law treatises were available, and those which could be obtained in the territory were not translated into the English language.

The population of Louisiana at that time was estimated by Claiborne to be about 72,000, one-half of whom were slaves. The city of New Orleans had a population of only 10,000. A great majority of the white inhabitants were of French descent, and a substantial portion of the remainder were Spanish. Only a few lawyers were located in this Province prior to the Louisiana Purchase, and most of those had theretofore limited their activities to advising the Spanish officials.

The formal delivery of Louisiana to the United States had not been completed, however, before a host of emigrants, both American and foreign born, flocked to New Orleans—intent on making a fortune. Among them were a number of lawyers, most of whom were of common law origin, and many of whom were ignorant of the language of the people among whom they had settled. Fortunately for the future of the State, however, the lawyers who were located here during these early years, whether emigrant or native born, with few exceptions, were men of remarkable ability. The names of Martin, Derbigny, Matthews, Lewis, Hennen, Duponceau, Brown, Porter, Moreau-Lislet, Workman, Carleton, Livingston, and Mazureau are but a few of the great names which would have adorned the legal history of any time. But, even these able lawyers and the newly appointed judges could not properly interpret and apply the complex and conflicting Spanish law. The need for some immediate clarification of the laws which governed Louisiana was urgent.

Claiborne was a common law lawyer, a native of Virginia. He began practicing law in Tennessee when he was 20 years of age, served on the supreme court of that State when he was 21, and as a Representative in Congress at the age of 22. He was only 28 years of age when he, as a commissioner of the United States, took possession of Louisiana. Claiborne was loyal to his country and disposed to be fair to the people of his new

trust, but he was handicapped in that he understood neither French nor Spanish. His early proclamation that the Spanish laws should remain in effect was intended as a temporary measure only, because Claiborne planned eventually to establish the English common law as the basic law for this new territory, just as had been done in all of the States which had been admitted to the Union up to that time.

Many inhabitants of Louisiana, already displeased over the arbitrary powers conferred by Congress on the president and his appointees in the territory, became alarmed when they learned that the newly appointed American officials intended to institute the common law system. Their experience with Spanish judicial proceedings had left them with little or no respect for the courts, and they were afraid of the common law system where the decisions of the courts became law, and where they would be required to search through English jurisprudence to determine what laws applied. They preferred to continue to be governed by the laws of Spain, with which they were familiar, where all enforceable laws were required to have some statutory origin, and where the decisions of the courts did not assume the status of laws but were considered merely as judicial interpretations of statutory provisions.

There is little question but that the common law system would have been established here shortly after the United States assumed sovereignty, and that Louisiana would be a common law state today, were it not for the fact that Edward Livingston, a New York lawyer who emigrated to Louisiana in 1803, emerged as a leader in opposing this action, and as a champion for the cause of retaining a civil law system in the territory.

Livingston was a man of unusual ability. The history of his life and his remarkable accomplishments in political and professional fields, in New York, in Louisiana, in the Nation's Capital and in France, are well known and need not be recounted here. Although educated in common law traditions, Livingston had made a study of the civil law before his arrival in Louisiana and felt for it an affection which is evidenced all through his literary and professional activity.

Claiborne had the misfortune shortly after his arrival in Louisiana of acquiring as bitter political enemies Edward Livingston and Daniel Clark, a wealthy and influential citizen of New Orleans. Their personal dislike for each other was such that Claiborne in his official letters referred to Livingston and Clark as unprincipled and as having views hostile to the interests of the United States.³ On one occasion in 1805 when Governor Claiborne accused Daniel Clark of being implicated in the Burr conspiracy, a duel ensued in which Claiborne received a bullet wound through his thigh. Because of this intense political feud, the controversy between Livingston and Claiborne as to which of the two rival legal systems should be established in this new territory was sparked with a great deal of bitterness.

On March 26, 1804, Congress divided the area included in the Louisiana Purchase into two parts, that portion which is now substantially the State of Louisiana being called the Territory of Orleans. The law provided that the governing authority of this territory should be a legislative council, consisting of 13 members appointed by the President. The need for adopting some system of substantive law for the territory was urgent, so Claiborne, as the first Governor of that Territory, was anxious for the legislative council to convene as soon as possible for that purpose. For a number of reasons, however, he experienced considerable difficulty and delay in assembling the first legislative council.

One reason for the delay was that a yellow fever epidemic struck New Orleans at that

time taking the lives of a large portion of the population of that city. Claiborne's wife and only child died on the same day—victims of the fever—and his private secretary, his brother-in-law, and several members of his staff also perished. Claiborne himself became infected and was bedridden for 3 weeks.

Also, a slave insurrection was threatened, which required Claiborne's attention in organizing a volunteer militia.⁴

A third reason for the delay was that Livingston, fearing that this first legislative council selected by Claiborne would establish the common law as the basic law of the territory, prepared a memorial urging Congress to grant statehood immediately to the Territory of Orleans in order that it might thereafter be governed by elected representatives.⁵ This memorial was adopted at a public meeting held in New Orleans in October, 1804, and thereafter with the help of Daniel Clark it was distributed throughout the territory for signatures, and was then presented to Congress.⁶ It thus received wide publicity. The feelings aroused by this memorial caused several men to refuse to serve on the legislative council, caused others to withdraw the consent they had previously given, and created stronger opposition to Claiborne's plan to change the basic laws of the territory.⁷

The legislative council was convened on December 5, 1804, however, as soon as Claiborne was able to locate eight men who were acceptable to him and who would agree to serve, one more than was needed for a quorum. At its first meeting this council appointed three of its members as a committee to prepare a civil code and a criminal code, and "to employ two counselors-at-law to assist them in drafting the said codes."⁸

This committee was disposed to appoint James Brown and Edward Livingston as the two counselors-at-law to assist in drafting these codes, and agreed on a fee of \$5,000 for that work,⁹ but Governor Claiborne, although favorable to Brown, opposed the appointment of Livingston. The passions raised by this disagreement paralyzed the work of the committee appointed to draft a civil code, and consequently it did nothing.

The memorial prepared by Livingston did not accomplish its avowed purpose, but it was one of the principal reasons why Congress, a few months later, provided that the governing authority of the territory thereafter would consist of a legislature, composed of an elected house of representatives and an appointed legislative council.¹⁰

In 1806, the first legislature of the Territory of Orleans convened and, apparently siding with Livingston, promptly adopted an act providing that the Territory of Orleans should be governed by the Roman and Spanish laws which were in effect at the time of the Louisiana Purchase.¹¹ This act was vetoed by Governor Claiborne on May 26, 1806. The legislature, in obvious annoyance, then passed a resolution for adjournment, assigning as the reason therefor that, "Their best acts were rejected by the Governor."¹²

A few days later several members of the legislature signed and published a manifesto, purporting to be a resolution for the dissolution of the general assembly because of Claiborne's veto. This document revealed the attitude of a majority of the legislators toward the two rival legal systems. Here are some of the statements contained in this manifesto:

"We certainly do not attempt to draw any parallel between the civil law and the common law; but, in short, the wisdom of the civil law is recognized by all Europe; and this law is the one which nineteen-twentieths of the population of Louisiana know and are accustomed to from childhood, which law they

Footnotes at end of speech.

would not see themselves deprived without falling into despair . . .

"The debate in the Chamber of Representatives and even the refusal of the sanction of the Governor, do they not seem . . . [to raise] the presumption that there is a secret intention of throwing us, despite ourselves, into the frightful chaos of the common law?"¹²

On June 7, 1808, just a few days after this manifesto was issued and published, the legislature adopted a resolution appointing James Brown and Louis Moreau-Lislet "to compile and prepare jointly a civil code for the use of this territory." The resolution provided that:

"The two juriconsults shall make the civil law by which this territory is now governed the groundwork of said code."¹³

Governor Claiborne at that point apparently decided to bow to the will of the majority, because he approved the resolution, in spite of the fact that it specifically directed that the laws of Spain, or the civil law, rather than the common law, should be used as the basis for the proposed code.

Brown and Lislet had entirely different backgrounds in law, one being bred in the intricacies of the common law, and the other trained in the principles of the civil law. Brown was born in Virginia, but practiced law in Kentucky and served as secretary of State there before coming to Louisiana. After establishing himself here he served as the first secretary of the Territory of Orleans, as district attorney, as a member of the convention which framed the first constitution for Louisiana, as U.S. Senator, and as Minister to France.

Lislet was born in Santo Domingo, a French dependency. He received his education and legal training in France, and came to New Orleans about the time of the Louisiana Purchase, while he was in his thirties. After settling in America, he perhaps contributed more to the legal literature of this State than has any other one person. During his busy career, he participated in more than 200 cases before the State supreme court, and also served at various times as a member of the State house of representatives, a State senator, as a parish judge, as attorney general, and as a Representative in Congress.

Brown and Lislet were eminent lawyers. They were well versed in both French and Spanish, and for some time they had advocated the adoption of a code of laws for the territory.

They completed the work assigned to them in less than 2 years, and the civil code which they prepared was formally adopted by the legislature on March 31, 1808.¹⁴ Governor Claiborne approved the adoption of this code, but in a letter which he wrote to the secretary of State a few months later he stated that it was still his object "to assimilate our system of jurisprudence as much as possible to that of the several States of the Union."¹⁵ On October 11, 1808, Claiborne also wrote to one of the judges in the territory that:

"The Code will probably be greatly censured by many native Citizens of the United States who reside in the Territory. From principle and habit, they are attached to that system of Jurisprudence, prevailing in the several States under which themselves and their fathers were reared: For myself, I am free to declare the pleasure it would give me to see the Laws of Orleans assimilated to those of the States generally, not only from a conviction, that such Laws are for the most part wise and just, but the opinion I entertain, that in a Country, where a unity of Government and Interests exists, it is highly desirable to introduce thro'out the same laws and Customs. . . ."

Claiborne obviously was sincere in his belief that the common law system was superior to that of the civil law, and in his attempts to establish the common law in the Territory of Orleans it has never been questioned but that he was motivated solely by a desire to do what he considered to be best for his country and for the inhabitants of that Territory.

The official title given to the code of laws which was adopted in 1808 was "Digest of the Civil Laws Now in Force in the Territory of Orleans, With Alterations and Amendments Adapted to Its Present System of Government." Although these compilers described their work as a digest of the laws then in force, it actually was a complete civil code, divided into three books, each of which was broken down into titles, chapters, and articles, similar to our present code, except that in numbering the articles a new series of numbers was used in each title.

The resolution authorizing the preparation of this code provided that "the indemnity justly due to the juriconsults shall be determined by the legislature at their next session," but that in addition thereto Brown and Lislet each should be paid the sum of \$800 per year for 5 years after the code was completed, in consideration of which it should be their duty to attend the courts in order to take notice of the imperfections in the new code and to report their observations to the legislature.¹⁶ A different agreement must have been entered into later, however, because in 1807 the legislature authorized the payment of \$2,000 to each of these attorneys in full compensation for the services performed by them, three-fifths of which was to be paid immediately and the balance becoming due after completion of the code.¹⁷

The civil code prepared by Brown and Lislet, however, was not based on the Spanish law, as the legislature had directed, but it was based instead on the then newly adopted French Code, the Code Napoleon. No satisfactory explanation has been offered to this date as to why this was done. It is probable, however, that these two attorneys and the legislature had a high regard for the codification experience in France, not only as to form but also as to content, since both the French and the Spanish systems had many common sources in Roman law, and for that reason they may have used the Code Napoleon as a model without any intent to displace the Spanish law.¹⁸ This theory is supported by the fact that there are many differences between the Code Napoleon and the Louisiana Code of 1808, due largely to the fact that there were incorporated into the Louisiana Code a substantial number of Spanish laws, which had not been included in the French Code. The Louisiana Code contained 2,127 articles, a little less than the number contained in the Code Napoleon.¹⁹

There is some speculation among legal scholars as to whether Brown and Lislet modeled the Civil Code of 1808 on the Code Napoleon, as finally adopted, or whether they used only the project or preliminary drafts of such code. Judge Martin, K. A. Cross, and the late Henry P. Dart are among those who contend that only the project of the French Code was available to the redactors at the time the Louisiana Code was adopted.²⁰ They base that conclusion principally on the fact that the Louisiana Code contains a number of articles which were in the project, but were omitted from the Code Napoleon as finally adopted, and that the numbering of articles in the Louisiana Code corresponds to that in the project, but does not correspond to the numbering system used in the final form of the French Code. Other more recent scholars contend that the final and official draft of the Code Napoleon also was used by Brown and Lislet in compiling the first Louisiana Civil Code.²¹ To support that view they point out that the French Code

was promulgated in 1804, 2 years before the redactors of the Louisiana Code were appointed, so they reason that it must have been available to them, and that the Louisiana Code contains some articles which correspond to those in the Code Napoleon, but differ from the text on the same subject which appears in the project.

No attempt will be made here to resolve those differences of opinion. The answer to that particular question, however, may well lie in a very interesting leather-bound book owned by the family of the late Charles de la Vergne, of this city. It is a first edition printing of the Civil Code of 1808, which appears to have been owned by Moreau-Lislet himself, since his name is printed in gold letters on the outside front cover. In this volume, written in pen and ink in French, on pages interspersed for that purpose, is an extensive commentary on the articles of that code, purporting to give the source of each such article. These handwritten comments and notations are voluminous and appear to have been written in 1814 by Lislet or by someone who had intimate knowledge of the work done in drafting this first code. No study of this volume has ever been made, and it is possible that a thorough analysis of it will reveal the actual French sources which were used by Brown and Lislet in drafting this first code, and it may affect the interpretation which has been placed on some of the articles which have been carried over into our present code.

Regardless of the French sources used by the redactors, the primary significance of the adoption of the Civil Code of 1808, of course, was that it constituted the formal recognition and establishment of the civil law, and not the common law, for the Territory.

The resolution appointing Brown and Lislet to prepare a civil code did not specify the language in which that document was to be drafted, but it did authorize the payment of expenses incurred for translations. They actually prepared their digest or code in the French language, and it was translated into English by two other persons appointed for that purpose. For their services each of these translators was paid \$750.²² In formally adopting the code, the legislature directed that it be printed in the French and English languages, and further provided that "if . . . there should be found any obscurity or ambiguity, fault or omission, both the English and French texts shall be consulted, and shall mutually serve to the interpretation of one and the other."²³ Inaccuracies in the translation did appear, and it is significant to note that in a written brief submitted in the case of *Dufour v. Camfranc*, in 1822, Lislet himself disclaimed any responsibility for errors in translating the code into the English language.²⁴ The Supreme Court has consistently held, of course, that in case of conflict the French text shall prevail, since the original draft was in French.²⁵

The act of the legislature adopting the civil code of 1808 repealed only those ancient laws of the territory which were contrary to or irreconcilable with this digest. The Supreme Court, thereafter, in 1817, and in spite of Livingston's arguments to the contrary, held that all of the Spanish laws which formerly were in effect and which were not contrary to the code were still in force.²⁶ This had the effect of revising the Spanish law, and again throwing the substantive law of Louisiana into a state of chaos. In an effort to remedy this situation the legislature authorized the translation and publication of such parts of the "Partidas" as were in force in Louisiana, which translation was done by Moreau-Lislet and Henry Carleton in 1820. This translation did not eliminate the conflicts and confusion in the Spanish law, however, so a restatement of the law was viewed as a necessity.

Footnotes at end of speech.

On March 14, 1822, the legislature adopted a resolution appointing Moreau-Lislet, Edward Livingston, and Pierre Derbigny "to revise the civil code (of 1808) by amending the same in such manner as they will deem it advisable, and by adding unto * * * (it) * * * such of the laws that are still in force and not included therein * * *."

Pierre Derbigny, a linguist, an orator, and an able lawyer, was born in France, of French nobility, but was forced to leave that country during the revolution to avoid political persecution. He came to Louisiana while in his thirties, and shortly thereafter he joined Livingston in actively opposing Claiborne's plan to institute the common-law system here. He, in fact, was one of the three bearers who presented to Congress the memorial prepared by Livingston seeking statehood for the Territory of Orleans. He later served as a justice of the Supreme Court, as Secretary of State and as Governor.

One year after this appointment was made, Lislet, Livingston and Derbigny submitted a report to the legislature in which they made it clear that in performing the task assigned to them it would be their purpose to prepare a code which would be complete and would relieve the courts "in every instance, from the necessity of examining into Spanish statutes, ordinances and uses."²⁹ The legislature approved this plan and ordered the printing and distribution of the code as soon as it was ready for the press.³⁰

Later that same year, 1823, these three attorneys completed and had printed a project of their proposed revision, which they labeled "Additions and Amendments to the Civil Code of the State of Louisiana, Proposed in Obedience to the Resolution of the Legislature of the 14th March 1822, by the Jurists Commissioned for That Purpose." As this title indicates, only the additions and amendments which they recommended were included in the report, the articles of the civil code of 1808 which they did not propose to amend being omitted.

This project also was prepared originally in the French language, and was then translated with some inaccuracies into English. The French text was printed in one volume and the English translation was printed separately in another. Following the text of each proposed article were printed the comments and observations of the redactors, often indicating the reason for the proposed amendment and citing the authorities upon which it was based.³¹

Although there seems to have been no act passed by the legislature for the express purpose of adopting this civil code, the legislature did authorize the printing and promulgation of the code, as amended, by act approved on April 12, 1824. The act provided that the text should be printed in English and French on opposite pages, and that the jurists who had revised the code were to superintend the printing of it, were to number the articles consecutively throughout, and were to add a complete index to it.³²

In February 1825, the legislature granted additional time to the printer to complete the printing of the civil code,³³ and on May 20, 1825, the Secretary of State issued his certificate to the effect that the printing had been completed, and that the code should be deemed promulgated 1 month from that date.³⁴

The title of this completed code, as promulgated, is "Civil Code of the State of Louisiana." Included in it were provisions originating from Spanish law which were not contained in the code of 1808. It also contained some provisions from territorial statutes, and others from common law sources. There were a total of 3,522 articles in this code, more than 1½ times as many as were contained in the code of 1808.

In order to make certain that all of the old Spanish laws were repealed, and to eliminate the necessity of ever having to refer to them again, this code contained an article providing that:

"From and after the promulgation of this code, the Spanish, Roman, and French laws, which were in force in this State when Louisiana was ceded to the United States, and the acts of the legislative council, of the Legislature of the Territory of Orleans, and of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, be and are hereby repealed in every case, for which it has been especially provided in this code, and that they shall not be invoked as laws, even under the pretense that their provisions are not contrary or repugnant to those of this code."³⁵

In spite of this provision, however, the Louisiana Supreme Court, in 1827, held that the Spanish laws which were not contrary to the civil code were still in force, and that the articles of the civil code of 1808, which had been omitted from the 1825 code, also were still in effect.³⁶

These decisions led the legislature to adopt two acts in 1828, one of which provided that "all the civil laws which were in force before the promulgation of the civil code lately promulgated, be and are hereby abrogated," and the other act specifically repealed all articles of the civil code of 1808, except certain provisions therein excepted.³⁷

Even these acts did not have the effect of eliminating further reference to the Spanish laws, because the supreme court shortly thereafter held that they repealed only the positive, written, or statute laws of Spain, and that they did not abrogate those principles of law which had been established or settled by the decisions of courts of justice.³⁸ That apparently has remained the status of the Spanish law in Louisiana to this date.

Changes brought about by the Civil War, together with the adoption of a new constitution, made it necessary to again revise the civil code. Consequently, the legislature, in 1868, authorized a joint committee to select one or more commissioners to revise the civil code.³⁹ John Ray, of the Monroe Bar, who already had been selected to revise the general statutes of the State and the code of practice, also was commissioned to revise the civil code. Ray thereupon employed three attorneys to assist him in this undertaking,⁴⁰ and he and his assistants submitted a project of a revised civil code which was printed in English in 1869. The revised code which they proposed was adopted as Act 97 of the legislature of 1870, and it was given the official title of "The Revised Civil Code of the State of Louisiana." The civil code of 1870 is substantially the code of 1825, except for the elimination of all articles relating to slavery and those which had been repealed, and the incorporation of all acts passed since 1825 amending the civil code of dealing with matters regulated by the code.

There have been no other revisions of the Louisiana Civil Code since 1870, although an unsuccessful attempt to revise it was made 50 years ago. In 1908, the legislature authorized the appointment of a commission to revise and reenact the Civil Code of Louisiana.⁴¹ These commissioners were appointed, and they prepared a project of a revised civil code which was submitted to the legislature in 1910. Action on this project was first postponed, however, and later the proposed revision was rejected, after the Louisiana Bar Association had formally recommended against the adoption of this new code.

During the 88 years which have elapsed since our civil code was last revised, many articles have been amended, repealed, or added, and a number of statutes have been enacted relating to matters which properly should be incorporated into that code. These considerations caused the State Legislature, 10 years ago, in 1948, to adopt an act direct-

ing the Louisiana State Law Institute to prepare comprehensive projects for the revision of the civil code and the code of practice.⁴² The project for the revision of the code of practice is almost complete and soon will be ready to submit to the legislature. It is expected that the difficult and long-term task of preparing a proposed revision of civil code will soon get underway.

The fact that the Louisiana Civil Code has been revised twice during the past 150 years, and a third revision is being contemplated, does not indicate a weakness in that work, but, on the contrary, it evidences an orderly evolution of the law. In the course of time consolidated statements of law in a civil code become overgrown with additional data in amendments and other statutes on the subject matter. Also, new inventions and discoveries present problems which are difficult to settle by reference to older rules or principles. So it is necessary from time to time that such a code be reexamined and perhaps revised or rewritten in order to incorporate all of these changes and to keep it virile and up to date.

The Civil Codes of Italy, Venezuela, Peru, Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil have been revised recently. The French Code itself, on which our code was modeled, is in the process of being revised at this time. The revision of the Civil Code of Holland, which was originally adopted 120 years ago, is almost complete, and the Legislature of the Province of Quebec has authorized the revision of the 90-year-old Quebec Civil Code.

The Louisiana Civil Code is not simply an adaptation of the Code Napoleon. Neither is it a digest of the Spanish laws which were in force in 1808, as the title of the code adopted during that year seems to indicate. It includes many provisions having a basis in common law, but the common law system does not prevail in this State—despite arguments advanced by some to the contrary. The simple truth of the matter is that Louisiana has developed a legal system of its own, and although grounded on civil law, it must be classified as *sul generis*.

The civil law and the civil law method of thinking are deep rooted here, and there is an emotional attachment to it in the minds of the people of this State. The civil code is defended today with the same vigor which characterized the actions of Livingston, Brown, Lislet, Derbigny and others who defended it 150 years ago.

The affection which lawyers throughout this State have for the Louisiana Civil Code now is no less than that which Napoleon expressed for the code of laws which bears his name, when he wrote: "What nothing will destroy, what will live eternally, is my civil code."⁴³

¹ Proclamation issued on surrender of Louisiana, Dec. 20, 1803; 1 Claiborne, Official Letter Books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816, (Rowland ed., 1917, p. 307).

² John H. Tucker, Jr., "The Code and the Common Law in Louisiana," "The Code Napoleon and the Common Law World" (New York University Press, 1956, p. 350); Schmitt, "The Civil Law of Spain and Mexico," p. 102; Flory, "Edward Livingston's Place in Louisiana Law" (Louisiana Historical Quarterly, vol. 19, p. 344 (1936)).

³ See letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Department of State, "The Territorial Papers of the United States" (Carter, compiler and editor, 1940, pp. 242, 245, 246, 261, 310, 320, 348, 385, 395).

⁴ Petition to Governor Claiborne by inhabitants of Point Coupee, November 9, 1804, and letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 326, 298, 325.

⁵ Louisiana Gazette, July 24, 1804; Annals 8 Cong., 2d sess., 1597-1608.

⁶ See Letters from Claiborne, 9 U.S. Depart-

ment of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 245, 261, 246, 310, 314.

⁹ U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra Note 3, pp. 334, 344, 348, 428.

¹⁰ Joint resolution approved Feb. 4, 1805, acts passed at the first session of the Legislative Council of the Territory of Orleans (1805), p. 458. The committee consisted of Dr. John Watkins, Benjamin Morgan, and George Pollack.

¹¹ Louisiana Gazette, February 5, 1805.

¹² Act of Congress of Mar. 2, 1805. This memorial was presented to the House Dec. 3, 1804, and referred to a committee appointed to consider improvements in the Orleans government. A report was made Jan. 25, 1805, denying some of the assertions made by the petitioners, but recommending self-government for the Territory. The petition was presented to the Senate Dec. 31, 1804, and referred to a committee Jan. 4, 1805. The bill reported by the committee was passed as the act approved Mar. 2, 1805.

¹³ Franklin, "The Place of Thomas Jefferson in the Expulsion of Spanish Medieval Law From Louisiana," (XVI T.L.R., pp. 323-326); Brown, "Legal Systems in Conflict," (The American Journal of Legal History, vol. I, No. 1 (Jan. 1957, pp. 35, 47)).

¹⁴ Brown, op. cit., supra, note 11, pp. 48-49.

¹⁵ Le Telegraph, June 3, 1806; 9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra, note 3, pp. 643-657.

¹⁶ Resolution approved June 7, 1806, acts passed at first session of first legislature of the Territory of Orleans (1806), pp. 214-218.

¹⁷ Ch. XXIX, approved Mar. 31, 1808, acts passed at the first session of the second legislature of the Territory of Orleans (1808), pp. 120-128. This act is entitled, "An act providing for the promulgation of the Digest of the Civil Laws now in force in the Territory of Orleans."

¹⁸ Claiborne to Secretary of State, Oct. 7, 1808 (9 U.S. Department of State, op. cit., supra, note 3, p. 802).

¹⁹ Claiborne to Judge J. White, Oct. 11, 1808, 4 Claiborne, op. cit., supra, note 1, p. 225. Also see letter from Claiborne to Judge Wyckoff dated Oct. 22, 1808, Report of the Louisiana Bar Association for 1909, pp. 129-130.

²⁰ See supra, note 14.

²¹ Ch. XXXI, approved Apr. 14, 1807, acts passed at the second session of the first legislature (1807), pp. 190-192.

²² Dainow, "Introductory Commentary to the Louisiana Civil Code," West's Louisiana Civil Code, vol. I, pp. 1, et seq. Tucker, op. cit., supra, note 2, pp. 347, 356.

²³ There were 2,281 articles in the French code.

²⁴ Martin, "History of Louisiana, James A. Gresham, publisher, 1882, p. 344; Introduction, Cross, "Treatise on Successions, L. Graham & Son, 1891, p. XXIV; Dart, "The Source of the Civil Code of Louisiana," Saunderson's Lectures on the Civil Code, Upton, 1925, p. XXXV.

²⁵ Dainow, op. cit., supra, note 20, p. 9.

²⁶ See supra, note 19.

²⁷ See supra, note 15.

²⁸ Dufour v. Camfrano, 11 Martin (O.S.) 675, 701.

²⁹ Phelps v. Reinach, 38 La. Ann. 547 (1886); Straus v. City of New Orleans, 166 La. 1035, 118 So. 125 (1928); Sample v. Whitaker, 172 La. 722, 135 So. 38 (1931). See also Dubulson, "The Codes of Louisiana," Report of Louisiana Bar Association for 1924, pp. 143-157.

³⁰ Cottin v. Cottin, 5 Martin (O.S.) 93 (1817).

³¹ "Preliminary Report of the Code Commissioners," Feb. 13, 1823, reprinted in "Louisiana Legal Archives," Thomas J. Moran's Sons, 1937, vol. I, pp. LXXXV-XCV.

³² Louisiana Acts of 1823, p. 88.

³³ This project has been reprinted in vol. I, "Louisiana Legal Archives."

³⁴ Louisiana Acts of 1824, p. 172. See also Louisiana Acts of 1824, p. 446, relating to compensation of the juriconsults, translators and copyists.

³⁵ Louisiana Acts passed at the first session of the seventh legislature (1824-25), pp. 128-130. The printer was granted 6 months from the date of that act.

³⁶ Tucker, "Source Books of Louisiana Law" (vol. I, "Louisiana Legal Archives," pp. XXIV-XXV).

³⁷ Art. 3521, Civil Code of 1825.

³⁸ Fowler v. Griffith, 6 Martin (N.S.) 89 (1827); La Croix v. Coquet, 5 Martin (N.S.) 527 (1827).

³⁹ Act 40 of 1828 and Act 83 of 1828.

⁴⁰ Reynolds v. Swain, 13 La. 193 (1839); Hubgh v. New Orleans & Carrollton Railroad Co., 6 La. Ann. 495 (1851); Moulin v. Monteleone, 165 La. 169, 115 So. 447 (1928).

⁴¹ Act 182 of 1868, approved Oct. 21, 1868. The joint committee consisted of C. W. Lowell, chairman, Hugh J. Campbell, W. F. Blackman, Frank Morey, and C. B. Pratt.

⁴² Isalah Garrett, Franklin Garrett, and Col. F. A. Hall.

⁴³ Act 160 of 1908.

⁴⁴ Act 335 of 1948.

⁴⁵ 1 Planiol, Traité Élémentaire De Droit Civil 33 (3d ed.).

Inaugural Address of Hon. John Patterson, Governor of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the members of our Alabama congressional delegation had the great pleasure of attending the inauguration of our new Alabama Governor, Hon. John Patterson, in Montgomery, Ala., on Monday, January 19, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Governor Patterson's inspiring address:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN PATTERSON, GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA, JANUARY 19, 1959

Governor Folsom, Lieutenant Governor Hardwick, Lieutenant Governor Boutwell, constitutional officers, members of the legislature, distinguished guests, and my fellow Alabamians, it is with a deep sense of humility that I stand before you on this historic occasion and express to the people of Alabama my gratitude for the high honor that they have bestowed upon me. We all sense the greatness and the traditions of our State of Alabama today when we realize that we are standing on the same spot where Jefferson Davis took the oath of office as the first President of the Confederate States of America. We sense the greatness of our State when we realize the many important events of history which have taken place in this capitol building and on these grounds on which we stand.

Our forefathers by their sweat and blood and toil have passed on to us a great heritage and you and I are charged with preserving it, improving upon it and passing it on to our children untarnished.

STATES RIGHTS

There are serious times facing us here in Alabama and in the South. Coping with the multitude of serious problems facing us during the coming 4 years will require ingenuity, fortitude and sacrifice on the part of all of our citizens. We have serious domestic problems within our State, our Nation

is being attacked from without, and we are being undermined from within by the usurpation of the rights of the States through the unconstitutional encroachment of the Federal Government. The Federal courts have decreed that we must send our children to integrated schools contrary to our customs and traditions. They have told us how we must sit on city buses in Montgomery. We have seen paratroopers with bayonets try to ram integration of the races down our throats. We should bear in mind that the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers only—that it has only those powers that were granted to it by the States—and that any encroachment by the Federal Government on these rights of the States is tyranny.

I think we should pause a moment and pay tribute to a great American whose birthday is today—Robert E. Lee. Lee, a southerner, was a champion of States rights and saw in them, as did Jefferson and the other drafters of our Constitution, a means by which the people would be protected against the tyranny of an all-powerful centralized government. He so believed in this that he gave up a bright career in the U.S. Army and gave his life and fortune to defend these principles. I think we should also pay tribute to a great Alabamian, a former Governor of our State, who served on General Lee's staff, Hon. Thomas Goode Jones. We are honored by the presence of his son and daughter here today, Hon. Walter B. Jones, and Mrs. William B. Griffin, of Montgomery.

The present trend, as reflected in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and actions of the executive branch of the Federal Government, shows that they are bent upon a policy of destroying the powers of the States, reducing the States to mere counties under a central government, thus creating an all-powerful central government in Washington. We face the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of our country. The attack that is being made upon us is devastating, nor is it limited to any particular State or region. New Hampshire and Pennsylvania have been told by the U.S. Supreme Court that they may not inquire into subversive activities within their borders. New Mexico and California have been told by the Court that they cannot fix qualifications for the practice of law in their States. New York has been told by the Court that it cannot fire a professor in the public schools of that State who refuses to answer certain questions under oath because the answers would tend to incriminate him. Oregon has been inhibited in the regulation of nonnavigable waters within her borders. Alabama has been hindered by the Supreme Court in the regulation of the activities of foreign corporations doing business within the State.

The Supreme Court has rendered other decisions of the same import. The Court has ordered integration on public golf courses, parks and swimming pools. It has turned loose Communists by the wholesale. It has been severely criticized by the overwhelming majority of the chief justices of our State supreme courts.

Every section of the country is feeling the heel of the Federal Government. To all of us who believe in constitutional government and who want to preserve the sovereign powers of the States and protect our democratic way of life, this is an alarming situation.

I want to pledge to you that as your Governor, I will be unyielding in my opposition to this wrongful usurpation of power by the Federal Government and I will use every power at my command to prevent any further usurpation by the Federal Government of the sovereign powers of Alabama. My administration will be dedicated to the preservation of our constitutional form of government.

I will work in every way possible with the other States, particularly the Southern States, to form a common front, so that we can better protect ourselves from the unlawful actions of the Federal Government.

EDUCATION

As your Governor, I will preserve and promote the cause of public education in Alabama. I want to see every child in this State afforded the best education possible irrespective of race or color. The well-being of this State and our Nation depends on the education of our children. Our children must come first.

As your Governor, I promise you that I will do everything possible to increase the salaries of our schoolteachers, commensurate with salaries paid teachers in other States, and provide adequate school facilities for our children.

The white and Negro pupils should have equal school facilities, but they must be segregated. I will oppose with every ounce of energy I possess, and will use every power at my command to prevent any mixing of the white and Negro races in the classrooms of this State. I dedicate every capacity to preserving segregation in the schools.

The people of this State are overwhelmingly in favor of good public education and they are overwhelmingly against integration of the races in the public schools. The people of this State will not tolerate nor support integrated schools and any attempt by the Federal Government or anyone else to integrate the schools of this State by force would cause turmoil, chaos, and violence and would result in the destruction of our public school system.

There can be no compromise in this fight. There is no such thing as a "little integration." The determined and ruthless purpose of the race agitators and such organizations as the NAACP is to bring about as fast as possible an amalgamation of our society. They seek to destroy our culture, our heritage, and our traditions. If we compromise or surrender our rights in this fight, they will be gone forever, never to be regained or restored.

I call upon the people of this State and our representatives in the legislature to support me in this fight to preserve our public school education system, and maintain segregation of the races in our schools.

I recommended for the consideration of the legislature the enactment of the law authorizing the Governor to close any public school where military or other forces are employed by the Federal Government to police their operations. I further recommend the enactment of a law cutting off all public funds to any public school which is integrated.

I am well aware that as Governor of Alabama, I am the Governor for all the people of Alabama, white and Negroes alike. The overwhelming majority of the Negro citizens of this State are opposed to integration of the races. They, like everyone else, want their children to have a good public education. The trouble between the races is being caused by a handful of race agitators who are not natives of this State, but who have been sent here to stir up racial trouble and strife.

I would like to say to the Negro citizens of this State that I am interested in your welfare and that my administration will be working to protect your interests as well as the interests of all of the citizens. However, I would like to say further to the Negro citizens, that if you wish to preserve your public education system and educate your children, you should stand up and speak out against the agitators of your own race whose aim is to destroy our school system. If you do not do so, and these agitators continue at their present pace, in a short time you will have no public school system at all. Our public schools once destroyed and closed down, may not be reopened in your lifetime

and mine. Our children will suffer the consequences.

Our race problems will never be solved by court decrees, injunctions, and Federal troops. They will only be solved through mutual understanding and good will between the races without outside interference and agitation.

On May 6, June 3, and November 4, last year, the people of Alabama with an overwhelming voice gave expression to their convictions that the rights and powers of the State of Alabama must not be abandoned, and that segregation of the races must be maintained. This expression by our people was a mandate to me as Governor and to the legislature to defend and preserve the rights, customs, and traditions of our State. I shall observe and carry out that mandate and I call upon the legislature, with the utmost confidence in their loyalty and devotion to duty, to stand firmly with me in carrying out the will of the people. We must put life and meaning into the motto of our State: "We dare defend our rights."

LAW ENFORCEMENT

You know that I am a strong believer in good law enforcement. Your laws will be enforced diligently during the next 4 years. During my administration, there will be no room for gangsters to operate in this State and vice and corruption will be stamped out wherever they rear their head.

Since I have been your attorney general I have waged an unrelenting attack against those in our State who prey upon the working man by extracting from him unlawful usurious rates of interest. One of the worst of problems confronting us today in Alabama is the open, arrogant and flagrant violation of the law by "loan sharks." Our laws are inadequate to protect our citizens from this outrage. I call upon the Legislature of Alabama to enact laws which will prevent these wrongs from being practiced on our people.

FARMERS

I will work constantly as your Governor to improve the life and working conditions of our Alabama farmer. I will work to see that he has a market for his products and gets a fair price for the things that he sells. My administration will be dedicated to helping the farmer and the working man of this State to have a more comfortable living for himself and his family.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

One of the great needs of our State is new industrial plants. I pledge the State government's full cooperation to our citizens in their efforts to attract desirable new industries to their communities. I have appointed a capable, outstanding, experienced businessman to head the department of industrial development and I propose fresh and vigorous efforts to attract and bring new industry to our State and to encourage the expansion of industries presently in our State.

LABOR

I am a strong believer in organized labor. Organized labor has helped build this State and Nation. I want them to know that they have a friend in the Governor's office. During my administration I will not allow labor to be mistreated in any manner and I will work untiringly throughout my administration toward insuring good labor-management relations in Alabama.

RIVERS, DOCKS AND HARBORS

Of great importance to us is the continued development of our rivers, docks and harbors. Alabama is blessed by an abundance of natural resources of which our rivers and harbors form a most important part. We have made great progress toward the development of our rivers systems and it has brought prosperity and industry to many sections of our State. Much remains to be done, and I pledge the full resources of the Patterson administration toward pushing the program.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

One of the fine things that we have to look forward to is the splendid development of our system of highways and roads. We have made great strides in roadbuilding during recent years, but we still have a long way to go. We must keep our highways modern and up to date and abreast of the era of progress in which we live. We must continue to expand our farm-to-market road program to meet the needs of our rural communities, and I will see that our roads are kept in good all-weather repair.

If we are to keep pace with progress and get our fair share of the industrial growth and expansion of our Nation, the development of our highways is of prime importance. Urban areas are critically in need of relief from traffic congestion. Many areas of Alabama offer complex highway problems that will command ingenuity, boldness and money to resolve.

The Federal Interstate Highway program is barely under way in Alabama, and, when completed, it will be a wonderful addition to our highway system. During my administration, we will have available for matching purposes approximately \$379 million in Federal money for the building of roads; \$275 million of this sum will be for the Interstate Highway System, for which the State matches \$1 to every \$10 of the Federal Government. In order to keep pace with other States and carry out our duty to the people of Alabama, we cannot fail to take advantage of this great opportunity to build highways for the future. To do so, we must issue bonds to raise money to match with Federal funds for the building of roads. This bond issue can be financed from present gasoline-tax revenues without any additional taxes levied on our people. In fact, there are ample funds coming into the State treasury to finance the entire roadbuilding program throughout my administration without any additional taxes being levied. With money from the bond issue and other funds coming into the highway department, we can take full advantage of every Federal dollar available during the next 4 years and leave the highway department in excellent financial condition when I go out of office, 4 years from this day.

I call upon the people of this State and our representatives in the legislature to support this vitally needed highway program.

TOURIST TRADE

The great importance of tourist trade is evident in Alabama. No single industry contributes so much to the economy of our State. I will put into effect a program whereby every department of the State government will lend its every effort in a coordinated plan to advertise the attractions of our State throughout the country and encourage tourists to visit Alabama.

PENSIONS AND SECURITY

The public welfare and pensions of the State is an important function. Through this program the State discharges its obligation to people who are in need. This program which is carried out by the department of pensions and security is designed to protect and safeguard the State's human resources which are its most valuable assets. Much progress has been made in this field during recent years and we have seen the average monthly payments to our senior citizens, the blind, dependent children and disabled persons steadily rise. In spite of this, these payments are still low and woefully inadequate.

I stated during my campaign that we should pay an average old age pension payment of \$75 per month, as well as increase substantially the payments to the blind, dependent children, and disabled persons. This can be done. I am going to put into effect a program to bring this about. When we cut out the graft and corruption and waste in State government, cut out the padding of public contracts, cut out payments

of commissions to political favorites who render no services to the State of Alabama, require competitive bidding on contracts and purchases of property, and get our moneys worth for every tax dollar spent, we will have enough money, without more taxes, to increase the old age pensions and other benefits, as well as expand the other programs of the State.

ELIMINATION OF GRAFT AND CORRUPTION

You know how strong my feelings are against the waste of the taxpayers' money. I made that clear on the stump throughout this State during my campaign. I promise you that tonight at midnight when I take over the reins of this State government that a program will go into effect to cut out the waste and squandering of your tax money. I am sick and tired of seeing your money go down the drain and into the pockets of political favorites of every administration. We have had enough of that kind of government.

I assure you that I will stop up the holes in the public treasury and get you your money's worth for every tax dollar spent. With the money saved from cutting the fat out of public spending, we can expand every program the State now has underway, without increasing the taxes on our people. We are going to operate every department of the State government in an honest and efficient manner. We are going to put the State docks department back on a businesslike basis, and we are going to operate the conservation department, as well as all the other departments, in the interest of all the citizens of this State.

There are many other serious and important matters that I would like to discuss with you today, but time does not permit me to do so. To do so would trespass further on your kindness and patience.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all of you for coming here today and helping to make this inauguration such a memorable occasion.

In closing, I want to say to you that I deeply appreciate the interest that you have shown in me and in our program. I deeply appreciate your support and I am looking forward with pleasure to working with you all to make our State a better place in which to live. I wish to say to the members of the legislature that I am honored to be privileged to work with you in a spirit of confidence and mutual respect during the next 4 years for the betterment of our State. I assure you that every ounce of my energy, and every moment of my time during my administration will be dedicated to serving the people of the State of Alabama, and in doing everything within my power to further the interests and traditions of our great State and its people.

We all realize that stormy days lie ahead and that our sacrifices will be great; nevertheless, with a firm belief in the integrity of the people of Alabama, and placing our trust in Almighty God to guide and direct us through the trials that lie ahead, I am sure that we will succeed in our endeavors, and shall pass on to our children a greater Alabama.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, January 22, marks the 41st anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Friends of Ukrainians throughout the world are remembering this date and I am honored and privileged to add my voice in commemoration of it.

The Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain and one wherein the spirit of freedom lives in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian proclamation of independence took place on January 22, 1918, after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. It is sad to recall that the joyous event of independence was so short lived and that the fine and courageous Ukrainian nation was overrun and crushed by the oppressive forces of communism.

We in America, who have been so fortunate to enjoy the precious fruits of liberty, cannot help but have our hearts saddened at the spectacle of tyranny which prevails in the Ukraine.

We respect and admire the Ukrainian nation and its people who have continued in their steadfast resolve to attain their freedom and independence and who have stood as a shining example, for us the fortunate, of the eternal dignity of man and of his desire to be free.

We can take courage that the spirit of the Ukrainian nation and its people will eventually prevail and that the Ukraine will again be a free and independent nation. I know that all Americans join with me in saluting these brave people and extending to them our friendship and encouragement.

Education, Democracy, and Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, two excellent editorials by the editor of the Rapid City Journal have come to my attention recently. The first, entitled "Ultimate Challenge," draws the grim alternatives facing modern man—the choice between peace or virtual destruction of the civilized world. The other editorial raises the important question of how a free society can best meet the cost of the kind of quality education which is called for by our modern world. Under unanimous consent, I include these two editorials at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Jan. 13, 1959]

ULTIMATE CHALLENGE

In the First World War the German Navy made use of a phrase with chilling overtones. When one of the dreaded U-boats made a kill, it was reported that the victim had been "spurio versenkt"—that is, sunk without a trace.

The phrase sometimes echoes in the minds of thoughtful men as they reflect on what would happen if there were to be an all-out nuclear conflict. Above all they fear this, that the great ship of civilized human society would be "spurio versenkt" by such a conflict.

To entertain that fear, to think prayerfully of means of preventing this tragedy that would dwarf all the other tragedies mankind has suffered, cannot be taken as evidence of cowardice. It springs, rather, from a profound, loving concern for men, and for all that has lifted man above the level of savagery. To think of nuclear warfare as a solution of international troubles does not reflect bravery. It reflects unimaginative, irresponsible foolhardiness.

The nature of things has compelled us to develop nuclear weapons, as well as others which may be as terrible, though they seem less dramatic. The nature of things will compel us, and rival powers, to go on developing ever more fearful means of destruction. The only hope one can realistically attach to this is that these weapons may be enough of a deterrent to hold warfare in check.

Logic decrees that the real hope of keeping civilization from being "spurio versenkt" lies in devising the machinery to settle disputes without going to war. In the past this has been more or less true. Our generation is the first to be faced with the absolute alternatives of peace or virtual destruction of the civilized world. No previous generation of human beings was ever thus challenged.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, Jan. 9, 1959]

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR EDUCATION?

Just about any way you look at school proposals submitted for the consideration of the 1959 legislature, one question sticks out: Who should be responsible for the education of South Dakota's youth?

South Dakota's claim to infinite variety applies not only to her scenic beauties but also to the distribution of her school age population. At one extreme are the heavy concentrations of youngsters in booming centers like Rapid City, Sioux Falls, Aberdeen, and other cities which have been harassed for several years to keep building new facilities for their constantly growing school enrollments.

On the other extreme are sparsely settled rural areas, particularly in the West River, where population was scarce to begin with and continues to decline as farms and ranches are combined into larger units.

Between the rural areas and the larger cities are the smaller cities and towns, a few making population gains because of some specialized industrial or agricultural development but most of them becoming smaller as improved transportation facilities shrink distances to the growing urban centers.

Shifting populations are only a symptom of what has taken place and is continuing to take place in American (and South Dakota) life. Education becomes more and more a key to success in the competitive life of our Nation.

The educational needs of our youth who choose agriculture as an occupation are much greater today than they were even 20 years ago. Agriculture is now more than just production and hard work; it is a competitive business that calls for understanding of conditions far beyond the local situation. It demands knowledge of markets, animal and plant nutrition, entomology, soil and water conservation, government, and many other factors far removed from the farm itself.

Not only that, our generation of farmers is producing another even more significant crop: the young people themselves. From 40 to 50 percent of a community's farm youth may be expected to move to urban communities. This means that high schools have the responsibility of preparing young people to meet competition for occupations in cities as well as in agriculture.

Much as we may regret to see this change from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban character in American life, the

trend is not one which can be reversed. It is not merely a situation which must be lived with; it is a change which can be adjusted to—and taken advantage of.

But before this is possible, we need to recognize the adjustments which must be made in our philosophy of public education.

One premise behind the establishment of free public education decades ago was that an educated populace is essential to the democratic process. If that was true in the early days of our Nation, it is even more true in the age of rockets, satellites, and missiles in which we live. The very survival of our Nation and of the democratic system in years ahead will in large measure depend on how well we are able to marshal the brainpower to harness our country's human and physical resources.

As a Nation we cannot afford to permit any budding scientist, philosopher, or statesman—even the potential poet, artist, or musician—to be denied the opportunity to develop his abilities to the fullest possible extent—regardless of where he may be born and schooled, even to the most remote corner of our West River cattle country.

Providing the opportunity for one of these potential von Brauns, Salks, or Sandburgs to reach the full flower of his genius is not just the responsibility of the immediate locality in which the child lives. Too much is at stake. This is the responsibility which all of us must shoulder.

Two main proposals are to be brought before South Dakota's lawmakers during the legislative term which opened Tuesday. Both, essentially, are wrapped in the premise that more South Dakotans need to become involved in the task of supporting our State's public educational system. Their authors' conclusion, obviously, was that more must be done to provide every child in the State with a maximum possibility for schooling.

One proposal, sponsored by the committee for education in South Dakota, would increase State support of schools through a minimum foundation program. The committee's plan is based on the assumption that the wealth of the entire State should support a minimum program of education for every child wherever he lives. The State and local school districts would share as partners in providing the minimum.

While this plan cannot be permitted to become a leveler, standardizing education at a minimum level throughout the State, its backers contend it could provide the shot in the arm which poor districts must have to meet their educational responsibilities. The committee for education also calls for a teacher retirement program and a strengthened State department of public instruction.

Finding a method to finance the minimum foundation program may prove an impossible task since its cost is estimated to run as high as \$18 million. Several possible sources of money have been suggested: a broadened sales tax to apply to sales of services as well as to goods, an additional 1-cent tax on the present or an expanded base or a State income tax.

The second proposal, advanced by an informal association of county boards of education, calls for reenactment of many of the 1953 school law measures with regard to reorganization of the State's present system of school districts. The county board members contend reorganization would enable local school districts to better bear the financial burden of education by spreading the property tax load to all areas and would enable a reduced number of local districts to operate more economically by centralizing administration.

The committee for education and the county boards have no particular argument with each other. Each group agrees that the other's proposal could mean better schools.

The job of the legislators is to give both proposals serious study and enact new laws which will provide what seems an inevitable answer to the question of "Who's responsible for education?" The answer, as we see it, is "everybody."

Let's Take the Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me to so do, I present to the attention of your own distinguished self and all others who may read the same, the text of two editorials appearing in one of the important daily newspapers in the great 23d congressional district which I represent, this my 13th year, in this great House of Representatives.

First, the editorial in the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., under date of Monday January 12, 1959, as follows:

DON'T BE TAKEN IN

The American public must not be taken in by the "live and let live" pitch delivered in Beverly Hills last night by Soviet Super-salesman Anastas Mikoyan.

Unimpeachable evidence over the years has shown repeatedly that "friendly" talk from any representative of the Soviet Union can be as deadly as a cup of hemlock if accepted at face value.

And particularly has this been true in the case of Deputy Premier Mikoyan, whose leadership in the betrayal of Hungary 2 short years ago properly has earned him the appellation "butcher of Budapest."

While we join with President Eisenhower in deploring mob-like demonstrations and the throwing of eggs and assorted vegetables we cannot but feel a deep sympathy and understanding of the feelings of those refugee Hungarian Freedom Fighters who have been largely responsible for such demonstrations.

And we deplore just as thoroughly the fawning attitude of many Americans, in official position and elsewhere, toward Mr. Mikoyan and his American mission.

TEMPER TREATMENT WITH FACT

Treat him courteously to be sure, for he is a guest in this country. But certainly the treatment he receives must be tempered by the cold realism of fact.

Communist Russia, its diplomats and its leaders cannot be trusted in any regard.

Read, if you will, the foreword by Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to this month's report of the House Committee on un-American activities.

"Let those of our citizenry who flutter and rejoice in response to the blandishments and smiles of suave Communist diplomats," WALTER writes, "take stock of the simple, awful truth that these blandishments and smiles are a facade behind which operate the deadly tentacles of a human meatgrinder that has already consumed millions upon millions of human beings."

"May those who accept at face value the pretense of 'peaceful coexistence' with the masters of international communism justify, if they will, the deceit, intrigue, blackmail, espionage, subversion, and mass murder which characterizes the program of communism for no less than complete world domination."

Second, an editorial in the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., under date of Monday, January 5, 1959, as follows:

LET'S TAKE THE LEAD

The United States once again has been forced into the wings while Communist Russia stands in the spotlight receiving well deserved bows for scientific achievement apparently beyond the ken of our most able scientists.

Once again Communist Russia has scored immeasurable gains in the race for world leadership at the expense of American prestige at home and abroad.

Once again our complacent national administration has been content to sit back and congratulate itself on its fiddling while Rome burns.

Frankly, this newspaper does not like it. We do not like sitting in the back seat while Communist Russia sits behind the wheel.

UNITED STATES MUST LEAD TO SURVIVE

The United States, if it is to survive the inevitable final showdown, cannot afford to be pushed into obscurity in the field of space exploration or any other so closely allied to world politics and national defense.

Just a little more than 2 weeks ago this country put into orbit around the earth a voice-transmitting Atlas missile—an accomplishment we were told had equaled and perhaps even bettered anything Iron Curtain scientists could do.

This weekend we found out with certainty we still are lagging behind. But just a year behind, some America authorities optimistically insist.

And perhaps they are right. But we belong at least a year ahead.

We hope this latest Russian push into space will have the same effect on the American people the sputnik embarrassment of 1957 had. We even more fervently hope it will convince our national administration that world leadership and a peace-assuring national defense effort are worth far more than a balanced national budget.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I present the text of an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., on Friday, January 16, 1959:

GROWTH: GOVERNMENT'S PART

Just what are the real differences between the spenders and the budget balancers? If the American people are to think usefully on the issue and if Congress is to make wise decisions, the two cases must be presented in sharper focus. Useful light on the size of the difference—in terms of Federal expenditures—came out of President Eisenhower's appearance at the National Press Club.

In answer to one question he said that in the reasonable future the Nation could expect a gross national product of \$500 billion, while the 1959 budget is set at \$77 billion. Should the gross national product go no higher than \$460 billion in 1960, the Federal budget Mr. Eisenhower proposes would amount to about one-sixth of it. It is unlikely that the forces favoring spending would add more than 10 percent to the budget. Related to the gross national product that is only one-sixtieth—say \$7.5 billion.

Is this the amount advocates of spending rely on to make the difference between stagnation and growth in the national economy? Is this the amount the President believes can make the difference between inflation and stability?

Perhaps the difference cannot be measured fully in terms of money; perhaps attitudes are also important. The advocates of spending would point out that continued unemployment incurs an irrecoverable loss; they would put extra emphasis on the urgency of more effective economic competition.

with the Soviet. Mr. Eisenhower points to the importance of fiscal responsibility and to the possibility of growth through price stability.

The public may reasonably ask of both sides: Just how big a part can the Government play and just how will its actions affect the national economy? It should ask the advocates of spending about what kind of spending might be expected to boost the gross national product most effectively. Are they chiefly interested in equipment, such as highways and better schools, or are they talking about welfare programs?

Likewise the President may be asked in what way an unbalanced budget may be expected to promote inflation. There is a \$12 billion deficit this year. Would another \$7.5 billion next year shake confidence in the dollar and increase the prices Government must pay for money, materials, and labor? Would it give a decisive nudge to the inflation spiral in the whole economy?

The President has rightly said that the Government is not the author of prosperity—although politicians often seem to say it is. Quite possibly more emphasis should be placed on private responsibility for recession or inflation—as in the wage-price spiral. But Government is the largest single force. It takes more than half the profits of corporations, tosses \$40 billion a year into the market for military hardware, and subsidizes other sections of the economy with tariffs and farm price supports.

So its influence extends beyond the immediate question of adding or not adding something like \$7.5 billion to the budget. Yet it is imperative that the public should have more definite information as to what effect that sum would have if used in different ways. Only then will it be equipped for essential decisions.

Freedom and Independence for Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing today the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. In the profound faith that Moscow's deceitful campaign of "smiles and trade" could never cause us to forget the aspirations of the captive nations and their fundamental importance to the security of our Nation, and with the hope of helping to keep the spirit of freedom alive in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians, I join in their celebration. I hope, too, that these words will serve notice of my sustained faith in the eventual liberation of all nations enslaved by imperialist Moscow. They should also demonstrate to the Mensheviks, Mikoyans, and Khrushchevs that American memories of their crimes and our standards of civilized decency and justice cannot be erased by their calculated genteel antics or by spurious promises of trade.

The reception given Mr. Mikoyan by some of our wealthy Americans is food for serious thought. It indicates the spiritual climate in some quarters. Twenty years ago, the Nazi Dr. Hjalmar Schacht was completely ignored for what

he represented. Today, despite his personal crimes, the Armenian quisling is widely feted. The thousands of patriotic Armenians, Azerbaijani, Don and Kuban Cossacks who were annihilated by his orders in 1917-21; the Millions of Ukrainians who starved to death in the manmade famine of the thirties while Mikoyan shipped grains abroad; the role he played in the liquidation of Hungarian patriots—these and other facts no longer seem to bestir the consciences of some of us. Only 2 months ago, before the Moscow City Soviet, Mikoyan delivered a violent anti-American speech; today, without self-respect, some accept him as a deliverer of peace.

I wish to pay my respects today to the many Ukrainians of American descent for keeping high their hopes and aspirations for the restoration of freedom and independence to the land of the birth of their forefathers, and to assure them that all true Americans are solidly behind them in their endeavors.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukraine declared itself an independent republic. This was literally the first time since the 17th century that this land and its people had known freedom.

Their liberty, alas, was short lived. In 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was destroyed by the Red army and it has borne the brutalizing tyranny of the Russian bear ever since.

It is difficult, if not virtually impossible for us in this country to have a realistic conception of what this means. Much is said of America taking her freedom and her way of life for granted. I believe that this is less so today than ever before because of the never-ending peril of communism. Nevertheless, the awareness of an enemy, and understanding the reality of living under that enemy's political system are two entirely different things. It is partially for this reason that I call to your attention this 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We cannot know what the Ukrainian people have lived through. It is my sincere hope that we will never have this knowledge. We can, however, take this moment to pay tribute to a subject people who have been terrorized without letup for almost 40 years. The Ukrainian people obviously have not sunk into servile apathy. The Soviet Union has been forced to maintain its rule by force.

The intangible quest for liberty—for the freedom of mind and action—never dies. It is the Russian knowledge of this truth that demands their rule by terror as the only way of dominating their subject peoples. Herein lies the tragedy of the Ukraine. Those two free years from 1918 to 1920 cannot be wiped from memory.

Today then, I wish to express my awareness and appreciation of the spirit of the Ukraine, January 22, 1918. I am aware and appreciative, because it is also the Spirit of 1776.

Responsibility of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently there have occurred significant developments connected with the inauguration of the Governor of Maryland, who has lived in my congressional district during the period of his outstanding service to the State. While his installation marked the return of control of the executive department from Republican to Democratic, it had additional far-reaching significance. It signaled the reestablishment of executive authority in one who had already proven his worth through the conduct of the fiscal agencies of the State over a span of 20 years, thus giving reassurance to the citizenry of well-considered plans for the maintenance of solvency throughout his administration.

Our Governor, J. Millard Tawes, enters upon his high post with the greatest vote of confidence ever given to a Governor of Maryland and with unprecedented majorities in the State senate and house of delegates, assuring the adoption of programs of progressive legislation. At the same time he will adhere to sound fiscal measures eliminating excessive spending and assuring the public the fullest measure of value for every dollar expended. The beginning of his term which marks this return to the statehouse of businesslike administration was interestingly commented upon by the Baltimore News-Post in a most enlightening editorial, which I ask to have included in my remarks as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WELCOME, GOVERNOR TAWES

In a mood generally cordial and hopeful, Maryland's some 3 million people today are welcoming into office the State's 59th Governor, J. Millard Tawes.

The cordiality is largely genuine and the ceremonies unusually gay and elaborate, because the courteous Eastern Shore man is personally popular.

The spirit is hopeful because an overwhelming majority of the voters have expressed at the polls their belief that he may be the man to pull the State out of the morass of overtaxing and overspending. They remain sanguine that he will make good.

The inaugural address of Governor Tawes today is couched in generalities, but it reflects a deep feeling of responsibility and opportunity to serve the people of the State well.

He exhibits awareness that the next 4 years are likely to bring a record boom in industrial and business activity and mushrooming population and a readiness to cope with the expanded need for public facilities of many kinds.

He may well keep in mind that increase in the taxable bases, rather than any increases in the tax rates, should meet the need for more money for public services.

Of great importance, Governor Tawes asserts that "matters of State no longer can be handled in a day-to-day manner, without plan or program. We must project our designs many years in advance to achieve the best results."

How true. The State and city, too, long have suffered because of hand-to-mouth spending and taxing.

Also, the Tawes aim to increase the public awareness of what is going on in the State government, and to furnish advance information of the likely effect of proposed programs, is all to the good.

So is his recognition that 70 percent of the population now live in urban areas, that the ratio will increase, and that new metropolitan areas will be created and existing ones expand. His awareness that new problems posed by their interdependence must be solved, beginning now, is a hopeful sign.

With the bulk of the State's population, we are pulling for Governor Tawes to make a shining success of his administration, with the aid of a legislature so predominantly of his Democratic Party.

But a word of warning. Just balancing the budget for the coming year and the next three, with tax levels remaining static, will not be accepted as success.

The State taxload, with its 50-percent increases in income and sales taxes adopted last year, is just too big to be borne without severe distress to the taxpayers.

What the public demands is so searching a streamlining of the taxing and spending pattern of the State that not just balancing of income and outgo but reduction of taxes will be achieved.

That would give the Tawes administration a rare and real glory.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence and on this solemn occasion I wish to pay tribute to the courageous and freedom-loving people of the Ukraine.

To these brave people who have kept alive the spirit of freedom and independence through long enslavement and oppression by the cruel and unrelenting Russian Communists, we in America offer our deep and enduring friendship.

Like them, we look forward to the day when the Ukraine once again will become an independent nation, free of the Russian Communist yoke and free of the

indignities and cruelties that have been their lot under domination by the savages of the Kremlin.

The desire and love of freedom of the people of the Ukraine cannot be ignored and must not be denied, even though the road to its achievement is a long and hard one. We and all other God-fearing peoples cherish with the people of the Ukraine the significance of this proudly remembered anniversary day and we join in looking ahead to that future date when Ukrainian independence shall live again in reality, as it lives today in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Economy Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Rockford, Ill., Morning Star, entitled "Economy Budget."

ECONOMY BUDGET

Most of the provisions in the budget President Eisenhower has submitted to Congress should have solid public support. In this budget, the President is keeping his pledge to fight to hold down Government spending.

The fight which must be made to overcome grave hazards besetting our economy can be won if the taxpayers let Congress know that they stand with the President on the side of economy.

President Eisenhower believes that his budget of \$77 billion for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 will allow for a surplus of \$70 million at the end of the year, contrasted with an anticipated deficit of \$12.9 billion at the close of the current fiscal year June 30. The President pointed out that whether he can keep the budget balanced will depend on Congress, public support, and developments in our economy and in the world.

The biggest share of the overall budget is the \$40.9 billion allocated to defense. Despite the expanding missile program, the defense budget represents an increase of only \$145 million over the figure for the current year. The President recognizes that there is a vast opportunity for saving in the Defense Department and he has called for curtailment of elements of the military program which do not meet present-day needs and for elimination of military waste.

The administration's budget places heavy emphasis on curtailment of subsidy programs. Thus, the President proposes to reduce the farm budget from the current \$7.3 billion to \$6.4 billion; to refuse to approve any new low-rent housing projects or flood control, navigation, and irrigation programs; to cut new spending for local hospital grants, health research facilities, and waste treatment works.

He also calls for modification of legislation providing benefits to veterans for disability not related to military service; puts the brakes on the new science education program; gives school construction advocates no comfort.

The President is moving in the right direction in asking for legislation to encourage more private financing of veterans' and college housing and rural electrification and telephone projects.

By calling for an increase in the Federal gasoline tax from the present 3 cents to 4½ cents, the administration concedes that it can't get the Federal highway program back on a pay-as-you-go basis without handing the motorist another substantial tax increase. By proposing new taxes on aviation gasoline and reducing airport subsidies, the President is calling on the airlines to be contributors as well as to pay their own way, something the railroads have been doing all along.

The President's request for a \$350 million increase in postal revenue, evidently through a 5-cent stamp for first-class letters, needs closer study. It isn't fair to raise the first-class rate and not air mail. The public expects better service in return for the substantial postal increases granted by Congress last year.

President Eisenhower has called for a 10-percent reduction in foreign aid. There is room for a much bigger cut than that.

Maybe We Don't Worry Enough About Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the January 15, 1959, issue of the Daily Intelligencer, a Bucks County newspaper, which contains some thoughts that we could all heed:

MAYBE WE DON'T WORRY ENOUGH ABOUT PRIDE

Quite a few who examine American life closely today wonder whether our people, generally speaking, take a sufficient pride in achievement.

As a nation we continue to get high marks for ingenuity, resourcefulness, technical mastery. Yet there is evidence in a good many places that as individuals some Americans show little interest in, or respect for, solid accomplishment.

Dr. James R. Killian, President Eisenhower's top scientific adviser, took note of this matter recently when he said Americans need to develop a higher regard for learning and a fuller pride in achievement.

What counts, he said, is the importance Americans attach to the factor of excellence in our society.

Disquieting signs exist that a lot of us don't worry nearly enough about excelling in the things we do, whether it's running a business, making a product, trying a lawsuit, clerking in a store, holding down a Government job, or keeping house.

There are at least a couple of things involved in this.

One is how we as individuals feel about trying not simply to do what we may vaguely define as our best, but to meet clear standards of excellence. If we do not think it is good or necessary to succeed by that test, then our pride of accomplishment is indeed sadly limited.

The game of getting through the day, the week, and the month, of drawing pay for routine effort, is one that may lure us all at times. But nothing great was ever built or sustained that way.

The day that becomes the American's general philosophy of life, the Russians can lick us without firing a shot.

The second thing is how we look upon others who excel. Do we respect them for their attainments? Or do we try to downgrade and belittle them, to treat them with suspicion because they are not like us?

If we should ever, as a people, seriously entertain the idea that to be superior in any endeavor is to be odd, to be deserving of scorn and ridicule, then we might as well fold up our tents. For this world will prove too tough for us.

More than ever, the race today is to the swift. We not only had better be swift, but if we wish to gain that end we had better learn to think well of those among us who already are.

Foreign Aid for Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in the coming months the Congress will be considering legislation which will continue our foreign aid program. As we all know, it is most difficult for the average Member of Congress to know exactly where and how the money we vote for foreign aid is eventually spent.

The Indianapolis Star in its lead editorial of December 23, 1958, does an excellent job in summarizing for us how much foreign-aid money has gone to Communist countries during the last 12 years.

I would like to hear from the proponents of foreign aid just how such expenditures to these Communist countries have been justified and how in the present state of world affairs we can continue to pour taxpayers' money in the form of so-called mutual aid into Communist countries.

The excellent Indianapolis Star editorial follows:

FOREIGN AID FOR COMMUNISTS

President Eisenhower is asking for an extra \$1 billion for foreign aid next year. A rundown of new Democratic Senators in U.S. New & World Report shows that almost to a man these men will vote to continue the foreign aid program. But we will bet that not 1 man in 10 in Congress knows how U.S. foreign-aid funds are spent, who gets the money, or why. How can they? The State Department will not make an item-by-item report.

We are no more able than Congress to get the facts and details of foreign spending. But we do have some figures on who got how much money during the last 12 years from the U.S. taxpayer. They come from the Library of Congress.

Communist Albania got \$20,444,000 between 1946 and 1957.

Communist Czechoslovakia got \$185,827,000 plus \$29,583 credits.

Communist Germany (yes, that's what we said) got \$17,339,000.

Communist Hungary got \$17,723,000 plus \$15,917,000 credits.

Communist Poland got \$365,017,000 plus \$88 million credits.

Communist Yugoslavia got \$789,732,000 plus \$55,900,000 credits.

That total for Communist countries outside the Soviet Union since 1946 is \$1,585,482,000 from the American taxpayer. Did it ever occur to you that this is almost as much

as the Communists have spent since 1946 for their entire foreign aid program outside the Soviet captive states? Did it ever occur to Congress and the President that the United States has provided enough money to finance the entire Communist economic offensive announced by Communist boss Khrushchev? Man, what fools we are.

As late as 1955 we sent \$2,374,000 to Communist Czechoslovakia. Between 1954 and 1958 we sent a total of \$17,339,000 to Communist Germany. In 1955, before the Hungarian revolt we sent \$3,496,000 to Communist Hungary. Then after the Hungarians revolted and were smashed by the Reds we sent the Red Hungarian Government \$11,867,000. Apparently it pays in American foreign aid to smash a revolt against communism with Soviet troops.

Between July and December of 1957 we sent Communist Poland \$49,890,000 of the U.S. taxpayers' money and more was sent in 1958. Note that Red boss Gomulka has just lined up solidly with Red boss Khrushchev and damned the United States publicly.

From 1955 to 1958 we sent \$170 million to Communist Dictator Tito. He is still a Communist. He still votes with the Soviets in the U.N. He still sells the Communist line in the Middle East and Asia. He still imprisons anti-Communist critics.

Is this the foreign aid program the new Congress will support? Is this what is being described as the answer to the economic offensive of the Communist world? Do we intend to send to Communist countries just the amount of money they say they are spending in order to bury us?

What sort of inverted thinking produces such insanity? Why doesn't Congress stop it? What is wrong with the President and Secretary of State who permit this betrayal of American interests?

We wish somebody in Congress or the administration would find out.

Working Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EDITOR, DAILY NEWS:

Some time ago the uptown merchants in cooperation with the chamber of commerce sponsored a campaign to stimulate uptown business. During this project, the public was offered free maps of Lebanon, city and county. I received one of these maps and upon close examination I was amazed at the large area owned by the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Lebanon may be the home of the bologna but Bethlehem Steel must sure be paying the taxes. I also thought of all the people employed at this plant and the importance of the payroll to the community. The thought clung to my mind and I brought up the subject with some of my fellow workers from the steel plant. They had a different point of view. In a disgusting manner they informed me that the local plant is so small it could be set inside the main offices at Bethlehem. This may be true but you could hide Coleman Memorial Park in New York's Central Park. Statements such as these prove nothing but they could reveal a frame of mind which is not in the best interests concerning the progress of our community.

We all realize that Lebanon has had its share of the recent recession. According to newspaper reports, many of the steel mills in other parts of the country are recovering quite satisfactorily. Again I hear pessimistic and even ridiculous remarks referring to conditions at our local plant. First I was informed that employment would improve after recent elections. Next it was the shut-down of automobile industries. Now it will be shortly after New Year. Production workers are so sure they know what is going on in the front office. Management doesn't pretend to always know what is going on in the plant, but they do try. It would be to everyone's advantage if we, the production workers would only try to understand the problems of management. No manager worth his salt would allow good employee relations go to pot while his competitors are doing a brisk business down the street. Management has nothing to hide. The director meetings behind pulled shades are a thing of the past. Industry's financial reports are for the public. Years ago companies made progress but they overlooked the human problems. Modern management is a highly skilled profession interested in working with and through people. They, too, are paid to perform a job.

It is my firm belief that if the production worker would understand the structure of big business he readily realizes some of his duties and not just his rights. Our local plant like all large business ventures started as an idea. This idea had to be kindled with tremendous courage. A great many people had to risk money. Stockholders had no guarantee that there would be buyers. They did not know if costs could be met much less have a profit left. If business does not grow it dies. If it stands still it will be trampled by its competitors in the stampede for progress. When business is good, Uncle Sam taps the till. When business is poor, the stockholders face ruin. Management is under constant pressure from three fronts. They must see that the worker gets a fair wage. The stockholder wants a return on his investment. The customer wants a quality product within a time limit at a low price.

Waste is our vulnerable spot. This could be waste of man-hours or material. Both are figured in dollars and cents and added to the cost of the product. If you would be in business for yourself and intend to stay in business you would soon realize the value of a satisfied customer. The plant worker has a customer also. This customer may be miles away but only minutes by wire or phone, and he does keep in touch constantly.

I like to think of the average worker as a pretty shrewd fellow. Give him the facts and I have faith in his reasoning. He should recognize false ideologies which look good on paper. One of these making the rounds tells you that the more you earn, the more you will spend. This is only part of the story. Read the fine print and see how much you can purchase with cheap abundant cash.

I do not promise a pay raise next week for a few hours burst of energy. Progress is a slow, long, hard climb. Perhaps only our children will benefit.

If you still consider the local steel plant small and insignificant, think of the company salesman. He can bat his brains out convincing a customer that you can and will do the job, but if we punch a time clock and would rather discuss last night's bowling scores this customer will find the fellow who builds that better mousetrap. Since the recession has caused a decrease in the working force and the man with more seniority can claim another man's job, there is a ruling of ability to perform the job. You may have ability but are you willing? You should not be working for Bethlehem Steel—you should be working with Bethlehem Steel.

Yours,

A STEELWORKER.

A Bill Relating to Withholding, for Purposes of the Income Tax Imposed by Certain Cities on the Compensation of Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit withholding on the compensation of Federal employees for purposes of income taxes imposed by certain cities. I have been in favor of this legislation for some time for several reasons. It provides for good reciprocal relations between the Federal Government and our city governments which already withhold Federal taxes from the wages of their employees. It is economical in that it provides a less costly way of collecting legal taxes, overall. It is a real convenience to the Federal employees.

I want to dwell on this last point a little bit because at one time many Federal employees thought that this legislation was unfriendly to them. Some, but fortunately a very small minority, through misunderstanding still think so.

The reason certain Federal employees thought the legislation was unfriendly stemmed from the fact that the city earnings tax was unpopular, as most taxes are, to many, particularly to non-residents of the city who worked in the city. As a matter of fact this form of taxation was considered by some to be unconstitutional, as taxation without representation. However, regardless of the unpopularity of this kind of tax, or its merits, the courts throughout the United States have upheld its legality. This is no longer a question. This form of tax has become an important source of revenue for many of our cities and is rather obviously here to stay.

Federal employees are liable for the tax just as any other person living in or working in a city which imposes such a tax. The present bill has nothing to do with whether a Federal employee is liable for the tax or not.

Federal employees soon found out that when they failed to pay the tax the cities allowed the amounts owed to accumulate until they were sizeable enough to warrant the expense of collection. Then when the employee was forced to pay, he had a sizeable sum to pay, instead of a modest amount. It included not only the accumulated amount but interest and collection costs.

As a result the Federal employees found, as do all taxpayers find, that it is really a favor to them to have the amounts owed withheld in weekly or monthly amounts where they have none of the nuisance of making returns or the embarrassment of having to budget a sizeable accumulated amount.

Most Federal employee unions are on record as favoring this legislation. The officials of the city of St. Louis, part of which I represent, have long requested

this legislation. Other cities through their officials and representatives in Congress have urged this legislation. I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this this year.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees", approved July 17, 1952 (Public Law 587, 82d Congress; 5 U.S.C., sec. 84b), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "State or Territory" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "State, Territory, or city"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'city' means only a city which is incorporated under the law of a State or Territory and which had a population (according to the last decennial census) of seventy-five thousand or more individuals."

The International Law of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the *Diario Las Americas* is an outstanding Spanish language daily published in Miami Springs, Fla. It has been very instrumental in bringing to Latin America a better understanding of our country. It also has been extremely helpful in developing the Latin American point of view here in this country.

Diario Las Americas, under the editorship of Francisco Aguirre, and the management of Horacio Aguirre, has always taken the course of strengthening the bulwark of the free world which lies in the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

Recently they commented with considerable force and logic on a major problem confronting the people of the Americas and the free world as we move headlong into the space age. The thoughts, observations and recommendations of the editorial which follows merit consideration and action:

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE SPACE

In view of the advancements achieved lately by science in the conquest of space, following is a reproduction of our editorial of April 9, 1958, which at this moment acquires special interest:

"If there is any science wherein permanent dynamic constitutes an essential element, that is international law, because it is a matter of daily recourse, so to speak, with every new situation faced by the countries, by the people and by science, and in the different existing conditions. International law is not like a body of dead water, nor is it of the static kind. The law of the seas had to be gathered here and there and had to accommodate gradually to the new needs created by the steamship, or by modern warships or submarines. Later came the inter-

national law of the air, with the conquer of air by man.

"In this atomic era it is no longer a fantasy to say that man is in the threshold of the conquer of space. The United States and Russia have launched manmade satellites that now circle the globe; and interplanetary travel, starting with the trip to the natural satellite of the earth, seems to be far nearer to realization than the human mind could conceive a few years back. Thus, in this era, when man is almost on the verge of establishing physical contact with space regions that before seemed to be pieces of abstract mathematics, the human forces will have to cope with the problem of regulating the conduct of the States and of the people in the face of these new achievements. Naturally, the man of sound mind wishes that everything be encouraged through instruments meaning broader progress for humanity and to destroy every possibility of those new instruments ever being used from the open spaces to dominate the earth.

"It is a case similar to that of the atomic energy, which together with the incalculable benefits its discovery and conquer represent for humanity, it can also be the source of unthinkable horrors when in the hands of mental deviates who aspire to world domination.

"A few days ago this paper published an article by George Marden on the 'Regulation of Space Control,' saying that Russia is trying to negotiate an arrangement with the United States on the regulation of space control, on condition that the United States abandon their military bases overseas. A dangerous proposition this is, to set a matter of pure war strategy as a condition prior to an agreement on laws that have already become a necessity. Precisely for the contrary, to prevent that any nation may try to control our planet from the spaces above, it is why this matter must be focused. It is not for reasons of space politics that the problem must be coped with. Ample discussions in the United Nations, where the most outstanding international jurists may study this undeferrable topic from all scientific and impartial aspects, will undoubtedly provide a sensible solution.

"Such discussions may lead to the laying of the fundamental principles of the international law of the space."

Rumanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the reestablishment of Rumanian freedom and independence under the protection of the Western powers. On this anniversary I wish to express my warm sympathy for the aspirations of the Rumanian nation and for their present struggle against Soviet-Communist domination.

This commemoration is a reminder of the political importance and historical reality of Eastern Europe, where old and fiercely independent peoples have developed their own cultures and national entities. These peoples, with their cultures, are a vital part of Europe, which, without their free contribution and participation within its boundaries, is reduced to

a strangled existence, as is the case today. The problem today is not to accept the limited area of discussion imposed on us by the Soviet maneuvering, but to raise the whole question of that part of Europe on which the peace and security for the future so largely depend.

It is obvious to me that the main source of tension and insecurity for the Atlantic Community stems from the inability of the West to exploit this whole unpleasant situation in Soviet-dominated Europe. This situation, as long as we condone it, constitutes an immense benefit to the Soviets, whereas, instead, if we would turn the tables and exploit this situation ourselves against them it would be a terrible thorn in the Soviet flesh.

The inevitable objection that this would increase the cold war is totally untrue. The free hand enjoyed by the Soviets in their controlled part of Europe has in no way lessened the tensions between the Soviets and the United States; on the contrary, it has actually increased them. When we do not use a weapon at our hand, such as the subjugation of a good part of Europe by the Soviets, we are actually encouraging them to continue and even increase their pressure for the advancement of their global Communist aims of world infiltration, subversion, and eventual domination.

This is what is happening right now, when Mikoyan, unlike us, is using every means at his disposal, even kissing American babies, to push us out of Europe.

It is my conviction that the American people will not be taken in by this latest Soviet, Mikoyan propaganda stunt. I believe that, together with the highly deterring defense advocated by Congress, we are going to adopt the policy which would put us on the ground of reality concerning Soviet tactics.

Must TV Booster Stations Be Shut Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include the following editorial from the *Wenatchee Daily World* of January 11, 1959, entitled, "Why the Hurry in Barring Reflectors From the Air?"

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been interested in the efforts by the residents of many small, isolated communities in the mountainous areas of the West to provide themselves with television reception. Because the Federal Communications Commission had no answer to their problem and showed no inclination to help them solve it, these people have taken the initiative by erecting community-sponsored VHF booster stations or reflectors which pick the television signals out of the air from surrounding hilltops and redirect them into the homes in the valleys. Several

hundred of these booster stations are now operating satisfactorily throughout the mountainous areas of the West.

Last month the Federal Communications Commission peremptorily ordered these stations off the air. It gave the operators of the stations 90 days in which to apply for licenses to convert to a more costly facility, the UHF translator, or else face legal proceedings to shut them down. Yet it has been apparent for some time that UHF translators are not the answer for many of these communities, so the FCC order confronts them with the possibility of a television blackout.

The editorial from the *World* properly asks the two key questions, will UHF translators on the higher channels be able to serve the people now being served, and how can the funds be raised to finance the costly installations? Until these questions are answered, what is the hurry in taking reflectors off the air?

The editorial follows:

WHY THE HURRY IN BARRING REFLECTORS
FROM THE AIR?

The long arm of the Federal Communications Commission has reached out from Washington, D.C., and held up a pronouncement saying to north central Washington television reflector associations: "Get off the air. Change to UHF."

The public notice, as the new rule is officially called in the FCC's voluminous set of regulations, says the community groups who now operate the dozen and a half reflectors in this area, must notify the FCC within 90 days that they intend to comply with the order.

If they don't, they're going to be hauled into court.

The FCC decision has long been expected. It nevertheless came as a shock. It put squarely before reflector leaders two major problems: (1) Will UHF translators on the higher channels be able to serve the people now being served? and (2) how can the funds be raised to finance the costly installation?

As to problem No. 1, the UHF translators which the FCC recommends have never been tested in mountainous areas here. A *Daily World* representative saw one tried at Quincy but there the terrain is ideal, with the transmitting antenna on a high hill and the entire area to be served a flat plateau.

Manson has one in operation on a limited basis but its situation doesn't match conditions in many of our areas—Entiat and the Methow Valley, for instance.

At Oroville one company selling one of the better types of translators refuses to test its equipment there because of fear it won't do the job. Oroville has a receiving antenna 10 miles from town, which reflects to a transmitting antenna on a high hill above Oroville.

Every area has a different engineering condition to face. In some narrow valleys the UHF device may not work at all, who knows.

Problem No. 2—financing the installation—is also far away from solution. Raising a relatively small amount of money by donation to operate the current VHF stations has proven a headache almost everywhere. A lot of people are getting a free ride—that is, a free picture, and nothing can be done to collect from them.

To pay for the more expensive UHF—figures up to \$73,000 are being bandied about—a hit and miss collection system won't work. Something like State Senator Wilbur Hallauer's bill whereby a television district could charge everyone getting the picture from the district's reflector a service fee may be the answer.

Surely it will be kicked around a long time

in the legislature before it becomes law. The cable companies who kept bottled up in committee a suggested State law to legalize VHF reflectors during the last session, probably will oppose the measure because of its possible encroachment on areas that they feel can best be served by cable.

Hallauer told the *Daily World*, in announcing his proposal, that the bill-drafting service at Olympia found it an exceedingly difficult measure to draw. There is no precedent for it, although the idea resembles one on which the hospital district law is based. The proposal may be found to be completely illegal.

In the face of these two major difficulties—and we've skipped over a lot of side problems associated with both—the year's delay in filing of the intention to comply with the FCC rules, as requested by the Washington State Television Reflector Association, seems a just one.

The various community television groups face having to accept an FCC proposal that neither they nor the FCC for that matter, really know will work in each individual instance. They're being forced to sign on the dotted line for something they don't know will work. Experimentation, required in every local situation, can't possibly be begun satisfactorily until ready access is available to the high points where reflectors are located.

The people bringing reflector TV to our valleys are ordinary citizens donating their time and energy without pay. Their work is difficult enough without saddling them with the added burden of having to face blizzards and freezing weather where the elements are at their worst. They also face months of efforts in raising funds and testing equipment.

It seems to us that the FCC has never squarely faced up to the problem of bringing television to mountainous areas. It started in the direction of legalizing VHF reflectors, and then turned about and went another direction—toward UHF—under the pressure of the lobbyists for the cable corporations.

Now it has ruled VHF must go. The little people in the remote valleys can't afford any longer to fight the powerful Federal agency. They must comply or else get off the air.

We hope the FCC will prove an understanding arm of Government and be lenient in allowing plenty of time for a big job to be done, if it must be done.

Anyway, what's the hurry? We have yet to see any proof of consequence that the VHF reflectors in our areas are interfering with anyone.

Ukraine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Thursday marks the 41st anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. We are all likely to forget the history of the individual countries which are now involuntarily held in the U.S.S.R. The independence which was declared by the Ukrainians in 1918 was short lived. The new bolshevik Russia wrenched freedom from the militarily weak Ukrainians only 3 years after it had been proclaimed. The Ukraine harbors a hate for Communist oppression as great

in fervor as their love of freedom. It is the hope of all free men that the taste of freedom which was so fleeting in their mouths will serve to whet their appetite for liberty. The Communists can prohibit public demonstrations, but nothing can suppress the patriotism which lives on in every Ukrainian heart.

The Spending Issue Arises Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 19, 1959, entitled "The Spending Issue Arises Early":

THE SPENDING ISSUE ARISES EARLY

The Democratic leadership in Congress has marked for early action a series of spending bills which challenge the basic premises of President Eisenhower's fiscal policy as it was outlined in general terms in his message on the state of the Union. Two of the three measures which the Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, described as issues clamoring for resolution were vetoed by Mr. Eisenhower at the last session of Congress.

In his message to a joint session of Congress January 9, Mr. Eisenhower enunciated these rules: (1) The budget must be kept in balance; (2) current costs must be met from current revenue; (3) deficit financing must not contribute to further inflation.

"If we cannot live within our means during such a time of rising prosperity," the President said, "the hope of fiscal integrity will fail. If we persist in living beyond our means, we make it difficult indeed for every family in our land to balance its own household budget. But to live within our means would be a tangible demonstration to ourselves and to others of the self-discipline needed to assure a stable dollar."

It is already clear that the Democrats with their largest majorities in both House and Senate since 1940, do not agree on the need for self-restraint. The three spending measures they propose even in advance of submission of the administration's budget Monday would knock the President's proposed limit of \$77 billion out of kilter, adding some \$3.3 billion to the bill.

The major Democratic spending measure is a housing bill, offered in varying forms by Representative RAINS, of Alabama, and Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama. The administration will propose a housing bill of its own which is considerably more modest.

The Rains and Sparkman proposals contemplate larger grants for urban slum clearance than the administration will seek. Provisions for restoration of authority for direct mortgage purchases by the Federal National Mortgage association would, in themselves, account for a quick outlay of several hundred million dollars. Democratic loans for college housing run \$200 to \$300 million more than the administration thinks feasible. Several other proposals involving large outlays will also encounter opposition from the administration.

An airport construction and improvement bill calling for \$575 million in Federal aid in a 5-year period is similar to a measure vetoed last year by Mr. Eisenhower. At that time he said that, while Federal assistance

may have been appropriate when civil aviation was growing to maturity, the Government had done its part and the time had arrived for an orderly Federal withdrawal.

The success of Mayor Daley, of Chicago, in persuading commercial airlines to assume the principal expense in developing O'Hare International Airport shows the soundness of the President's contention that airports should be considered a responsibility of local governments and the airlines.

The Democrats are also renewing the measure vetoed last year to alleviate unemployment in depressed areas. Spending of \$375 million is envisioned. In his veto message last year, Mr. Eisenhower maintained that the major responsibility for planning and financing economic redevelopment should remain with local citizens; that the proposed bill provided little or no local participation, and that it would mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies.

It is certainly unwise to use Federal money to freeze conditions of chronic hardship in communities where economic opportunities have become exhausted. Instead, the unemployed should be encouraged to seek work and a promising future in areas which can offer them.

It is said that Mr. Eisenhower is determined to hold the fiscal line even if he must fight off the Democratic majorities with the veto power. As things are shaping up, the first of these tests will be presented to him perhaps as soon as early March. His response will demonstrate to the people whether he means what he has said.

The President a Spender?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an article which appeared in the November 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "The President a Spender?" The author, Mr. Gabriel Hauge, cites the President's spending record and feels that the major portion of blame for increased Government expenditures rests squarely on the Congress, not the President:

THE PRESIDENT A SPENDER?

(By Gabriel Hauge, former special assistant to President Eisenhower for economic affairs)

It should be understood that the deterioration in the budget situation is not, of course, solely, or even mainly, a reflection of increased spending. The net change in the January budget as officially revised early in the autumn is \$12.7 billion. Of this total, \$7.4 billion are accounted for by lower receipts almost entirely due to the recession.

Increased expenditures account for the remaining \$5.3 billion. Of these increased expenditures it is perhaps fair to say that about \$3 billion can be attributed to conscious antirecession policy—mainly in the fields of housing, unemployment insurance, and accelerated public works. Looming large in the remainder are about \$1.8 billion more for the Department of Agriculture and about \$500 million for added defense outlays.

It is a little bewildering today, in listening to some critics of the President as a

spender, to recall the scene 6 months ago when many voices, from many quarters, were calling upon him to do something, to do anything—whatever the cost—to deal with the recession. That he did act, selectively and prudently, is now a matter of record. As far as the increase in farm spending is concerned, responsibility will have to be assigned elsewhere, including the weather. And with regard to defense spending, the majority of critics complain he is spending too little rather than too much.

Second, in evaluating some of the more partisan attacks on the President, this salient fact should be remembered: In the last session Congress enacted specific appropriation items, authorizations and tax adjustments involving a total budgetary burden of \$7.5 billion beyond the President's January budget recommendations.

Adjusted for reductions made by Congress in other parts of his budget, such as in mutual security, the additional net budgetary burden to be borne in succeeding years amounts to about \$5 billion over and above his recommendations. Regrettably he was not equipped with such tools as the item veto to help avoid such a result.

Third, in the last session the President's vetoes of spending authorizations and his effective opposition to other appropriations and authorizations that had passed one House of Congress resulted in the avoidance of legislation involving an added budgetary burden of \$5.5 billion which would have had to be borne over succeeding years. These facts suggest that the President's budget posture was a lot better than the alternative Congress sought to impose upon him.

Fourth, it should be recalled that the Presidents' January budget contained 16 legislative proposals for economy, both for decreasing expenditures and for increasing nontax receipts. These, if enacted, would have produced estimated future annual budget savings of \$3.5 billion. Congress failed to act at all on eight of these proposals, went the other way on four by increasing rather than diminishing the programs involved, and acted only partially on the others. The result was that net benefits to the budget amounted to only about \$500 million.

Fifth, the President was the leader of the forces, drawing strength from both sides of the aisle in Congress, which held the line against a general antirecession tax cut. Such action, if taken, would probably have avoided little of the additional spending which did result and would have added substantially to the \$12.2 billion deficit now projected for this fiscal year. Subsequent events have already begun to prove his judgment right.

These five facts entitled the President, in my opinion, to speak with authority as well as conviction on the matter of public spending. These facts make clear how much more serious the budget situation would have been if he had not been both courageous—and right—earlier this year. The facts entitle him to the support of every thoughtful American in his efforts to build a sound and sensible budget position.

Colorado 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD, a poem

entitled "Colorado 1959," written by the State's distinguished poet laureate, Milford E. Shields. This year, Colorado is observing the centennial of the gold rush of 1859 which resulted in the settlement of Colorado and its eventual entrance into the Union as a State. Mr. Shields' poem is a worthy contribution to Colorado's "Rush to the Rockies" observance. The poem follows:

COLORADO 1959

Our mountains rise up in the sky,
In high and holy air;
They kiss the clouds that blow on by,
Drink virgin raindrops there.
Our plains put on a fragrant green
That ripens into grain;
Above them is a vibrant sheen
Of rainbows after rain.
Beneath the richness of our soil
We have a wealth untold,
A vast uranium and oil
More precious than pure gold.
We have our factories and mills
That call for eager hands;
They use the highest of the skills
That excellence commands.
Yet more than this we have our men,
Our giants in the sun,
Who serve our State again, again
Till time and tide are won.
Thank God for Colorado great,
Our Century Sublime;
God bless and keep our Four Square State
Throughout all future time.
—MILFORD E. SHIELDS

**We Have No Right To Meddle in Cuba's
Internal Affairs**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Cuba have stirred up all kinds of critical comments and discussions by Americans. The result has been that the leader of the Cuban revolution, Dr. Fidel Castro, has personally undertaken to defend himself and Cuba's new government against Americans generally.

I agree with the analysis recently written by Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News. Bill Baggs is an outstanding newspaperman. He has remarkable objectivity in reporting on events as they transpire. He is well oriented on international affairs, particularly in Latin America.

I think what he says in this article makes sense and is the best course for the United States:

**WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO MEDDLE IN CUBA'S
INTERNAL AFFAIRS**

A crazy rumor was shot into orbit last week.

No one seems to know who launched the piece of gossip, or from where.

But all of a sudden there was a grumbling on the sidewalks of Havana that the United States might send in the Marines to halt the trials and executions which are being conducted under the auspices of the new Cuban Government.

Fidel Castro recognized the rumor and commented on it.

If the Marines came he said, 200,000 gringos would die.

In Miami, the telephone rang incessantly. The callers were outraged. Every one of them. They were outraged by what they identified as a threat of sorts from Castro.

AIR, NOTHING ELSE

Put into place, what Castro said was a counter-threat to a threat born of a rumor made out of air and nothing else.

This weird bit of business rode across the headlines and took away the play from something real, something which did happen and is a fact. As a truth, however, it is almost as fantastic as the rumor.

In Washington, a Congressman on a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee suggested an economic reprisal against Cuba fashioned to stop those trials and executions.

Perhaps, he said, U.S. credit for the country of Cuba could be shut off or Cuban sugar could be barred from the trade in our Nation. This is a truly exotic thought.

NOT OUR BUSINESS

Since when did the Congress of the United States acquire the job of managing the domestic affairs of Cuba?

For too many generations, too many individuals in this country have stuck or tried to stick their thick paws into the domestic affairs of other countries in this hemisphere.

Every morning, afternoon, and evening, we are beat around in the conversations of Latin America because a few among us try or have tried to steer the purely domestic affairs of Latin American countries.

You know and I know that most people in our country have not even a passing notion to have an arm in running Cuba, Mexico, Argentina, or any foreign country. We know it, but the Latins don't.

DEMOCRACY AT LAST

It is rather tragic that this old kink curls into view at the moment. Fidel Castro is perhaps the best thing which has happened to Cuba since the Spanish fleet was sent to the bottom outside Santiago Bay in the summer of 1898.

He represents a fresh prospect for the establishment of democratic institutions in Cuba.

His strength is altogether inherited from the people, who swelled his pitifully small ranks as the rebels came out of the hills and marched across Cuba to take it away from a dictator.

He seems to know what self-government means, and what morality in government means.

PRESS IS NOW FREE

He sent the rebels into Habana to chop up the gambling wheels and the dice tables, and to put them off limits for the people of Cuba, and these are the people who can hardly afford to gamble a peso.

He restored a complete freedom of press, and in all history, there has never been a free society which did not have a free press—and in all history there has never been a free press in a dictatorial society. The two can't live together.

But.

What about those trials and executions?

Earlier, we have commented that a trial out in the field under a tree in the atmosphere of an angry people coming out of a revolution is wrong.

The fact that these people in the crowd have been tortured, their brothers and even their sisters killed, does not make this kind of trial right.

JOB FOR COURTS

The fact that the press is invited to these trials does not make the trials and the executions which seem to inevitably follow right.

In our opinion.

We would prefer that Fidel Castro jail the accused from the Batista gang and try them after the courts are reorganized.

But if the U.S. Government has a complaint against the field justice in Cuba, the United States should present its complaint to the Cuban Government or to the United Nations for a hearing.

No one can condone these trials, exhaustive as the trials may be, in the mood of revolution. We have seen pictures of the men, the women and the children killed by Batista's thugs and still we cannot condone the trials of these thugs by semimilitary jurors who are still wet from the revolution.

FOOLISH MEDDLERS

In spite of them, everything Senor Castro has done makes him look mighty like a bearded angel compared to the procession of dictators before him.

And, as declared in this comment, no one ever gave any citizen of the United States any right to preside over the domestic affairs of Cuba.

And anyone who assumes the right, a Congressman or anyone else, is a foolish meddler in a nervous world.

BILL BAGGS, Editor.

The Late Attorney General of Massachusetts a Martyr to Public Service

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, George Fin- gold was attorney general of Massachusetts, and one of the best vote-getters of the Republican Party in my home State.

Even though his political allegiance differed from mine, I was but one of the many Democrats who admired his ability, his character, and his marvelous energy.

George was a bighearted man in every way.

To all outward appearances, he seemed the picture of health.

But the toll of public life, as he cheerfully endeavored to meet the impossible demands of the people who liked him, and wanted him to be here, and there, and everywhere was breaking him inside.

George never complained because he was inspired by the sincere belief that his mission in life was to help others.

Unanimously endorsed by the Republican State convention to be its nominee for Governor of Massachusetts, he was engaged in an intensive campaign for that high honor when he was suddenly stricken.

Even now, nearly 5 months later, it is difficult to believe that he has passed away, so vivid is the memory of him.

He was the first member of the Jewish faith to be elected to State office in Massachusetts. He earned the confidence of all races and creeds and he vindicated that trust by his devotion to duty, finally sacrificing his life in the service of that ideal.

There is no finer tribute to his memory than the eulogy given by Rabbi Charles Weinberg, of the Congregation Beth Israel, Malden, Mass., that appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on September 2, 1958. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ATTORNEY GENERAL FINGOLD EULOGIZED AS CHAMPION OF LITTLE MAN—COURAGE AND INITIATIVE CITED BY RABBI WEINBERG

The following is the eulogy given by Rabbi Charles Weinberg of the Congregation Beth Israel, Malden:

"With grieving hearts we are gathered with the beloved family of the late attorney general, George Fingold, to pay our last respects to an eminent leader in the political arena of our Commonwealth.

"The shock of the sudden death of George Fingold has barely subsided. The spontaneous reaction to this tragedy that befell the family and the citizenry of our Commonwealth is in itself a great tribute to a great leader.

"Cut down in the midst of life, George Fingold exemplified the product of this land of opportunity, wherein a young man of modest circumstances was able to reach the loftiest positions in public service.

"Reared in a traditional Jewish home he learned early the great attributes of humility and trust. These virtues accompanied him throughout his brilliant career. Though he achieved quick eminence, he never forgot his past with its struggles and hardships.

"He was therefore recognized as the champion of the little man whom he loved and respected. The dignity of man was a venerated ideal in George Fingold's heart.

"He held sacred the right of every human being, regardless of their station in life, race color, or creed.

"In his search for strengthening our system of government he was guided by the ideal of a community of equals. His radiant personality warmed the hearts of those who crossed his path.

"ENEMY OF LAWLESSNESS, DEVOTED TO FAMILY

"George Fingold early in his career declared courageously with great moral conviction his unmitigated enmity against lawlessness. He had a passion for justice and sought always to secure the rights of the citizens of this Commonwealth.

"He long ago recognized that the state was a vehicle through which the godly attributes of justice and mercy, righteousness, and truth must be served.

"There was a continuous process in his life of the unfolding of the spirit of a man whose humanity, morality, and ethics were based upon the profound teachings of Judaism.

"His ethical standards of leadership filtered through his relations with his fellowman.

"George Fingold met the challenges of life and achieved greatness because he had confidence in the validity of his dreams and projects.

"He had courage and initiative. He knew clearly what he wanted to do and went right to it. Above all, he felt the hand of God guiding him, and so he had faith.

"We were the beneficiaries of these attributes of our late attorney general. There is, however, another great quality which is perhaps little known, for which indeed his soul is blessed.

"George Fingold had a deep attachment to his family. The Fifth Commandment, 'Honor thy father and thy mother,' took precedence over all. In the busiest of days, he took time out to visit with his father and these were frequent visits.

"The memory of his late mother abided with him throughout his career. It was a unique type of family devotion whose exemplification should inspire us all.

"VICTIM OF STRAIN ON PUBLIC SERVANTS

"Mrs. Fingold, you shared your husband with us far beyond the call of duty. You and his beloved family were a real source of inspiration to him in his career.

"Though his years were brief in number, his record of achievement was great. The presence of all the distinguished leaders of

our Commonwealth from all walks of life, the many thousands of messages that arrived from all over the Nation, bear testimony to the high esteem in which George was held.

"George Fingold was about to embark on the gubernatorial race. His service as a public servant took its toll and he was stopped short of an attempt to achieve the crowning success of his career.

"Should not his untimely death serve as notice to the public of the strenuous demands made upon our public officials? Through technical advances we have eased the burden of our daily tasks while at the same time the burdens of public servants have increased immeasurably.

"What a pity to have lost in the prime of life a leader whose guidance brought blessings to so many.

"Dear friends, we are faced now with the transition of a noble being from mortal to immortal life. George Fingold has achieved immortality. He will long be remembered by his beloved wife, his devoted family, and the hosts of friends.

"May his soul be bound up in the bond of eternal life."

Ormonde A. Kieb

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the devoted and unselfish service rendered to our Government by Ormonde A. Kieb, who has just resigned as Assistant Postmaster General. Mr. Kieb, a resident of New Jersey, is a personal friend of mine whom I have known for some years, and at considerable sacrifice to himself he accepted his appointment to the Post Office Department, thereby meeting the challenge to reorganize and revitalize the service.

In the 5 years of his administration which will come to a close on January 31, 1959, Mr. Kieb reorganized the operations of the Bureau of Facilities of the Post Office Department by reducing it from nine divisions to three functional line divisions known as Real Estate, Supplies, and Motor Vehicles. In addition a great part of the operations of these divisions was decentralized by being assigned to field offices. In the acquisition of post office space he introduced sound business practices in the commercial leasing technique and this was made possible by his long training in the real estate business in Newark, N.J. He brought about reduced costs in the supply system of the postal service together with reduced delivery schedule time and streamlined various operational procedures. These are only a few of the constructive features that "Toni" Kieb installed for the benefit of the postal service.

Mr. Kieb deserves the heartfelt thanks of all American citizens for his devotion to duty and he leaves his office operating with far greater efficiency and effectiveness than when he first entered into it. He received from the Postmaster General in 1956 the Distinguished Service Award of the Post Office Department in

recognition of his untiring zeal and constructive achievements.

I am glad to append herewith Mr. Kieb's letter of resignation to the President dated December 31, 1958, and the President's reply thereto of January 7, 1959. I include also an editorial dated January 10, 1959, from the Newark Evening News entitled "Public Service":

DECEMBER 31, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with deep regret that I tender to you my resignation as Assistant Postmaster General to be effective January 31, 1959. It has been a rewarding experience to have completed almost 6-year tour of duty in Government service during your administration as President and under the direction of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. I now find the time has come when I must return to private business.

It is a comfort and satisfaction that the responsibilities assigned to me have been completely reorganized.

The Real Estate Division through a competent and able staff, using modern real estate techniques, has obtained modern space for the Department at lower average rentals. Over 2,600 new modern buildings have been erected through public bidding by private investors for lease to the Department. Even though paying local real estate taxes to the communities out of the rent, they reflect lower annual costs to the taxpayers than the occupancy costs of postal space in traditional monumental Government-owned buildings. This modernization program is well underway and ready for rapid acceleration when the Congress provides the funds for your program.

The Department's supply system has been completely revamped. It is operating with much improved efficiency and better administrative control.

The Government-owned motor vehicle fleet has been almost completely changed over to standard production-line trucks in the new red, white, and blue color scheme. This, combined with modern fleet operating standards, shows lower initial costs and lower operating costs per mile. The motor vehicle service facilities are adequately equipped and have been fully redesigned with but a few exceptions in Government-owned garage buildings.

Please understand my appreciation for the opportunity to have contributed a small part to the many accomplishments of these years. It is with keen regret that I now write you to terminate my official assignment.

Mrs. Kieb and I shall always be devoted to Mrs. Eisenhower and yourself, as well as to the kind of Government service your able and dedicated leadership have provided for the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

ORMONDE A. KIEB.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 7, 1959.

The Honorable ORMONDE A. KIEB,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KIEB: I have your letter of December 31, 1958, and regretfully accede to your wishes by accepting your resignation to be effective January 31, 1959. I am aware of the splendid service you have rendered to the Post Office Department since you first assumed your duties in 1953. You have certainly earned the appreciation of your co-workers in Government and the people of the United States for your contribution to the work of the administration.

As you leave Government service to return to private life, you take with you my best wishes for your future health and happiness.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[From the Newark Evening News, Jan. 10, 1959]

PUBLIC SERVICE

Career men in government are inclined to be disdainful of the businessman who enters public service. The practice of bureaucracy is supposed to be full of things he just doesn't understand.

The businessman in Government does have his limitations, but on the whole he has been more effective than the professionals will admit and has been able to show them that government has something to learn from business.

The Eisenhower administration has drawn heavily on business in filling key posts requiring a knowledge of accounting and finance, personnel policies, purchasing and managerial techniques. Most conspicuous among them are Secretary of Labor Mitchell of Elizabeth and C. Douglas Dillon of Far Hills, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Ormonde A. Kieb, Newark realtor, has just resigned after serving 5 years as Assistant Postmaster General. As chief of his department's Bureau of Facilities, Mr. Kieb's long experience in real estate was of much use to the Government. Among other achievements, his leasing policies produced a substantial reduction in the average rent the Government is paying for post offices.

He returns to private life with the President's thanks for splendid service, a commendation which has been well earned.

Most Unkindest Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes on November 20, 1958:

MOST UNKINDEST CUT

Our readers will note that the heading to this editorial contains two superlative adjectives modifying a single noun. This use has been condemned by grammarians of recent years as redundant. At the time Shakespeare, in his drama Julius Caesar, wrote the line from which these words were taken, the custom of strengthening the thought to be expressed by two such superlative adjectives was accepted as grammatically correct.

We would like to point out that the noun described as most unkindest is the noun cut. Undoubtedly the Bard of Avon was anxious to bring home to his readers and to his hearers, the extent of the cut which brought an end to the life of one of Rome's greatest warriors, a man who had brought glory to the standards of the empire. So much for grammar.

All this discussion is brought about by a recent story which appeared in the columns of a Washington, D.C., newspaper.

The story goes on to say that President Eisenhower discussed new veterans spending with top aides yesterday (Saturday, November 8) in the first big test of his postelection pledge to fight for reduction in Federal spending.

The story continues: The session was held shortly before the President left by air on a weekend business and pleasure trip. Veterans' benefits, it was stated, which will cost

slightly more than \$5 billion this fiscal year, are one of the big spending items of the Federal budget.

And the story continues: The President said in his budget message to Congress last January that the time had come to "reconsider the laws providing veterans' benefits and services." He is reported to have said that many of these now overlap other Government welfare programs.

Over the years the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes has always tried to go along reasonably with the Chief Executive of our country, regardless of party, but we have found ourselves in a quandary to reconcile certain of his statements with other public utterances when it comes to a question of reducing Federal expenditures.

Certainly we would like to see certain Federal costs reduced. It might result in a reduction of the income tax which all of us have to pay, for which, we are sure, all our citizens would be grateful.

We have racked our brains for some years past in an endeavor to understand the mentality of the President when it comes to the consideration of the cost of veterans' benefits.

Unhappily, we have come up with but one answer. President Eisenhower is not interested in veterans, as such, and may perhaps be influenced by the leaders of big business who, certainly, have no desire to add to their taxes by repaying the debt they owe to our war veterans.

It may be all very well for the President to proclaim Veterans' Day on November 11 in high-sounding phrases, such as are contained in his recent decree which, among other things speaks "of our obligation to the veterans of the armed services, who have contributed immeasurably to the realization of those ideals of a free society which we cherish," and that "we should give nationwide expression to our high and enduring esteem for these veterans."

These are all pretty words but when we compare them with the fact that the first item to be considered in the reduction of Government costs is the cost of benefits to veterans and their dependents, we are inclined to think of these beautiful phrases as a mockery—something to be used once a year and then forgotten.

Up to now we must admit we have indulged in words of criticism alone. Now we would like to cite some statistics compiled by Col. Leonard P. Ayres, onetime Chief of the Statistics Division of the General Staff of the Army on the subject of our war with Germany from 1917-19.

At the outbreak of World War I on April 6, 1917, there were, in round figures, 200,000 men serving in the Regular Army of the United States.

By the end of the war approximately 4 million men had either enlisted or been drafted for service in the Army. Of this group, 2,810,298 men were draft inductees. Others included the National Guard troops which were taken into the armed forces.

After the war was declared, the size of the Regular Army jumped from 200,000 to 500,000. Thus, 300,000 were volunteers who joined the service before being drafted. Naturally, all of these came from civilian life.

According to Colonel Ayres, 20 divisions of the Regular Army served during World War I. Of these divisions, 12 reached France. Three of these divisions, again according to Colonel Ayres, never served in combat.

The average strength of a division in World War I was 28,000, including officers and men. Considering the Regular Army divisions who really fought the war, we find that nine of such divisions saw combat. Multiplying nine times 28,000 we find that 252,000 Regular Army men saw combat and some of these divisions did not enter the lines until late in October 1918.

So we are inclined to ask ourselves who won World War I insofar as American troops

were concerned? Further study of Colonel Ayres' statistics brings us to the mathematical conclusion that of the men who actually saw combat service, 1,190,000 came from civilian life. These figures are interesting but the facts sustain them.

So again we ask ourselves: What does President Eisenhower have against the men who fought and won World War I? Is it the fact that all his military training has brought him to the belief that civilian fighting men are men to be used in time of need and then discarded, left to make their own way in the world?

Has our President become obsessed with the thought that only the man who follows a military career all his life should be considered when it comes time to repay him for such service?

We could go on quoting statistics to show that civilians won World War II and acquitted themselves nobly in the Korean war. These were not professional fighting men, but men who realized that when their country called it was time to serve, as their forefathers had done from the days of the Minute Men of Massachusetts down through all the wars our country has fought.

It has been said in these columns from year to year that the cost of veterans' care must be considered as the cost of the war in which they fought.

We can understand the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce taking potshots at war veterans. The cost of aiding such veterans hits their pockets, and when you hit the pockets of the NAM members and the members of the National Chamber of Commerce you hit their hearts.

But when a President of the United States, himself a veteran of two world wars, makes it his first objective of business to seek a way to cut benefits from the very men who made our Nation possible, we must agree with Shakespeare, "This is the most unkindest cut of all."

Florida's Governor Has the Right Slant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, has demonstrated his rare ability as the State's chief executive on many occasions. He has been one of Florida's outstanding Governors.

His attitude on the recent visit of Russia's Deputy Premier is reported with observations by John B. McDermott. As political writer, John B. McDermott has a very high reputation. He has traveled all over the world and has for many years been a very keen student of international affairs. He just recently returned from an extended trip to Russia. His observations and conclusions are sound and merit much consideration.

His recent article in the Miami Herald follows:

COLLINS HAS RIGHT SLANT

(By John B. McDermott)

The proposal made by Sumter L. Lowry, of Tampa, former gubernatorial candidate, that Gov. LeRoy Collins try to block a visit to Florida by Russian Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan represents isolationist thinking.

One pertinent fact this writer learned from his trip to the U.S.S.R.—we just got back—is that the U.S. Government should encourage Russian leaders to come to this country and see how we live.

The Russian people have no real concept of conditions in the U.S.A., and the only way they can learn is to have representatives come here and find out. An example of this was brought home to me during a chance meeting in Red Square when, through an interpreter, I had a conversation with some dozen or more passersby.

THEY NEED FACTS

These men and women, representing the average man-in-the-street, were concerned about the fact that unemployment is rampant in this country. They had read of this condition repeatedly in the highly censored Russian press. They were obviously surprised by my assurance that most people who want to work have jobs in our country.

I feel sure that General Lowry's intentions in wanting Mikoyan to be kept out of Florida are well meaning. But if we put an "iron curtain" around our country, how will the Soviets get a true picture of just how good conditions are here?

We live in a land of luxury which, to the Russians, is almost beyond the realm of belief. The greatest luxury I experienced in Russia were the plush accommodations and delectable dinner aboard the KLM Royal Dutch airliner over the U.S.S.R. on the last leg of a flight from New York to the snow-draped Moscow airport.

REMEMBER NIXON?

This is not to imply that I experienced hardship of living while there. I didn't. The hotels were adequate, clean and well heated. The food was plentiful and good, although not particularly inspiring with the exception of chicken Kiev.

The Russians tried hard to be friendly to the foreign visitors—a factor which we would do well to emulate when Russians or other foreigners are in our country.

Most of us recall the revulsion which swept this Nation when Vice President Nixon was spit on and insulted during his good will tour of Latin America.

Yet, has not Mikoyan been given comparable treatment during some of his stops at American cities?

Admittedly, these demonstrations are being sparked by Hungarian refugees or sympathizers who have good reason to hate the U.S.S.R. and its official functionaries. But do these demonstrations against Russia's No. 2 man do any good? I think not.

LET OTHERS COME

Governor Collins told Lowry he sees no need for urging the U.S. State Department to keep Mikoyan out of Florida. He does not feel, as does Lowry, that Mikoyan may lull us to sleep.

Lowry claims that allowing Mikoyan to visit here would be an insult to every patriotic citizen, a betrayal of the memory of Florida men who lost their lives in Korea.

Collins advised Lowry he felt Floridians were able to take care of themselves during Mikoyan's visit—that he did not feel Floridians were in danger of being contaminated by communism simply because the Kremlin's No. 2 man was passing through.

And, pointedly, he suggested to Lowry that if the former National Guard general felt a danger of being improperly influenced, he and any other person of like thinking could:

Keep away from airports or any other places where Mikoyan might be during his visit.

Refrain from listening to radio broadcasts or watching television shows which might feature the Russian bigwig.

Skip over newspaper accounts which describe his visit or which report on interviews with him.

In the opinion of this writer, based on his own experiences in Russia and covering the cold war in Europe for some 8 years, I'd say that our best weapon against communism is to expose the Communist leaders to what this land of democracy has to offer.

And where else but Florida can we show a better example of American living at its best?

Eggheads and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Leon Keyserling, which appeared in the October 27, 1958, issue of the New Republic.

Leon Keyserling, consulting economist and attorney and president of the Conference on Economic Progress, was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from 1950 to 1953. His experience in government began as assistant to Senator Herbert Lehman and has included work on legislation relating to housing, social security, banking and currency, public works, labor relations, and unemployment. He is presently a member of the Advisory Committee on Economic Policy of the Democratic Advisory Council.

The article follows:

EGGHEADS AND POLITICS

(By Leon Keyserling)

Recent writers in the New Republic, commencing with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., on September 15 ("The Death Wish of the Democrats"), have discussed the egghead's contribution to politics and especially Democratic politics. But only the surface has been scratched thus far.

First of all, how valid is Mr. Schlesinger's thesis that by excluding intellectuals and creative liberalism, the Democratic Party is "blowing out its own brains"?

1. In support of this thesis, Mr. Schlesinger says that the party in the 1920's was a "dreary alliance of northern city bosses and southern Bourbons," that Roosevelt and the New Deal transformed this situation, and that Mr. DeSapio in New York and others elsewhere are now part of a revolt against this splendid transformation. I had thought that, at the level of practical political operations, Roosevelt's New Deal victories in Congress (not to speak of his electoral victories on domestic issues in 1932 and 1936) were forged of this dreary alliance, and that F.D.R. lost his power to put through domestic legislation circa 1937, when the southerners in Congress withdrew their support.

2. Mr. Schlesinger says that Al Smith's Liberty League affiliation after 1933 "showed the feebleness of even the best of the party whose [presidential] nominee he was in 1928." But I had thought that this same feeble party had nominated F.D.R. for Vice President in 1920, when it also nominated the highly literate and then liberal (pro-League of Nations) James M. Cox for President. In the State of New York, about which Mr. Schlesinger is now particularly worried, the same feeble party in 1928 nominated F.D.R. for Governor and Herbert H. Lehman for Lieutenant Governor. In the same State, the great Robert F. Wagner was

first nominated for the U.S. Senate in 1926. Turning from history to logic, I suppose that James F. Byrnes might now be deemed as conservative as Al Smith appeared to be when he joined the Liberty League. Does this demonstrate retroactively the feebleness of the best of the Democratic Party at the time when Roosevelt made Byrnes his chief lieutenant in the Senate, then made him a Justice of the Supreme Court, and after that made him a forerunner—and much better version—of Sherman Adams during World War II?

3. In addition to Senator Wagner—who was neither an Ivy League man nor an egghead, but who climbed straight up the political ladder from boyhood without skipping a single rung—the men whom the Democratic Party in New York State nominated and elected to the Senate during the height of the New Deal were Royal S. Copeland and James M. Mead. They were both good men and true, and my respect for their records is genuine. But assuredly they were not eggheads, and there are no indications that Mr. Finletter would have received the party preferences had he then been available. I must add that Mr. Finletter was my preference for this year, but that is beside the point. So much for New York. As for Connecticut and Pennsylvania, to which Mr. Schlesinger also calls attention, I cannot recall that a majority of the Democratic Senators from these States during the early New Deal were a composite of Messrs. Benton, Bowles, and Dilworth. I hasten to add that these three men are also among my favorites, but again this is beside the point. The Democratic Party today, and the role of the liberals in it, may be different from a generation ago, but Mr. Schlesinger's evidence to this effect is not very convincing.

What is important is not that so brilliant and accurate a historian as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., may have taken a temporary holiday from his discipline. It is that his article in the New Republic raises implicitly the whole issue of the appropriate and feasible role of the intellectual concerned with the substance of political programs.

Let us return for guidance to the early New Deal era. I was in Washington then, in a spot where it was easy to observe what was going on. There were indeed some New Deal intellectuals who dabbled and squabbled, and even connived, with respect to the choice of candidates for governor, Senator, and even perhaps the Presidency. This they were perfectly entitled to do. But I can think of few, if any, of the bold economic and social measures of the early New Deal which shot from the fertile brains of these gentlemen. Quite to the contrary, some of the most important of these measures were originated by New Deal era intellectuals who did not concern themselves with who got nominated for what, and who remained so much in the background that they may not receive much space in the best histories of the New Deal.

I do not imply that intellectual innovators cannot, when they are uniquely gifted, successfully combine their intellectual activity with embroilment in more proximate political maneuvers. When they can, so much the better. But I do mean to say that this combination is not their most likely forte, and that when they attempt it they usually lose more than they gain. This is because the embroilment itself distracts them from the work which is their special challenge and responsibility. If it be true that the Democratic Party of today is programatically as much behind the New Deal as Mr. Schlesinger believes—which I do not personally feel—the fault seems to me not to rest primarily with the political nominees or officeholders. The trouble, primarily, is that these nominees and officeholders have had no sufficient source from which to draw the inspiration and ideas which many of them seek.

This brings us to the most important point of all. If there has recently been a shortfall

of creative liberalism in America, it has not been primarily on the straight political, but rather on the intellectual, or egghead, level. I take as illustrations Mr. Schlesinger himself, and also John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, whose ideas seem rather closely allied to Mr. Schlesinger's. This selection seems fair enough, since there are probably no two eggheads writing about public affairs who are more widely read, influential, gifted, and useful. It does embarrass me somewhat to say what I am going to, for I regard these men as two of my best friends, and my admiration for them is immense. But the cause may be worth the pain. Besides, my two good friends have on occasion swung their intellectual cudgels lustily against some of the cherished ideas of some of their friends, and one of their largest merits is that they are aware of the public and private good to be served from doing this on occasion. The method I shall follow is to state what seems to me a defensible liberal position on a few key issues, and then examine what my two friends have said on these issues.

In my view, foreign policy, and especially foreign economic policy, is or should be the dominant concern of American liberalism today. The recent observation of Mr. Nehru, that the gap is widening in the world between the living standards of the few who have and the many who have not, is statistically correct. It is also of supreme human and political importance to us in the United States. For even if we avoid atomic holocaust, which we shall have a far better chance of doing if we correct this gross inequity than if we do not, we would nonetheless in the course of time become an isolated system surrounded by an ever-rising wall of totalitarianism, if the dictatorships should help to raise the living standards of the underdeveloped peoples outside their own borders much more than we do.

Our default on this score is stupendous. The percentage of our total national product which has been flowing in recent years into international economic cooperation and assistance is by now so imperceptible that one blushes to mention it. And while this decline has many roots, the debate as to how much we can do overseas has been almost entirely in terms of the effect upon our domestic economy. In this context, a high rate of economic growth at home would not per se provide the will to spend abroad, but it would at least provide the means and some better foundation for popular assent for what we need to do.

For example, a high rate of economic growth (about 5 percent annual average) from the start of 1958 through the end of 1964 would yield about \$400 billion more of national product for the 7-year period as a whole, or an average of nearly \$80 billion more per year, than if we continued the low annual average rate of economic growth (somewhat above 2 percent) registered during the period 1953-57 and which has meant a gradually rising level of chronic unemployment of manpower and plant. Past experience, and especially current productivity developments, indicate that a higher growth rate is entirely feasible in relative peacetime. If we allocated even 5 or 10 percent of this high-growth increment to our overseas economic responsibilities, we could without feeling any pinch at home carry forward the most ambitious international economic programs envisaged by the best informed. There is nothing extreme about this objective; it has frequently been expressed by outstanding Republican businessmen, outstanding labor leaders, and Democratic public servants.

But Galbraith's new book, "The Affluent Society," fairly read as a whole, has been written virtually as if there were no economic world outside of the United States; in fact, he sometimes uses the phrase "in an affluent world." He ridicules those who

stress the rapid expansion of American production as a high priority, on the ground that we are already affluent. But in fact we are far from sufficiently affluent, even at home, to justify this derision. And even if we were later to achieve at home everything that we need and want, or think we need and want, it would not do for us to become an island of indescribable plenty surrounded by oceans of deprivation and envy. If we should for the first time in history register a technological breakthrough which could help enormously to erase the worst poverty from the face of the earth, should we not use this capacity to the full?

But in the May 3, 1956, issue of the Reporter, Mr. Schlesinger seemed to have argued that liberals should be wary of attending to international duties until America itself has been made a shining example for the world to follow. I grant that we have plenty to do at home; but the attitude of the rest of the world toward us must be affected at least as much by what we do with or to them as by what we do for ourselves. In fairness to Mr. Schlesinger, his idea about going slow on the international front probably reflected his view of practical strategy for the 1956 political campaign. But when the egghead gets preoccupied with this kind of business, he is not keeping his own store. His big job is to discover what programs are of vital national importance and why, and then to try to persuade the political spokesmen—and through them the country—accordingly.

Domestically, in addition to civil rights and civil liberties, the two prime political problems of our times, it seems to me, are: the vast impoverishment of millions of our citizens even today in their private economic lives and the vast impoverishment of our public services—relative to our current actual national wealth and product, and far more so relative to our current and rapidly growing technological potentials.

What does Professor Galbraith have to say on these matters? With respect to private property, chapter 23 of "The Affluent Society" says that it is "no longer a massive affliction" in the United States. The statistics supporting this assertion are limited to those families with annual incomes below \$1,000. He says that such poverty is of the "case" variety, attributable mostly to individual shortcomings, or "insular" poverty, due largely to the desire of people to stay in the locality of their birth. The remedy for most of this, he says, is in more public services like health and education, so that the next generation may not suffer for the sins of their fathers. Based on this analysis, Galbraith says that such poverty cannot be reduced much nor quickly enough by overall economic growth, and consequently that such growth at a high rate is no longer very important.

It is unnecessary at this point to show why this is far too narrow an attack upon even this poorest sector of the American community. For the truly startling thing is Galbraith's identification of the problem itself, which in turn weakens fatally the remedies proposed. For in 1957, we had more than 7 million consumer units (multiple-person and single person families) with annual incomes below \$2,000, and we had more than 19 million with annual incomes below \$4,000. An affluent society? Looking only at multiple-person families, there were almost 3.5 million below \$2,000 and almost 12 million below \$4,000—a figure considerably below that usually established by competent agencies as the bare minimum required today for a healthy and decent standard of living. This comes to more than a quarter of all multiple-person families. These families may be living in "affluence" compared with people in India, or compared with an even larger number of people in the United States a generation or two ago.

But they are certainly living in poverty by any standard that should have meaning for us today.

Galbraith's statement (ch. 8) that social security is "finished or largely finished business" is equally neglectful of the incomes and living conditions of an aged population about two-thirds of whom in the case of individuals living alone have money incomes from all sources including social security of less than \$1,000 a year, and more than four-fifths of whom are below \$2,000. Similarly, Arthur Schlesinger, in the New York Times magazine of August 4, 1957, intimates that we have outlived the New Deal in part because we have outlived private poverty in its gross and extensive form.

Now, it is perfectly clear that an expansion of public services such as education and health, while urgently desirable, cannot—in the absence of economic growth—remedy the truly massive problem of private poverty. Better education and better health may awaken the latent productivity and ambitions of a large portion of the poorest. But in the final analysis, their incomes can rise significantly (except for those employed by the Government only through the expansion of those parts of the economy which provide private employment and pay wages and salaries. An increase of almost \$17 billion in annual national income would be required to lift all of the multiple-person families now below \$4,000 up to even this meager level. While redistributing income might help to correct some inequities, obviously so huge a sum must come predominantly from a rapid increase in total production and total national income. Much of the reduction in private poverty in the past generation has resulted from the extremely high rate of economic growth and full employment during and immediately after World War II, and this occurred despite the heavy take of the war for noneconomic purposes. Since 1953, with our overall economic growth averaging only about half of what it should, there has been considerably less progress toward the lessening of poverty.

Furthermore, all historic experience shows that a low rate of economic growth has had a regressive effect upon income distribution, while a high rate of economic growth has had a progressive effect. So whatever Professor Galbraith may intend, his conclusion that a high rate of economic growth is not of prime importance would give comfort to the view that the further substantial reduction of private poverty in short order is not of prime importance. And his proposals to expand local sales and to acquiesce in a moderately high level of unemployment—which are perhaps the two most important specific proposals in his book—would cramp economic growth, have a high regressive effect upon income distribution, and perpetuate rather than reduce poverty. (Parenthetically, it is interesting that another distinguished Harvard economist, Arthur Smithies, has just found "evidence that satiety is being approached and that the utility of additional consumption is diminishing" (Challenge magazine, Oct. 1958). He adds that, if the high costs of the cold war continue, it might be desirable to modify consumer standards rather than to press for the high growth rate which the Rockefeller report urges. Evidently, the problem of poverty is not massive in the Widener library. And on purely economic grounds, there is something remote about economists who want to restrain consumption, when a slightly rising level of total consumption was the main reason why the economic recession did not get much worse, and when consumption will need to rise much faster than it is rising now to reactivate a healthy resumption of business investment in producer facilities and to restore full prosperity—even if public outlays are increased greatly.)

In addition to the families now below \$4,000 a year, there are now almost 20 million multiple-person families, or about 45 percent of the total, with annual incomes between \$4,000 and \$7,500. Thus, almost three-quarters of all multiple-person families are now below \$7,500. Can these families now afford trips abroad, cultural enjoyments, university educations for their children— which those who say we are now so affluent regard as modest for themselves? These families need economic growth, and so do those who produce what they buy.

Let us turn to our basic public services, including both national defense and domestic welfare programs. Putting aside national defense, Galbraith's view is that much or even most of the needed domestic expansion should be taken care of, at least for the short run, through the redistribution of the existing expenditures and product, with less going into private consumption and more going into domestic public services. I would agree fully that, at any recent or current level of total national product, some redistribution away from luxuries and toward essential public services would be highly desirable.

But it is too bad that Galbraith has not in his book quantified the amounts of additional domestic public services we need. Had he done so, it would have been shown that to meet these needs reasonably well (while assuring a sufficient level of expenditure for national security and international economic cooperation), our total public outlays—Federal, State, and local—must be lifted to an annual rate by 1964 of about \$33 billion, or 38 percent, above the recent annual rate. To attempt to do this primarily by redistribution of expenditures—from private consumption to public needs—rather than primarily through high economic growth, defies history and reason. Any such attempt would knock our whole economy for a loop, and would be unthinkable from the viewpoint of popular and political consent. In contrast, for the whole 7-year period from early 1958 through 1964, a high as against a low rate of economic growth would yield, as already indicated, a differential of about \$400 billion in our total national product. About \$70 billion of this differential would flow during these 7 years into enlarged national security programs, international economic cooperation, and domestic welfare services—housing, education, health. Moreover, granted a high rate of economic growth, adequate total government expenditure would represent a smaller part of our total national product than the starved government expenditures have represented in a retarded economy during recent years. Galbraith's allegation that other liberals have been impervious to our public needs passeth understanding.

We come to the old argument about who pays for all this growth. The method of financing domestic public programs is vital. On this, Galbraith in general argues that needed additional programs cannot be financed mainly out of the Federal budget, partly because of the heavy national defense burden, and partly because the new taxation required for this purpose could not be raised because liberals and conservatives would not agree as to who should bear the tax burden. He therefore proposes that the increased domestic public services be financed largely through local sales taxes, covering food and necessities as well as luxuries (ch. 18 and especially 22). How sound is this? In the first place, as already indicated, we probably would not need the additional taxes at all, if we had a high enough rate of economic growth. In the second place, is it wise or expedient to slide over the profoundly basic question of the proper imposition of whatever tax burden we have? And in the third place, is it practical to suggest that this political and social argument of principles of taxation could be reduced by turning the

question back to local authorities, or that an attempted resolution of the argument locally would result in more equity or social balance than resolution at the Federal level?

Even the late Senator Taft, especially in his housing and educational efforts, recognized the equalization principle which imposes upon the Federal Government heavy and increasing responsibilities. Can we as a nation afford the view that the improvement of education and health services for children in the States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico be no faster than these States can afford? We can find better ways to expand our domestic public services than to take more pennies in sales taxes from the depleted pockets of the poor. And these kinds of sales taxes, by further repressing private consumption among low- and middle-income families, would aggravate the imbalances in our economy which at all times save those associated with war have caused undue economic slack.

The other main proposal contained in the Galbraith book is that we should acquiesce in a moderately high level of unemployment. The reason advanced (ch. 15) is that this is probably the best defense against inflation, the ultimate enemy of social balance. This has been for years the chief weapon of ultraconservative groups in their fight against full employment. My answer is that even if it were true that a moderately high level of unemployment were one way to repress inflation, I could hardly imagine anything more antithetical to the concept of social balance than that the affluent college professor or the wealthy foundation president should enjoy somewhat more price stability at the expense of the unemployed. Nor can I accept the notion that higher unemployment benefits are a tolerable substitute (ch. 21) for the opportunity to use one's talents for constructive purposes, and thus to enjoy full economic as well as political citizenship. From a worldwide perspective, the surrender of the goal of full employment in the United States would stun those elsewhere who properly believe that the right to work in its true sense is a fundamental human right.

Furthermore, the theory that a moderately high rate of unemployment is conducive to price stability is invalid. Galbraith's statements (ch. 15) that inflation "can occur only when the demands on the economy are somewhat near the capacity of the plant and available labor force to supply them," and is most likely only "when demand is strong and rising, and unemployment below 3 or 4 million," seem curiously remote from the actual conditions of 1957-58. For this most recent experience, and in fact all experience save under conditions emerging from war, has demonstrated that high unemployment and economic slack—short of a real depression—produce more price inflation than a high rate of economic growth with very low unemployment. The data on this is abundantly available. And the reasons are clear: a slack use of plant and manpower increases costs per unit, or at least makes costs per unit higher than they would be with reasonably full use of resources, and these increased costs are indeed inflationary. Galbraith is correct in stating that the expansion of production in itself does not prevent inflation, as war experience shows. But such inflation occurred when expanded production and incomes led to civilian buying power growing much faster than goods available for civilian consumption. There is little analogy between such a situation and a sustained and well-balanced program of full employment and full production in relative peacetime.

Moreover, Galbraith's proposal that unemployment benefits be lifted close to the wage level when unemployment becomes relatively

high (an eminently desirable proposal on other grounds) would certainly be more inflationary and on all scores less desirable than productive job opportunity for these people. His proposal that unemployment reaches lower levels does not exhibit much "social balance" toward those who remain unemployed, and who are not one whit better off because they are part of a smaller rather than a larger total number of unemployed. This manipulation of the treatment of the unemployed, in the name of economic stabilization, seems to me a mechanistic disregard for the human element.

In the New York Times article to which I have already referred, Mr. Schlesinger says that "the economic problem at home seems to be fixed up for the moment." He suggests that "the liberal must recover his deeper roots in the American cultural traditions—in Whitman, Emerson, Thoreau, Melville, William and Henry James * * *." I am fond of these authors, but insofar as we are concerned with the means for improving the society's translation of liberalism I can hardly imagine a candidate thumping for dear old William James. The liberal's political task is still to discover ways of making available to all Americans better incomes, better housing and health services, better education, more freedom from economic insecurity, and more effective participation by our country in worldwide advance toward peace, freedom and plenty, all of which involve the mobilization of appropriate economic energies through the political process. The concern of the egghead in politics is a social concern. I would let each citizen decide for himself whether he prefers Melville to Mary Roberts Rinehart, or whether he would rather listen to the Fifth Symphony than Elvis Presley.

Mr. Schlesinger goes on to say, also in the same Times article, that, while the fight against poverty was the heart of the New Deal, "it has not been the central issue of traditional American liberalism," nor has it been "the heart of Jeffersonian democracy, nor of Jacksonian democracy, nor of the antislavery movement, nor of the Progressive movement." I beg to differ; it seems to me that these movements, and Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom as well, were directed toward the improvement of the relative and absolute economic and social status of the common man; they were not interested in what he read.

As I thus contemplate some of the ideas of some of the eggheads, I am mindful of the passages in Schlesinger's magnificent first volume of "The Age of Roosevelt," which point out how unprepared the most famous of the economist eggheads were to make any substantial contribution to the challenge of those days. His evidence tends to confirm my conviction, growing during the past quarter-century, that I would rather trust a good part of our political programs to the seasoned politicians than to the eggheads. Because they are closer to life, as it is commonly lived, these politicians may be better economists than those who belong to the guild. There are not many seasoned politicians today who advocate a moderately high level of unemployment or more sales taxes on food, or who tell us that we have pretty well gotten over the problem of massive poverty, or that unemployment insurance is ever a desirable substitute for jobs, or even that most of us are sufficiently affluent. Perhaps our political system is not so bad after all. Perhaps we should let the politicians continue to pick the candidates, and let the voters continue to decide who wins. And some of the eggheads, if they are not satisfied with things as they are, might consider afresh whether they might benefit by the words of Cassius: "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves."

The First Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on the newest veterans' organization which is the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., under the leadership of Lewis Brake, national commander. This editorial appeared in the Stars and Stripes, National Tribune on September 11, 1958:

THE FIRST STEP

Beginning next Sunday, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. will open their annual convention in Springfield, Ill.

It is pleasant to be able to say that this comparatively young veterans' organization has made splendid steps forward during the past year. It has had a sound leadership, a steadfast program, and its story of accomplishment is worthy of recording.

Under the leadership of Lewis Brake, together with the cooperation and support of the auxiliary, the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. has achieved one of its goals—the granting of a congressional charter, recognizing it as a veteran group to be considered and worthy of recognition in its own right, along with other major veteran organizations.

That congressional charter carries with it many privileges, much to be desired, and naturally certain obligations which we feel the group will fulfill.

The organization now has the right to represent its membership before the various claims bodies of the Veterans' Administration and to speak to congressional committees with an authority which it did not heretofore possess.

The delegates to the national convention will meet in Springfield in a few days and they will have before them two important problems to consider and act upon.

Naturally, the first and most important subject which will come up before the voting strength of the convention will be the choosing of leaders for the coming year.

Serious thought should be given by the delegates in their choice of national leadership for 1958-59. A successful surge forward has been made in many directions during the past few years of leadership and the delegates should see to it that those who are to lead and advise the organization for the coming 12 months be chosen wisely and with a view to advancing the interests of the membership they represent.

We would not consider it proper for us to advise the delegates as to how they should vote on any subject—election of officers or anything else—but we like to present to them our thoughts at this time, based on the experience of many years relating to the affairs of war veterans.

Setting aside the question of election of new officers, which is strictly the business of the organization, we would like to offer a few suggestions for the coming year's activities which we feel will aid the members and their new leaders in the guidance of the organization.

First, we recommend steadfastness of purpose. Up to the present time the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have set definite goals—happily, not too many—and thus the organization has been able to confine itself to the furtherance of those goals with success, partially accomplished.

We would, therefore, suggest that they retain this steadfastness of purpose and not go off on many tangents and facets which affect our national life, action which might tend to weaken their effort in reaching the goal which still remains to be accomplished—that is, an adequate pension for our veterans of World War I who are aged and needy and who deserve the consideration of the Government of the United States and its people.

It has been said that "constant dropping wears away a stone." This is certainly true, and if the organization brings to bear all its effort on the one plan which has been its reason for existence, then that constant dropping is certain to have the influence it merits.

Our next thought is membership. It is remarkable how this new group has grown, once proper leadership has been established. With its membership well over the 100,000 mark at this time and with new barracks being formed at the rate of about 4 a week all over the country, a stimulus has been provided for next year's work along this line which should excite the interest of every member and encourage every member to go out into the highways and byways and preach the doctrine of membership until all eligible veterans have joined the ranks.

The vast potentiality in membership may appear appalling but not to men of stout hearts and men of determination. The field is there—some 2,800,000 strong and the reason for joining among the class involved is sound.

We therefore urge that this year—and particularly these coming months, before the next Congress convenes—be used to build up such a membership that when the leaders of the organization appear next year before the appropriate committees of Congress they will be able to present statistics to prove that they truly represent a vast segment of the men who served in 1917-19, and that they express the will of these veterans with such figures that Congress will listen and take heed of their plea for the needy and aged comrades of that early war and grant the relief so much desired.

It should be a comforting thought to the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. to know that little by little, the two largest veteran organizations in the land are coming around to the new group's way of thinking.

True, there may be some divergence of opinion in the manner in which benefits should be granted to the needy veterans involved, but the basic fact remains that these two large groups recognize the need of aid and are willing to support legislation to grant such aid.

Our last thought brings up the question of auxiliaries. Happily for your organization the women who are eligible have responded nobly in their support of the organization. Almost as fast as a new barracks is formed, there you will find alongside it a new auxiliary, ready to carry on in ways which the men may not always understand but which seem to bring results just the same.

It has been said, "never underestimate the power of a woman," and, bearing this in mind we suggest that the veterans themselves encourage the formation of auxiliaries, for the combination of steadfast men and devoted women is a hard one to beat.

Therefore, we recommend that auxiliaries be built up as quickly as possible in order that the combined effort of the men and women involved may be exercised to the best possible advantage of all concerned.

As we have pointed out the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. have achieved their first goal—the granting of a congressional charter.

May we therefore offer as the slogan of the group for the coming year: Steadfastness of purpose, increased membership, and auxiliaries throughout the land. It's a winning combination.

Passports for U.S. Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address by Mr. Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, which he made in Washington to leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In his address, which appeared in the December 5 issue of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. O'Connor tells how Communists are freely going abroad and how the State Department is helpless to do anything about this dangerous situation. The author stresses the urgent need for tighter regulations in the issuing of passports to Communists, and appeals to Congress for legislation to provide this security measure which I too feel is so vital to the interests of our country:

In our view, control over the issuance of passports has been an important part of our defenses against indirect Communist aggression. Under the law today, that part of our defenses against Communist subversion no longer exists. Your Government is today powerless to deny passports to known Communists who are going abroad for the purpose of assisting and supporting the international Communist conspiracy. This dangerous situation exists because in June of this year the Supreme Court said that the State Department did not have adequate authority, without specific legislation, to deny passports to Communists of Communist supporters.

As a result of that decision, the State Department has received as of early this week 596 applications for passports from persons who have records of activity in support of the international Communist movement. Before the Supreme Court's decision, many of those persons had been refused passports or had abandoned their applications when asked to identify themselves as Communists. Since the decision, these persons have moved promptly to take advantage of the breach in our defenses. They are getting their passports while the getting is good.

We believe that this is a dangerous situation and one which needs to be cured promptly. It can be cured by legislation giving to the State Department authority to deny passports to Communist supporters. The Department sought to obtain such legislation in the last session of Congress. Although the House passed a bill, the Senate failed to act. With your help and active support, we hope to obtain such legislation in the next Congress.

In our view, the unrestricted travel of these 596 persons abroad represents a real danger to the security of the United States. Although the State Department promptly abided by the decision of the Supreme Court, there is a respectable body of informed opinion that does not agree with the philosophy of that decision. The majority opinion summarized the philosophy behind the decision by saying that a passport applicant need not state under oath whether or not he is a Communist because that question deals "with beliefs, with associations, with ideological matters."

This view seems to some unrealistic because it fails to take into account all of

the facts of the situation. The Communist Party and its supporters are an activist organization engaged in a worldwide conspiracy which seeks in every way to undermine and weaken the U.S. Government. I believe that our Government has a clear obligation to defend itself against that conspiracy. In doing so, scrupulous regard must, of course, be given to the rights of the individual and to the traditions of civil liberty. However, the courts should give equal weight to a realistic analysis of the danger that the Communist conspiracy presents to the American people.

After the Supreme Court decision, the administration promptly submitted legislation to the Congress. In an effort to meet the objections raised by the Supreme Court, the legislation proposed by the administration provided authority for the denial of passports to those persons whose records over the past 10 years showed activities in the Communist movement rather than mere beliefs or associations.

The administration recommended that Congress make certain findings of fact to show that Congress viewed the Communist Party as more than an organization reflecting political associations and beliefs. The proposed legislation also provided that a record of active support of the Communist Party justified a conclusion that an applicant was in fact going abroad to further the interests of the Communist Party. After a number of hearings, the House passed a shortened version of the bill on the next to the last day of the session. Unfortunately, it proved to be impossible to obtain any action in the Senate before Congress adjourned.

Much of the credit for the passage of the bill in the House must go to Congressman VOYTS, of Ohio, and Congressman SELDEN, of Alabama. These two men were most persistent and effective in their efforts to bring the bill out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and get it adopted on the floor.

But, among some of their colleagues, I repeatedly heard doubts expressed as to the need for such legislation. Through several days of hearings, I was frequently asked the question: "Why was it dangerous for American Communists to travel abroad? Why can they do more harm abroad than they can do here? Why, if the mails and the diplomatic pouch are open to these people, is it so important that they be prevented from actually traveling abroad in person?"

These are good questions and I should like to give you gentlemen the answers as I see them.

HOW COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY WORKS

To answer these questions requires an understanding of what the Communist conspiracy is and how it operates. I do not need to explain to this group the aims of the Communists or their political objectives. I should say, however, that the dependence of the Communists on direct armed aggression has in recent years lessened. The emphasis today is on indirect aggression. That type of aggression places a much heavier reliance than heretofore on subversion and espionage and on all forms of political agitation and political propaganda.

The principal instrument of the Soviet Communists for carrying out these tactics of subversion and political agitation abroad is, of course, the apparatus of the International Communist conspiracy. This international apparatus exists in almost every part of the world and is directed and supported from Moscow. It is a vast and complex organization, partly overt and partly covert. Much of its activity is public and can be seen in a variety of forms in every capital of the world.

Perhaps even a more important part of this activity is hidden from view and relies on secret communication and correspondence,

on covert financing, and on hidden means of resupply. In such a worldwide organization there must be hundreds, and thousands, indeed probably millions, of persons in all the countries of the world who have their valued place in the party machinery. A fair share of these persons are here in the United States. Let me tell you about some of the worst cases who have recently applied for passports.

One of our recent applicants was born in Czechoslovakia and is now a naturalized American citizen. It was his job to furnish his contacts in Czechoslovakia with the names of active anti-Communists in the United States whose relatives were living back in Czechoslovakia. What the Czech Government probably did to those relatives would not be hard to imagine.

Another client of our Passport Office was thought by the Canadian Government to be so dangerous to the public security that the Canadians refused him entry to that country to attend a Communist rally featuring the famous "Red" Dean of Canterbury. Yet your Government is powerless to deny him a passport.

Perhaps one of the hardest cases for us to stomach, and I am sure this group of veterans will agree with me, is that of William Lorenzo Patterson.

Mr. Patterson boasts that he is a Communist. He is the general manager of the weekly Communist newspaper, "The Worker." In 1950, when he was visiting his fellow Communists in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, he gave press interviews in which he accused this Government of being a Government of criminals and cannibals. He accused us of using germ warfare in Korea. He repeatedly advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government. He made a speech in New York City in 1952 in which he is reported to have urged his listeners to write to American soldiers in combat in Korea and to incite them to go over to the other side.

Patterson now wants a passport to go to Europe and to the Soviet Union on business and pleasure. It is not difficult to imagine what Mr. Patterson's business and pleasure will be. For the United States it will be dirty business. Yet Mr. Patterson travels with our official blessing and protection.

Another case involves a Communist labor leader who went to England some years ago during a strike at the port of London and had to be expelled by the British Government because of his activities as a Communist agent in blocking settlement of the strike. We have now been obliged to give him a passport which asks the British authorities to let the bearer pass safely and freely.

You all recall the name Julius Rosenberg, convicted of espionage for the Soviets and executed. The man who recruited Julius Rosenberg into the Communist Party in 1939 has applied for and received a passport since the Supreme Court's decision. Still a party member, his job has been to recruit chemists and other scientists into Communist-dominated organizations.

There is the case of Victor Perlo who has been identified in sworn testimony as a Communist who passed documents from the sensitive wartime Office of Strategic Services to a courier for the Communist apparatus. His application is now under consideration.

WHEN AMERICANS HERATE AMERICA

We have had to give passports to such ardent Communist supporters as Hugh Hurdymen and Anita and Henry Wilcox, all of whom attended a Commie peace conference in 1952 at Peking, in Red China, in evasion of passport restrictions. All of them made statements accusing the United States of using germ warfare in the Korean conflict.

Finally, there are the more notorious cases of Earl Browder and Anna Louise Strong. Browder, onetime head of the Communist

Party in this country, who had previously been convicted of misusing his passport, promptly applied again in order to renew his international travels. Anna Louise Strong, upon receiving a passport this year promptly visited her friends in the Soviet Union and, despite the passport restriction against travel to Communist China, she went from there to Peking, where she is still visiting and talking.

These are but a few examples on our list. The list now numbers 598. These people are from every profession and every walk of life. Legally, I cannot show that they are all members of the Communist Party. I cannot prove in a court of law that all, or even a large portion of them, are espionage agents or even trained subversives. However, as a group, they share one thing in common. Most of them are disciplined and obedient to the policies and directives of international communism. Many of them perform the most humble tasks of party organization. We are convinced that the effective functioning of the international party machinery depends to a very great degree on the freedom of many of these persons to travel.

One does not have to be a student of Communist Party organization to realize the truth of what I have said. To illustrate this truth each one of you needs only to think of the organization for which he works. Everyone in business today travels almost constantly. You all know that personal contact is an invaluable way of doing business. You all know that the telephone and the mails are not an adequate substitute in carrying on your own business for personal contacts. If this is true of normal business operations, how much more true is it of the enormously complex operation of the international Communist conspiracy.

Imagine, if you can, carrying on a worldwide business where virtually all of your communication must be kept secret. Imagine, if you will, carrying on a worldwide operation, the very essence of which is espionage, subversion, and sabotage.

The necessity of personal assessment, of personal recruitment—indeed, of all forms of personal contact—will be obvious to you at once. In an organization of this sort, to hamper the movements of any members of the organization is a crippling blow and puts the operations of the organization under a most heavy handicap.

I think, once these facts are understood, the reasons for our insistence on the urgent need for legislation to control the issuance of passports to Communists become much clearer. We do not say for a minute that we can prevent all communication between Communist supporters in this country and their counterparts abroad by not issuing passports. That would be ridiculous. We do not say that we can stop Moscow direction of the Communist Party in this country. We do say that we can very seriously hinder the effective operation of the Communist Party both here and abroad by making it difficult for the supporters of that party to depart from the United States.

It is this same reasoning that lay behind the enactment of the visa provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act. Those provisions effectively prevent foreign citizens who are supporters of the Communist Party from traveling to this country.

If those laws were enacted for sound reasons, and I am convinced that they were, surely it is equally sound to pass laws which prevent Communist supporters in America from traveling abroad.

No one of these restrictive measures will of itself destroy the international Communist apparatus. Perhaps no single one of these measures will even seriously cripple that apparatus. But there is no doubt in my mind that the cumulative effect of all such measures does most seriously weaken the effective

tiveness of the efforts of the international Communist movement.

From what I have already said, I hope you gentlemen will feel as I do about these 596 passport applicants. They are soldiers in the cold war—but they are the soldiers of the enemy. They are just as clearly the enemy as were the troops abroad that shot at you and me in World War II. They are going abroad under instructions to render service to the Communist conspiracy.

In a hot war they call this giving comfort and support to the enemy. But under the law today, your Government is forced to extend to these travelers the protection, the convenience and the dignity of a United States passport. Your Government today must not only allow them to leave the country on their infamous tasks, but must expedite their travel abroad.

This situation would be ludicrous if it were not so dangerous. It cries out for solution, and with your help the solution should be within reach. The administration will again next year request legislation from Congress to allow us to close this gap in our defenses. With the support of each of you and other like-minded citizens, I would hope that our request will receive prompt action. Until such legislation is passed, your Government remains helpless to prevent American Communists from traveling abroad to conspire against our national interest, and in some cases even against our national security. I am confident that we can count on you to help us remedy this dangerous situation.

"Mr. India"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that to the citizens of the United States, "Mr. India" in the United States means J. J. Singh, of New York, president of the India League. J. J. Singh means this to us here in America, as surely as we think of Mr. Nehru, as "Mr. India," on the scene in India.

We in America salute our good friend, J. J. Singh, of New York City, who has done so much to improve and develop the good relations now existing between the United States and India.

"J. J." as he is known to so many American friends has not only been a successful businessman among us for many years but he has been an eloquent and tireless exponent of friendly relations between our two great countries. He deserves our lasting gratitude and sincere thanks for his unswerving loyalty to this cause during many difficult times over the years.

We wish J. J. Singh and his wife and two sons the best of everything in their new home in New Delhi. We will look forward to their continued friendship and interest in these good United States of America, and the relations between the Indian and American people.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1959]
UNITED STATES SENDING ENVOY TO CALL OF INDIA—J. J. SINGH, A NONOFFICIAL AMBASSADOR, WILL RETURN HOME AFTER 33 YEARS
(By Joseph Morgenstern)

A man from India who got to be "ambassador extraordinary" without the benefit of

an ambassadorship or an embassy is going home to New Delhi after 33 years in the United States.

J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, has decided to leave his handsome house on East 61st Street and raise his children in New Delhi.

Until now, he has divided his time between an import business and anyone or anything offering him the opportunity to explain India and the United States to each other.

The 61-year-old Sikh from northern India, who wore a turban and a beard in his early days here, began acting like an ambassador to the United States when India had no official envoys of her own. He continued doing so, to the advantage of both countries, after India won her freedom.

NONOFFICIAL ADVANTAGE

"A nonofficial has an advantage over an official in this kind of work," he said. "People often open up more and speak frankly."

In addition to being a nonofficial, Mr. Singh was a nondrinker until 1942, is still a nonsmoker, and not the sort of person who stays inactive. Lobbying in Washington, writing articles and scores of letters to newspapers, sitting in on United Nations meetings, appearing on radio and television forums and presiding over informal dinner forums in the quiet elegance of his own home: these have helped to keep him from inactivity's clutches.

When Mr. Singh leaves New York in March with his wife and two sons, the India League will be dissolved. He became its president in 1941.

"I do hope that some other organization will continue the league's work of friendly interpretation between the United States and India," he said.

EXPOSITION FAILS

When he is asked about himself, Mr. Singh usually replies by discussing India. He said he had been gratified by the steady growth of knowledge about India in the United States.

"Originally, when people found out that I came from India, they were disappointed that I couldn't do the rope trick or produce a snake," he said.

That was in 1926 and shortly thereafter, when Mr. Singh arrived as one of the organizers of the Indian section of the Philadelphia Sesquicentennial Exposition.

"The exposition was a flop and I lost my shirt," he recalled, "so I decided to stay and recover that shirt."

Moving to New York, Mr. Singh opened the wholesale office of an importing firm specializing in Indian textiles. Subsequent business success enabled him to revive the India League with money and new ideas.

NEHRU HIS IDOL

At the center of his political convictions is a belief that India and the United States have a common bond in freedom.

During the period of British rule in India, which Mr. Singh calls the era when we were not free, he sought to rally supporters for the cause of Indian independence.

"You were once under British rule," he used to tell Americans, "and the British are ruling us." The response, he said, was usually quick and affirmative.

Convinced that India will not take orders from world communism, Mr. Singh says that modern India would long ago have torn itself into pieces, but for Nehru. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is one of Mr. Singh's idols.

DENTS IN VITAL ISSUES

A private citizen dealing with governments "can only make dents on vital issues," Mr. Singh said. One of the many substantial dents he made in Washington legislative circles led to congressional approval of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration aid for victims of the Bengal famine of 1943.

Another of his campaigns to influence the influencers led to an amendment of U.S. immigration laws permitting a hundred Indians a year to enter this country and become permanent residents and citizens.

In 1951, Mr. Singh married the former Malti Saksena, the daughter of the high commissioner for India in Canada and consul general for India in New York. Although Mr. Singh and his wife both speak Hindustani and English, their two sons will have to learn an Indian language in India.

A STUDY OF INDIA

Before he came to the United States by way of Britain, Mr. Singh was active in Indian politics. As a young man he did what many young men did, leading mobs, getting beaten up, getting shot at, the privileges of those who fought for India's freedom. At 24 he was the youngest member of the All-India Congress Committee.

Whether he will reenter the political life of his country is a decision for the future. "My first job will be to study India," Mr. Singh said.

"With small disappointments," he said "my faith in the United States has not been shaken."

In a few months, when Mr. Singh's new home is completed in New Delhi, the United States will, in its turn, have an unofficial Ambassador to India in an unofficial embassy.

A Tuition Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the provision of adequate education for the youth of this country is one of the great problems facing those who have the stewardship of our national affairs. The rising cost of education has made this problem more acute than it otherwise might be. Not the least difficult of all situations is that of the privately endowed educational institution whose costs have continually risen, while its capacity to offer its facilities to the able students who cannot pay has been held in check. A most thoughtful discussion of this problem has been made by Dr. John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, in a recent letter to the New York Times. I believe that he had made a valuable contribution to this discussion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Dr. Dickey's letter which appeared in the New York Times on December 7, 1958:

A TUITION PROGRAM

As a citizen who cares greatly about the excellence of all education, public as well as private, I feel the overwhelming need is to get more of our total national income into education at every level and through every possible channel, and especially to get more of our available tax dollars into the base of our national educational pyramid, the public elementary and secondary schools. Our great public universities have a direct stake in such an effort.

Many public educators testify that nothing would lift most public colleges more swiftly and solidly than better prepared students coming to these colleges from the public schools. This in most States means freeing up every educational tax dollar possible for

use at the elementary and secondary public school level.

I suggest for careful, dispassionate study the possibility that higher college tuition charges for those who can pay at least part of their way and the assurance of adequate financial aid for those who demonstrably cannot pay is today the path of educational wisdom and well-being for both the public and the private institutions in our mixed system of higher education. Such a program could:

Get a greater share of the national income for all education;

Free up tax dollars for public education at the lower levels where it is most needed by most of our people today;

Keep both our public and private colleges strong in a mutually beneficial mixed system;

Protect the public colleges and the taxpayers from having all higher education progressively, unnecessarily, and, I think, unwisely dumped onto their presently badly bent backs;

Protect the American college opportunity as quality education in either public or private institutions for any student who demonstrably needs a scholarship or loan.

I have no doctrinaire or trick answers for this difficult problem, but I see no prospect whatsoever of finding adequate finances now for the kind of education we profess and need on any either/or basis and do urge that all who care about American education work at this problem with realism and resourcefulness and not try to kill each other off with polemics about who among us is the more democratic; democracy is always the first victim in such a Donnybrook.

The growing public and professional discussion of tuition charges at public and private colleges is a healthy thing and long overdue. It will, however, waste much energy unnecessarily if the issues are stated in terms of the student paying the full cost and of worthy students being barred by higher tuition charges in either the public or private colleges.

Full-cost fees are not a realistic possibility for any major college today because, directly or indirectly, all higher education requires both public and charitable support. However, higher tuition fees for those who can afford to pay at least part of their way is a realistic necessity for all quality institutions unless some very unattractive alternatives are to be accepted. Among these are:

Higher and higher taxes to subsidize many who do not require educational subsidy at the college level, at least in present amounts;

Poorer and poorer elementary and secondary school systems because the available tax take for public education is going in part for increasingly unnecessary subsidy at the college level;

Private higher education progressively forced down and out by its inability to compete for students and teachers with nominal-tuition colleges.

The predictable result is an ever higher burden of numbers and costs pushed over into the public colleges and onto the tax subsidy, with the taxpayers' inevitable reaction at the expense of all education after the strength of the mixed system has been irreparably damaged by the induced weakness or disappearance of many private colleges.

No worthy student need be kept out of a public college because it raises its tuition charges from a nominal to a realistic level, provided always that financial aid in the form of scholarship grants or loans or employment is made available to that student on a basis of demonstrated need, as is fairly and competently done today in nearly all private colleges. The trouble comes when we unnecessarily subsidize all students, and often without the student, the parent, or the public being aware of the subsidy.

JOHN S. DICKEY.

A Bill To Protect Farmers and Other Persons Who Are Required To Treat Patronage Dividends as Income for Federal Income Tax Purposes by Providing for the Collection of Income Tax at Source on Such Dividends and To Provide Tax Equity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill designed to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity.

My bill provides a method of collecting some tax from cooperatives that I have advocated for several years. I have been particularly interested in it from the standpoint of the cooperative member, particularly the farmer who does not have a great deal of cash at his disposal. It is only through a withholding device like this that he will not have his personal cash position burdened with a taxpayment as the result of a noncash patronage dividend. This bill will, of course, produce revenue for the Treasury Department and will bring about a highly desirable equality of taxation among various types of business, some of which are now suffering quite unduly from the competition of the untaxed cooperatives.

A bill to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 39. Credit for income tax collected at source on certain patronage dividends.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount withheld under section 7901 as tax on patronage dividends shall be allowed to the recipient of the income as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle.

"(b) YEAR OF CREDIT.—The amount so withheld during any calendar year shall be allowed as a credit for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year. If more than one taxable year begins in a calendar year, such amount shall be allowed as a credit for the last taxable year so beginning."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Credit for income tax collected at source on certain patronage dividends."

SEC. 2. (a) Subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by

adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 81—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON CERTAIN PATRONAGE DIVIDENDS

"Sec. 7901. Income tax collected at source.

"Sec. 7902. Patronage dividend defined.

"Sec. 7901. Income tax collected at source.

"The Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations provide for the deduction and withholding on patronage dividends of a tax equal to 20 percent of the amount of each patronage dividend (as defined in section 274 and subject to the limitation in amount contained therein) paid in a form other than coin, currency or check dated and payable no later than the date of delivery thereof, and paid after September 30, 1956."

(b) The table of chapters for subtitle F is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Chapter 81. Collection of income tax at source on certain patronage dividends."

Deductibility of patronage dividends

SEC. 3. There shall be added to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 following section 273 a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 274. Patronage dividends paid by cooperative corporations.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deduction or other reduction of taxable income shall be allowed to cooperative corporations for amounts paid as 'patronage dividends' by such corporations except to the extent such dividends increase the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt. For the purposes of this subsection.

"(1) Such dividends shall be deemed to have been received in the ordinary course of a trade or business carried on by the recipient, and

"(2) No exemption, exclusion, credit or deduction available to the recipient shall be taken into account.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—

"(1) COOPERATIVE CORPORATION.—For the purposes of this section the term 'cooperative corporation' means a corporation (A) that calls itself a 'cooperative' or 'co-op', or (B) that represents to any persons or classes of persons which deal with it that their patronage will or may entitle them (i) to the payment, either actually or constructively, of patronage dividends, or (ii) to an equity interest in any of the corporations' assets, or (C) that is otherwise operated for the mutual benefit of persons or classes of persons that deal with it; but such term does not include a mutual insurance company or any corporation otherwise exempt under this chapter.

"(2) PATRONAGE DIVIDEND.—For the purposes of this section the term 'patronage dividend' means an allocation or a distribution paid or payable (whether or not in money and whether described as a refund, rebate, price adjustment, or payment of a balance due under a marketing agreement) to member patrons or to member and non-member patrons on some basis related to their sales to, purchases from, deposits with, investments in, loans from, or other transactions with the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions, determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined

only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus."

Taxation of farmers' cooperatives

SEC. 4. Section 522 (b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be amended to read as follows:

"(b) COMPUTATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In computing the taxable income of such an organization there shall be allowed, subject to the limitations provided in section 274, as deductions from gross income (in addition to other deductions allowable under this chapter)—

"(A) amounts paid as dividends during the taxable year on its capital stock, and

"(B) amounts allocated during the taxable year to patrons with respect to its income not derived from patronage (whether or not such income was derived during such taxable year) whether paid in cash, merchandise, capital stock, revolving fund certificates, retain certificates, certificates of indebtedness, letters of advice, or in some other manner that discloses to each patron the dollar amount allocated to him. Allocations made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the 9th month following the close of such year shall be considered as made on the last day of such taxable year to the extent the allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of such year."

Some Sound Advice to Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an article into the RECORD which, I believe, should be brought to the attention of all parents because of its sound advice. The article is entitled "Rose Flynn and Youth." It was published in a recent issue of the Christian Family, and was written by Ralph Land.

Mrs. Flynn is a well-known educator and psychologist in Brooklyn. She is a pioneer in the field of juvenile delinquency and has devoted many years—nearly two decades—in dealing with youthful offenders or potential offenders, both in the classroom and outside the school. She is credited with having rescued at least 1,000 young people from the perils of juvenile delinquency. Her motto is: "Prevention is better than cure," and she lives up to it by proving that teaching the three "R's" is in itself not sufficient.

The article on Rose Flynn has a lot of merit and contains excellent advice to parents on youth problems. It is for this reason that I am inserting it into the RECORD:

ROSE FLYNN AND YOUTH

(By Ralph Land)

At a recent special seminar in New York City a group of top police officials were thoroughly briefed how best to handle juvenile delinquents after they ran afoul of the law. Their instructor was Mrs. Rose R. Flynn, an educator-psychologist of Brooklyn, who has reaped national recognition as an expert on curbing juvenile lawlessness. Hundreds of

radio stations throughout America have been broadcasting her advice via tape recordings on how to cope with this rampant nationwide problem.

In her late forties, Mrs. Flynn is a vigorous brown-haired woman who reminds one more of a busy office executive. Her sparkling blue eyes and radiating sympathy have won over many a rebellious juvenile. Assertive, but not boisterous, calm yet firm, she has dedicated her life to uphold human values. Father James Keller has commended her true Christopher spirit: to light up a candle where there is darkness.

When she and her husband, Frank Flynn, a veteran New York City newspaperman and cousin to the late Archbishop Michael J. Curley, of Baltimore, once approached their parish priest about adopting children since they were childless, the advice was negative: "You have a special mission in this world," he told her. "God has meant that you should be mother to many."

A sixth-grade teacher at the William E. Cottle School in Tuckahoe, N.Y., Mrs. Flynn uniquely utilizes her clinical psychology training to detect and stem the growth of any delinquent tendencies among any of her pupils. "Prevention," she says, "is far better than rehabilitation. The classroom is the place where a child's mind takes shape for life. So it's up to the school to eliminate the seeds of misbehavior."

Although she has been diligently teaching the three R's since 1932, it was only 11 years ago she first turned to the study of clinical psychology because of disturbing classroom problems. She began to effectively apply psychotherapy to the juvenile delinquent, the potential delinquent and troubled children.

Stressing that the main cause of delinquency is a poor family relationship, Mrs. Flynn says: "I achieved success by being warm and human—a permissive classroom mother. When things go wrong at home, the child may be moody and depressed. I let him air his gripes before a panel of his classmates. They in turn declare how they would have behaved in a like situation. I have found the reaction amazingly beneficial."

"Maybe his demands are unreasonable," Mrs. Flynn adds. "But unless an understanding person shows the child this, he will continue to believe his parents are against him. This rejection will pile up in his mind, and then he will resent all authority. Finally, he may wind up stealing cars to get his freedom, or act out his aggression by attacking another person."

Encouraged by the initial results, she extended her after-school aid to various New York anti-juvenile-crime organizations. She became active in the New York City Police Department's Youth Squad. She undertook a challenging assignment: to reduce juvenile delinquency in a certain Brooklyn street known then as the worst in the city. Stealing, vandalism, school absenteeism, molesting, gang fights—these were common occurrences.

As a psychologist, Mrs. Flynn could easily pinpoint the underlying causes of these behaviors. The offenders came from homes steeped in family discord. Lacking love and attention, it was inevitable they would join gangs to seek the admiration they craved.

She set about combatting juvenile delinquency like a doctor a plague. Acting as a permissive mother, she visited the homes of these neglected children and effected bonds of understanding between them and their parents. Shortly after, the city built a sorely needed park for recreational facilities. Before long, the problem dwindled considerably in that area.

A high police official in charge then of the Brooklyn West Detective Bureau commented afterward, "Mrs. Flynn used methods that were effective. She achieved marvelous results. . . . In my opinion, she was respon-

sible for breaking up teen-age gangs in Brooklyn."

Why does she believe that school is the best place to arrest delinquency development? "A teacher has a child 6 hours a day," says Mrs. Flynn. "She knows how he plays, reacts to other pupils, his weaknesses, what he is capable of achieving. It's up to the teacher to reach that child and to find out the reason for his maladjusted behavior. The next step would be to enlist the parents' cooperation in working out a solution for the emotional disturbances that lead to errant actions."

Admitting that a happy home, managed by intelligent parents, should keep a child from going astray, she points out, "Millions of homes are not happy. And unless schools apply psychotherapy, the child from an unhappy home will be scarred for life and a liability to society."

Since 1950 Mrs. Flynn attends twice weekly the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital's neuropsychiatric clinic as a clinical psychologist. And on every St. Patrick's Day the predominantly Jewish staff in appreciative tribute to a wonderful Irish lady sport shamrocks.

Three of her evenings she devotes to the Brooklyn Association for the Rehabilitation of Offenders. Here she conducts clinical tests on both juvenile and adult delinquents. She is also a consultant for St. John's Home in Rockaway Park, N.Y., for boys, ages 12 to 16. Her regular delight is to rotate her invitation to a pair of boys from the home to spend a remembered weekend with the Flynn's at their Brooklyn apartment.

She belongs to the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae and is active in many civic, social, teachers, and psychological groups. The Flynn's are in Queen of All Saints Parish in Brooklyn.

One of nine children, six boys and three girls, she was born in Riverdale, N.Y. Her father and mother were devout Catholics. Every night the rosary was recited as a family group. "My parents would check and double check on each of our whereabouts and activities," she recalls. "There was only one key in the family. They knew when we came home and met us. She has a sister, Mother Freehill, religious of the Sacred Heart, professor of mathematics at Manhattanville College in Purchase, N.Y. Her aunt is Sister Mary Balthassar, a Franciscan nun, stationed at the mother house, Our Lady of Angel Convent at Glen Riddle, Pa.—at 91, the oldest one in that particular order, having served 68 years.

After majoring in psychology at the College of Mount St. Vincent, Mrs. Flynn continued at New York University and received her master's degree in 1942. She studied psychotherapy at the New School for Social Research in New York, and later took advance courses in Europe.

Establishing a reputation as an educator, lecturer, certified psychologist, juvenile delinquency authority, and guidance director, she built up an increasing demand for her services. She was one of the organizers of the Police Athletic League, the first of its kind in the country with a program to enroll teenagers and wean them away from delinquency. Her brother-in-law, the late Judge Joseph C. H. Flynn, was one of the pioneers in the creation of the adolescent court in Brooklyn and, as a result, she became active in the work.

Mrs. Flynn thinks that children under 7 years of age should be included in the drive on juvenile delinquency as well as those who are older. "If a child is forever stealing, cheating, bullying, and has unusual sexual interests and behavior regardless of age," she says, he is a potential delinquent.

"I feel that the strongest factor in molding a child's personality is his relationship with his parents. If they love him with a generous, even-flowing, nonpossessive affection, and treat him as a person who, like them—

selves, has both rights and responsibilities in the family group, then his chances of developing normally are excellent."

In the treatment of juvenile delinquency, she has found that adolescents have a feeling they are lost and have little hope. Successful advances in this movement cannot only restore human beings as useful members of society, but perhaps save the community huge funds in fighting crime.

Parental obligations? "It has been my experience," says Mrs. Flynn, "that too many parents are shirking or evading their responsibility by leaving their job of raising their child to someone else outside the home."

She recently devised a plan for American Legion leaders in which she suggested that Legionnaires throughout the country be enlisted to act as big brothers to youths who are potential juvenile delinquents.

"Every youngster," said Mrs. Flynn, "looks for a hero to worship. He may be a noted baseball player or boxer, or any other celebrity famed for prowess and achievement."

"Youth needs a strong male identification and he must feel that he is wanted. It is because he feels ignored and unwanted that he takes to juvenile delinquency."

In an address before a group of social workers in New York, she advocated the setting up of youth work programs. She proposed that local organizations like the Lions, chambers of commerce, and the like, compile a brochure of names listing the qualifications of youths and helping them either in regular, summer-vacation, or after-school jobs.

"When all is said and done," said Mrs. Flynn, "youths get into trouble because of idleness. Inexperienced at finding work on their own and unable to be guided by their parents, many of them drift into crime without forethought. They innocently get in with bad companions—oftentimes older, hardened criminals. And before they realize, they are enmeshed in the law. It is especially the older criminals who are the dangerous recruiters for crime."

A world-traveled woman, she visited last summer several European countries and carefully observed their clinical techniques with juvenile delinquents. She has been to Rome three times and had an audience once with the late Pope Pius XI and more recently met twice with Pope Pius XII.

How does juvenile delinquency develop? Here are three cases culled from hundreds referred to Mrs. Flynn for rehabilitation.

The first, that of a 15-year-old boy with average intelligence. He had a penchant for stealing cars. Outwardly the patient was excessively polite, orderly, compliant, with normal reactions to everyday situations.

His parents, both professional people, were financially comfortable, and he lived with them in an exclusive suburban area.

Upon examination, it was found the boy had very hostile feelings toward his parents. He asserted they were overbearing, punitive, nongiving, and faultfinders to the extreme. They rejected everything he did or said, disapproved of all his friends, and consequently drove him into a lonesome life.

His feelings of self-worthlessness brought on by repressive parents led him to attempt to restore his self-concept by committing delinquent acts like stealing cars. This he thought would gain him social acceptance with his peers and environment.

The second case: A girl, 16, of middle class socio-economic status. She had grown up in a family where her mother did not understand her and criticized her friends. She felt that her sister, who was older than she, was idealized and that she was the "poor Cinderella."

Since she was dependent upon her mother and confided in her at times, she felt her trust was prone to abuse. Her mother had the habit of embarrassing her in front of her friends.

The patient stated she had frequent arguments with her mother, but she felt more adequate to contend with her mother than she did with her father. Her father lost control and became violent, but ended up contrite. There were many arguments between her parents about money in her presence.

Although she had good intelligence, she did not like school and cut classes frequently. She would round up 20 teen-age girls, go to a park and have her group fight an innocent cluster of teen-agers who would be on an outing to the park. When arrested, she said, "I felt good that I was in a gang fight and the facts were reported in newspapers."

The last case: a young man of 18 with superior intelligence. He had stolen a large sum of money from his employer. His history revealed a compulsion for stealing since the age of 6.

Both mother and father worked. He saw them before leaving for school in the morning, was usually in bed when they returned home in the evening. Father worked 7 days a week. Mother was free on Saturday and Sunday, but she went out with her friends on those days.

At the age of 15 his mother took him into court because he was unmanageable and was doing poorly in high school and was rejecting the control and authority of his parents.

Subsequently, he moved out of his home and got a job. He lived alone.

The patient stated that he has always been embarrassed to tell his friends about his family. The impact of his present offense had made him realize his life had been one of lies and deceptions.

After her tape recordings on juvenile delinquency were aired nationwide, Mrs. Flynn received an avalanche of mail and phone calls. Chiefly the requests were: "What can we do for my child or children? What would you suggest?"

One particular missive evoked a chuckle. It was a proposal of marriage from a widower in Michigan who had three lively teen-age sons. He wrote he would like to have a wife like her to solve not only his personal problems but his sons' as well.

HER ADVICE TO PARENTS

1. The home should be a place of love, unity, and devotion. Religious training strengthens the moral fiber of a child exposed to many temptations. A sound home life begins with family prayer.
2. Parents should run their children or they will take the reins and run them.
3. Take time to listen to your children. You may assist in the solution of their problems. At least you'll find out what they are thinking about or what makes them tick.
4. Parents should set a good example of affectionate marital relationship. Discord in the family causes delinquency.
5. Teach discipline, respect for authority and elders, consideration for the comfort and rights of others, courtesy.
6. Teach your child on his own age level—not as an adult one day and a baby the next.
7. Give credit and praise when due. Reprimand your child privately.
8. TV and movies play an important part in forming the mental and moral outlook of impressionable minds. Have children only see productions which are inspiring, educational, and entertaining.
9. Guard the morals of your children by having them read good clean literature.
10. Too much money, too much free time, and a car at their disposal only invites disaster.
11. Guide your children in the selection of their friends and take out time to meet them.
12. Guard your child in the home and on the street. Know where they are going and with whom.

13. Be alert to know when your child goes out and the time he returns home. Don't trust him implicitly with the key.

14. Guard your children in dress. Stress decency in your daughter's appearance and proper attire for your son.

15. Too much freedom is given children at an early age, and they aren't able to use it intelligently. Remember, a child is a reflection or mirror of his home training.

Big Business in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following article entitled "Big Business in Russia" which appeared in the December 1958 issue of the Atlantic. This article by Mr. Edward Crankshaw, a noted authority on Russia, tells the inside story of the recent economic reorganization which took place in that country in the summer of 1957. It is indeed an interesting account of the maneuvering Khrushchev did in curbing the power of the big industrialists in Russia:

BIG BUSINESS IN RUSSIA (By Edward Crankshaw)

(The enormous growth of Russian industry has built up Soviet business tycoons, and in this penetrating paper Edward Crankshaw shows how the power of these industrialists has been curbed and redirected by Khrushchev. Mr. Crankshaw is recognized here and in Britain as a leading authority on the U.S.S.R. His earlier books have grown out of his residence in that country, and he is on his way back to Moscow as this article goes to press.)

Few people outside the Soviet Union have ever had a clear image of the magnitude of the several branches of Soviet industry or of the power and stature of the largely unknown men who run them. Thus the news of the radical economic reorganization pushed through by Khrushchev in the early summer of 1957 evoked very little response in the West, which simply did not understand the issues involved. Indeed, at that time all interest was centered on the downfall of Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, and Shepilov, and most people did not realize that Khrushchev's victory over the antiparty group (which meant the anti-Khrushchev group) was inextricably bound up with an economic and administrative revolution which was at that moment, in the grand Russian manner, convulsing the whole country.

More than a year has gone by since that revolution was made. An immense upheaval, full of grief and bitterness for a host of able and formidable individuals, has left scarcely a surface sign. Khrushchev has consolidated his position more thoroughly, although it is still erroneous to see him as an absolute tyrant, or dictator, responsible to himself alone. Soviet industry, moving ponderously and magnificently along its new lines, continues to deliver the goods, as far as can be seen, no more and no less efficiently than before. And now that the shouting has died down, it is a good time to contemplate the operation in retrospect and consider what

it tells us of the workings of the Soviet system, of the Soviet leadership, and, in particular, of Khrushchev's mind.

The outward story is quite simple. In February of 1957 Khrushchev, as first secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bulganin was still Prime Minister), convened a plenum of the party's Central Committee. He put before the assembly an explosive set of proposals. The development of Soviet industry, he said, was being impeded by an outdated ministerial structure. If production was to continue at the required rate, there must be a radical reform of this structure, and the central bureaucracy must be broken up.

He therefore proposed that most of the gigantic industrial ministries, the chiefs of which sat on the Council of Ministers, should be abolished at a stroke. The necessity of referring everything back to the central ministries in Moscow, the rivalries produced by the conflicting interests of individual ministries, and the absence of close cooperation between concerns working side by side in the various regions, but answerable to separate ministries at the center, were strangling initiative, impeding dispatch, and resulting in excessive waste and duplication. The highly centralized bureaucratic system had been adequate, he said, in the early days of industrial expansion, when drive and close coordination from the center were a vital necessity. But it was no longer the best system.

In place of the all-union and republican industrial ministries, there should be set up a number of regional authorities, to be known as national economic councils (Sovnarkhozy), with the task of coordinating and controlling the total industrial activity of the various regions. The underlying idea was that the various industries in each separate region should be integrated into a harmonious system based on mutual interdependence within each region. In the interests of the national economy, as expressed in the state plans, there would have to be a controlling body to give directives to the Sovnarkhozy in the regions. This body, Khrushchev said, should be the State Planning Commission, strengthened for the purpose; its directives should have the force of law.

These proposals, put forward in February 1957, were first made public on March 30. From the beginning they were associated exclusively with Khrushchev and were known as the Khrushchev theses. No other member of the Central Committee or the Council of Ministers put his name to them.

The debate was, nevertheless, sharp, far-ranging, and unusually outspoken. Although the higher leadership said nothing, the debate was reflected in the party press, and there was some fairly drastic criticism of Khrushchev's proposals from highly placed individuals, usually from the ministers affected and from factories. At the same time, factory directors seemed to enjoy letting off steam about their pet anomalies, and the press was full of ludicrous examples of the muddle and waste behind the imposing industrial facade.

At the May session of the Supreme Soviet the Khrushchev theses, with certain important modifications, became law, and their author characteristically demanded speed. The whole structure of administration, covering most of the vast industrial machine, slowly built up over the years, was to be torn down and rebuilt by July 1, just 7 weeks from the promulgation of the decree. That is to say, some 20 Ministries were to be abolished (fewer than Khrushchev had originally demanded), their buildings evacuated, the Sovnarkhozy set up all over the Union, housed and manned, all in 7 weeks.

There was clearly something more than Khrushchev's impatient ebullience behind this demand for speed at all costs. The obvious deduction was that he had met with heavy opposition behind the scenes, that he

was now hustling his opponents, and that he could afford to give them no time to regroup themselves. Within a month Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Shepilov were dismissed from office, banished to remote regions, accused of antiparty activity, and, in the case of Malenkov, charged with a capital crime: complicity in the Leningrad plot.

So much for the outward story; expanding Soviet industry was being freed from redtape and bureaucratic centralization carried to the point of lunacy. The great Moscow hives of unproductive and often obstructive officials batten on the active producers were overturned. The officials were scattered to all points of the compass. The ministerial overlords, men of formidable caliber and heavily entrenched vested interests, some of them as powerful as the president of General Motors, were suddenly out of their jobs. The directors of industrial trusts, the individual factory managers, the chief engineers would no longer have to wait on Moscow's decisions before varying their appointed routine in the smallest degree. Thousands of lesser officials would be freed from paperwork for productive labor. The ceaseless and time-consuming journeys between Moscow and the distant Provinces would be cut down. It all sounded wonderful.

A dozen or more great industrial ministries—steel, oil, chemicals, heavy machines, and so on—had, over the years, taken to manufacturing for themselves and in their own factories everything that might conceivably be needed in their work. They had done this partly in the ordinary way of empire building, partly according to the Soviet version of Parkinson's Law, but more particularly in a very natural and, indeed, necessary effort to make sure that their own plans were fulfilled and their own production schedules carefully insulated from the effects of failures and bottlenecks outside their control. Thus the ministry of coal, for example, would build its own cement works, set up its own building trusts (there were numerous separate building trusts run by different Moscow ministries in a single small provincial town), manufacture its own bulldozers and excavators and electrical machinery.

These ministerial empires, run by men who were born tycoons, were also beginning to represent centers of power which seriously threatened the one permissible center of power, the Communist Party.

Khrushchev did not mention this. Nor did he mention another aspect of the system which must also have been giving him grave cause for concern: the development of what amounted to a private enterprise network within the elephantine and rigidly controlled state network—the development and proliferation of a new kind of Soviet man not prescribed in the textbooks, the *tolkach*, or fixer.

Khrushchev had a good deal to say about the worst anomalies, with examples from real life. "The existing structure of the industrial and construction ministries," he said in section II of his theses, "is a multistage and complicated one. Ministries and departments exercising leadership from the center over enterprises situated throughout the country inevitably accumulate round themselves numerous parallel organizations—various offices for sale and supply, depots, trusts, and so forth. The ministries have many different central administrations, departments, divisions.

... The territorial central administrations in charge of enterprises in Siberia, central Asia, the Far East, and other remote regions are, as a rule, situated in Moscow.

... The workers of the ministries are forced to spend much time on interdepartmental correspondence ... reports and memorandums ... The huge streams of paper coming from the ministries divert a

large number of workers at enterprises from practical work. Many specialists are called to the center from the localities ... and spend months at the ministries."

And so on. All this is a pale image of the situation vividly reflected in Dudintsev's novel, *Not by Bread Alone*. Khrushchev was correct in concluding that the 200,000 industrial establishments and 100,000 construction sites scattered over the face of the Soviet Union could not be efficiently guided and controlled from Moscow. What he did not say, or even hint at, was how this ludicrous system had managed to work as well as it did.

The answer, very largely, lay with the fixer. It was this merry soul who made the wheels go round. He inhabited a sort of shadowland between the law and the labor camp—that shadowland which is the true reality of the Soviet Union, where people show their real faces and behave like human beings and where everything gets done. The state bureaucracy left to itself, left to develop unhindered to its logical conclusion, would long ago have ground to a virtual standstill. But the Russians, for all their love of theorizing, are a practical race with a heavy dash of cynicism; and they are also brilliant improvisers. Thus it was that hard-pressed factory directors spontaneously developed a system to keep the wheels turning, a system which amounted to a private enterprise network operating under cover of the state enterprise network and short-circuiting it at all points.

Factory directors, the heads of trusts and combines, even the heads of ministries are not interested in the state plan as a whole. They are interested in their own careers and in making a success of their jobs. Each and every one of them is bound by his appointed plan, imposed by Moscow with the force of law and stretching his capacities to the limit. Heavy bonuses are earned by exceeding the plan; on the other hand, if the excess is too marked, planned production is increased for the following year: Today's surplus becomes tomorrow's norm. To fulfill the plan at all, each concern depends on the punctual delivery of raw materials and components or machines from other factories; but in the vast civil service network, smothered in redtape and abounding in bottlenecks, punctual delivery was rare. To provide against emergencies, the directors and managers made sure that they had adequate reserves of everything they needed; but this sort of hoarding was frowned on by the center.

The answer was to circumvent the center; and this was where the fixer came in. Often he was a highly respectable and trustworthy individual, although, naturally, the profession attracted its spivs. He was the contact man in excelsis. He was usually paid a salary and commission, but the interesting thing is that he was often paid by two or more concerns. On the books of an electrical components factory in Kharkov, he would appear as "our representative in Ivanovno"; but on the books of a textile mill in Ivanovno, he would appear as "our Kharkov representative." His job was to insure that the electrical factory received direct consignments of insulating cotton from Ivanovno and that the textile mill received direct supplies of electrical equipment from Kharkov, the relevant ministries being bypassed and the central planners confounded.

This is a very simple case of the fantastic and complicated barter system which flourished within the rigid framework of the state plan. On top of all this, the *tolkach*, the fixer, was often an expert at rigging books, at concealing reserves, at influencing important officials, at ministerial lobbying. He was, in effect, the unsung hero of the Soviet economic system. And he made the system work by the simple expedient of ignoring it. Khrushchev, undoubtedly, had the fixers in

mind when he put forward his celebrated theses. For the fixer, proliferating, was making nonsense of the planned economy. More seriously, he was making a mockery of party control.

In one way and another, and from top to bottom, the Soviet industrial system had for years been developing an autonomous life of its own and moving ever further away from party control. If the party was to reassert itself after Stalin's death, it had to take action against the new managerial class, as in 1953 it had taken action against Beria's police empire. The man who had decided to take everything on controlling and reactivating the party machine was Khrushchev. The man who was most closely associated with the new managerial class was Malenkov.

Many failed to perceive this fundamental opposition, because Malenkov himself had risen to power, no less than Khrushchev, inside the party apparatus; for years he was regarded as the arch apparatchik. Further, most of the leading figures of the managerial class were themselves party members, some of them standing quite high in the hierarchy. But there is all the difference in the world between being a party member, even a senior party member, for reasons of convenience, and being a professional party functionary, or apparatchik.

As for Malenkov, at some time during, or soon after, the war, he seems to have decided that the future lay not with the party secretaries but with the new industrial bosses and technocrats, who were beginning to consolidate themselves into the fourth center of power—the other three being the party, the police, and the army—all held in check by Stalin personally. At any rate, he was seen to be ever more closely associated with the outstanding figures of this new class, who, in the first years after the war, during the tremendous drive for reconstruction, began to invade the higher echelons of government, quite manifestly to the disgust of the professional party functionaries. I am referring to people like Tevosyan, the man who created Russia's steel industry and who was regarded with limitless admiration by old Krupp, and Malyshev, who before his death was in charge of the automation drive. There were many more. They formed a great new class, which had suffered much and won. They were less interested in politics and ideology than in managing and making and in securing a better life for their children than they had themselves enjoyed. They had been created by Stalin's industrial revolution, and, having survived all the purges, they had built up the great industrial machine, which they alone knew how to run. They considered themselves indispensable. And they were the spearhead of what amounted to a new bourgeoisie, a brandnew middle class such as Russia had never known before, with a vested interest in stability.

Malenkov, perhaps as a result of his especially close contact with these men during the war, had evidently decided that they formed the future ruling class of the Soviet Union, a class which had moved right, away from Leninism. Khrushchev, whether from conviction or ambition or a combination of both, took his stand on the party apparatus—on the cadres, that is to say, of a revitalized party (the party, in Stalin's last years, had lost its coherence, its drive, and its authority, and was good for nothing; there was no other authority than Stalin).

This opposition was visible even before Stalin's death, when, at the 19th party congress in the autumn of 1952, Khrushchev came forward as the champion of party purity and integrity; the party was to be purged of bureaucracy and careerism and restored to its pristine glory. It began to manifest itself in action almost immediately after Stalin's death, when Malenkov, yielding to pressures which are not yet understood, gave

up his great office of first secretary of the party and took his stand as Prime Minister, or chairman of a formidable council of ministers. After Beria had been removed, in the summer of 1953, the conflict became ever more marked, as Malenkov continued to stress the need for a more prosperous and tranquil Soviet Union and Khrushchev began to invoke the spirit of Leninism and demand that party functionaries all over the country should give more time and thought to the supervision of every aspect of life, especially industry and economics. This was not a conflict between reactionary Stalinism and liberalizing Khrushchevism, although it was made to appear so. It was a conflict between Khrushchev and Malenkov, between the man who was determined to revive the party as the force which would carry him to supreme power and the man who had hitched his wagon to the new apolitical managers, the men who were running Soviet industry on the lines I have roughly sketched.

Thus Khrushchev's 1957 theses were by no means exclusively concerned with the promotion of efficiency. They were concerned with the reassertion of the party's grip on the economy of the U.S.S.R., and of Khrushchev's own grip on the party.

Khrushchev won his second round against Malenkov (the first was when he took the party secretaryship from him) in February 1955, when Malenkov retired from the premiership in favor of Bulganin, still remaining, however, an active figure and a member of the party Presidium. Almost at once Khrushchev indicated that radical changes were in store for Soviet industry. When the attention of the Western World was concentrated on the summit conference at Geneva in July 1955, he caused to be published a long and detailed report on the state of industry, which, it turned out, had been delivered some weeks earlier by Marshal Bulganin to the Central Committee. This report, which told the world more about certain aspects of Soviet industry than it had ever known before, was overlooked in the West at the time because the summit obscured it.

For some time, however, things went on as they were, although Bulganin had demanded a radical overhaul of the whole industrial setup. Khrushchev was then very busy improving his own position, developing his foreign policy, packing the party with his supporters, and so on. There was also agriculture. Industry was at least delivering the goods; agriculture was not, and it had to be put right first. It was not until December 1956 that it became finally clear that Khrushchev was fighting his heaviest and most critical battle on the industrial front and was within an ace of losing it.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was the year of the de-Stalinization. It was the year in which the Polish rebellion, the Hungarian uprising, and incipient revolt inside the Soviet Union itself brought Khrushchev very close to defeat. And the first major sign that he had lost much ground and that Malenkov was working for a comeback in alliance, not so much with his own friends as with Khrushchev's enemies (Molotov and Kaganovich) was the announcement of a far-reaching reform of the central planning apparatus for industry. It was not the sort of reform which would have appealed to Khrushchev. It left the industrialist ministries intact, reduced in importance and authority the State Planning Commission, and provided for the setting up of a new body with virtually dictatorial powers over the whole industrial front—the State Economic Committee, with the Deputy Premier, Perukhin, as its chairman. This reform, which was agreed to at the December plenum of the Central Committee in the closing days of 1956, marked a clear victory for what is loosely called the bureaucracy (Malenkov's private army) over the party apparatus—thus over Khrushchev himself.

But the new body never got into action. For it was only 2 months later that Khrushchev, by processes which remain totally obscure (though Marshal Zhukov evidently played a part in them) made his own comeback and surprised everybody and shocked many by convening another central committee plenum and confronting it with his revolutionary theses. Under his plan the newly formed state economic committee was to be abolished, the industrial ministries were to be abolished, the bureaucracy was to be scattered, the party was to be supreme. In May, with certain modifications, his theses became law. In July they were put into effect. And Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich were banished. With them went Khrushchev's own proud protegee, Dimitri Shepilov, who had clearly tried to change sides in the heat of the quarrel and paid for it with his career.

With this background, it is not surprising that the Khrushchev reorganization, as finally put into practice, left a good deal to be desired when seen from the blinkered point of view of the professional efficiency expert. The idea of breaking up the Moscow ministries was good, up to a point. There was no doubt a great deal to be said for establishing, or developing, regional complexes of industry grouped around local centers enjoying some autonomy and cutting across all departmental lines. I am not qualified to discuss such matters, except in very general terms. The task facing any individual desirous of rationalizing Soviet production is complex in the extreme. In the first instance he is confronted with the problems involved in making modern large-scale organizations work, of energizing them without allowing them to get out of hand, of directing them centrally without bringing them to a standstill—problems faced and only partly solved by the huge capitalist combines of Britain and America and the nationalized industries of Britain. In the second place any solution he arrives at must fit, or appear to fit, into the theoretical framework of the Soviet system as a whole.

But the solution imposed on the Soviet Union by Khrushchev and his friends is so patently bad, and so irrelevant to the real problems it purports to tackle, that it is permissible to doubt whether it was ever intended as a serious contribution to the rationalization of industry and to ask whether the whole reorganization, or revolution, was not distorted out of recognition for political ends.

The task of the Sovnarkhozy is to exploit and develop the industries of their separate regions as a balanced whole. Obviously it would be impossible to make each region entirely self-supporting, and in any scheme there would have to be export and import trading between regions, particularly in the matter of raw materials. But if the regional division of the vast territory of the Soviet Union were to make any sense at all from the economic point of view, the regions themselves would have to be large, and every effort would have to be made to draw the dividing lines between regions with economic considerations heavily emphasized. For example, some regions would be contrived to offer every opportunity for something approaching self-sufficiency. Where this was impossible—for instance, in the great oil, coal, iron, and timber producing areas—the region would be contrived to concentrate, for easy export, the greatest possible aggregate of individual raw materials. There would be specialist regions, with economic councils staffed by specialists, and mixed regions.

But do we find anything like this? We do not. We find in the first place 105 separate regions; we find that the map of these regions has little or no relevance to the map of the industrial economy—instead, in almost all cases the economic regional boundaries coincide with the existing local gov-

ernment boundaries: in the case of small republics, the republican boundaries; in the case of large ones, the oblast, or provincial boundaries.

Why this total disregard for economic geography? Why this rigid adherence to the local government territorial divisions which largely date back to Imperial Russia? The answer, surely, is that the virtual ruler of each region is the party secretary, appointed and controlled by the first secretary in Moscow, Khrushchev himself. The chairman of each Sovnarkhoz must be appointed or approved by Moscow. Either he is a local industrialist bureaucrat, already used to working under the local party secretary, or he is sent out from one of the dissolved Moscow ministries, a stranger to his region and entirely dependent for support and guidance on the established party organization. At a single blow, Khrushchev took control of industry away from the new managerial class and put it into the hands of his own party functionaries in a hundred and five separate regions.

The Sovnarkhozy, scarcely more than a year old, are now, we are told, working smoothly. Certainly, according to the official figures, production has not suffered from the revolution. Equally certainly the creation of the Sovnarkhozy has not made an end of anomalies and waste in Soviet production.

It is very hard to find out exactly what is happening. In the first place, Moscow is full of senior bureaucrats who should by rights have gone off to the regions, far or near, to take up posts in the Sovnarkhozy. They have blandly refused to leave Moscow, and most of them have found other jobs—many in the inflated Gosplan organization, the separate departments of which are, in many cases, already disguised ministries. The great industrial ministries have been abolished, it is true; but innumerable trusts and combines have kept their Moscow offices, and, on top of that, each of the hundred and five Sovnarkhozy seems to have its own Moscow office for liaison with the State Planning Commission, innumerable government departments, the defense and transport ministries (which were excluded from last year's reorganization, and remain intact), and each other. There are already springing up in Moscow new bureaucratic agglomerations. These have absorbed many of the displaced bureaucrats, and they perform many of the coordinating functions of the old ministries.

On the other hand, the regional Sovnarkhozy are staffed, especially in the remote areas, largely by local men, already strongly imbued with regional pride. I am not suggesting that there have been no transfers from Moscow to the provinces; on the contrary, there have been a great many. But the operation as a whole has produced nothing like the clean sweep that a stranger, unfamiliar with Russian ways, might expect from the terms of the Supreme Soviet's directive.

Until just over a year ago, waste and duplication arose largely from interdepartmental jealousy and distrust, from ministerial empire building, from lack of cooperation between ministries operating, as it were, in parallel in the same territory. Today waste and duplication are arising from inter-regional jealousy and distrust, from regional empire building, from lack of cooperation between the new Sovnarkhozy. Already there are telltale indications in the press. The Sovnarkhozy are proving to be reprehensibly selfish and more interested in building up their own regions than in the national economy as a whole. One particular outcome of this is that distribution, always one of the weakest features of the Soviet economy (especially in the matter of consumer goods), has become more chancy than ever before. Certainly the *tolkach*, the

fixer, is still very much in evidence; but now he acts as a contact man between regions instead of between ministries.

Khrushchev has broken the growing power of the great industrial ministries; he has removed some of the more crippling anomalies of the ministerial system; without really decentralizing the Soviet economy he has given a much-needed impetus to the big provincial centers; he has provided a new framework for industry which could be invaluable in time of war and is susceptible of being modified to form a sensible and flexible adaptation to the economic facts of life. But much remains to be done, particularly in the way of reducing the number of regions and redrawing their boundaries. Meanwhile, the outstanding feature of the reorganization is the political aspect: the reassertion of party power over industry.

What do we mean by "the party?"

The party, first and foremost, is Khrushchev himself. But who are the hundred and five republican and provincial party secretaries who now play so big a part in controlling and guiding, through the Sovnarkhozy, their local industries? Are they Communist fanatics who think of their work exclusively in terms of the greater glory of the Communist revolution? I do not think they are. Do they see themselves, and the great regions they control, and everything they produce in those regions, simply as part of a great ideological design? I do not think they do. Is there in fact a fundamental difference between the preoccupations and aims of the dethroned bureaucrats from the central ministries and the higher party chieftains in the provinces? I do not think there is.

The division, insisted upon by Khrushchev himself, between the bureaucracy and the party is, it seems to me, an artificial one. It has misled many, and continues to do so, in their application of the forces at work inside the Soviet Union today. The late ministerial chieftain, now working in the provinces or creating a new job for himself in Moscow, and the average party functionary, developing his career inside the ruling body of the U.S.S.R., are very like each other: both are ambitious individuals sharing the characteristics of ambitious men everywhere in the world, both are good at managing, both enjoy the exercise of power. There may be differences of emphasis. The typical industrial bureaucrat may have a slightly more concrete approach to life, may be slightly more technically minded; the typical party careerist may be slightly more interested in ideas than in things. But both are nearer in interests, attitude, and attack to able men in the West than they are to the old-fashioned Leninist revolutionary.

In a word, Soviet industry continues to move, in spite of its new labels, in the direction it has followed since the war. The fight between the industrial bureaucracy and the party officials was, in a sense, a phony war. The real struggle was between individuals. And the real issue was whether the party organization, the ruling body, subordinated absolutely to the central secretariat, should allow individuals, splinter organizations—a whole class outside the party hierarchy—to develop into an organized pressure group, or whether, at the cost of some broken heads, some disorganization, some sacrifice of proved and valuable ability, the party organization should seek to absorb into itself the accumulated power and experience of the great industrial network.

Khrushchev chose the latter course. But he must know very well that his party secretaries all over the country will, in consequence, find themselves being pulled ever more strongly into the orbit of the makers and the producers and away from the doctrinaires. Probably he does not mind this so long as he controls the machinery which comprehends them all.

Remarks of the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at the ICA All Employees Meeting, Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, December 10, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest, I am including in my remarks a recent speech made by our able Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Douglas Dillon.

This address was given at a meeting held last month of employees of the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Dillon spoke in his capacity as the individual charged with responsibility for coordinating all matters relating to mutual security, but he shows real understanding of the problems faced by Members of Congress, who must act on requests for authorizing and financing these programs. He shows too a clear recognition of the importance of a proper attitude in our dealings with newly independent, and in many cases uncommitted, countries.

Mr. Dillon's address follows:

I am delighted to be here with you this morning and to take part in honoring 32 of our fellow ICA employees for their outstanding services. I refer to them advisedly as our fellow employees. For I have felt that I am one of you ever since Secretary of State Dulles charged me with responsibility for coordinating mutual security matters, of which ICA is so important a part.

I wish that by some miracle of transportation, we could have with us for this important hour today, the thousands of dedicated men and women who are serving ICA overseas, where I have seen them operating under difficult conditions and even under extreme hardship. For I want to tell all of you in ICA, whether at home or abroad, what a magnificent service I think you are performing for your country.

I can testify that my feelings are shared by every official of the executive branch who plays a major part in the shaping and conduct of our foreign policy, and, I am sure, by many distinguished Members of the Congress as well. This is especially true of Secretary Dulles, who has asked me to give you his warmest personal greetings and to remind you of something he said in this same room at the first ICA all-employees meeting a little over a year ago. At that time, you may recall, he told you:

"You do not have the job security of other Government positions, or the remuneration which you could obtain in private life. What keeps you on the job is patriotism and loyalty to your country. Such patriotism is usual in times of war, but especially exceptional and laudable in times of peace."

What the Secretary said is as profoundly true today as it was a year ago. Nothing I could say would add to his tribute.

After the Congress reconvenes in January, there will be honorable men on both sides of the aisle who will want to take a hard look at our entire foreign aid program. It is my hope that they will examine it vigorously, but unemotionally and without undue

partisanship. I personally applaud such a full and frank discussion. For we are constantly seeking ways to streamline and revitalize our programs, to increase their breadth and flexibility, and to enlarge our objectives.

As you know, we are now preparing to present our next budget requests to Congress. In drafting our requests, we have constantly borne in mind our overriding responsibility to the American people to insure that every cent of their tax money will be expended with scrupulous care and maximum efficiency. I am confident that when the proper time comes, we can, and shall, justify our requests. For the cost of our foreign-aid programs represents only a modest portion of our national product. And every penny spent on foreign aid is an investment in free-world security.

I should now like to touch upon a point which must disturb you as much as it disturbs me. This is the fact that too many of our people are coming to think of our mutual security and other assistance programs solely as instruments of the cold war and answers to the massive economic drive the Soviet bloc is directing against the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Actually, as you well know, we have been in the foreign-aid business a long time. Our programs began in Latin America 15 years ago and were made worldwide 8 years ago. We are the defending champions in this field. The Communist bloc's technical-aid offensive, which began only 4 years ago, it is a response to your efforts and a tribute to your many successes.

The reasons behind the Communist bloc's offensive are readily apparent: The Communist leaders are aware that a great cooperative free-world effort to improve economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas will erect the most powerful possible barrier to the spread of communism. Rest assured that they will do everything to discredit you and the country you represent.

We can triumph over the Communists by helping the peoples of the underdeveloped nations to help themselves. But in the extension of our assistance, we must use discretion and forbearance and demonstrate true statesmanship.

In this connection, I was struck by a remark made the other day in New York by Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to this country, who said:

"A way of life determined by a specific set of political or economic doctrines has no meaning as such to Asian peoples. The struggle which interests them is rather the constant and bitter struggle for life itself, the struggle against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance."

What he meant, I believe, is that in the ideological struggle between communism and the West, most of the peoples of the newly emerging nations are uncommitted . . . so far. They need our assistance. But they are jealous of their new-found independence. They will be reluctant to accept the idea that either the Communist or the free world way provides a desirable blueprint for the good life until they have seen concrete results close at hand. The challenge to us to help them to achieve progress under freedom is clear.

The manner in which we extend our assistance can have a very great bearing upon the path they ultimately choose. We must offer aid in an unobtrusive way, working discreetly in the background. We are so accustomed to self-rule that we sometimes fail to realize how truly staggering a burden is the exercise of political responsibility for the first time.

I should now like to say a word regarding the role which each and every ICA employee must play in the conduct of our foreign policy:

Yours is a responsibility which rests squarely upon the shoulders of each individual, whether here or 10,000 miles away. It is, in part, a responsibility to help create a better understanding of our objectives at home and abroad. Each of you must also play an explicit and conscious role in the actual conduct of our foreign relations. To do so will require maturity, tolerance, and a widening appreciation of the complexities of our relations with other peoples. Let me urge you never to lose sight of the idealism in which our foreign-aid program was born. For, in the final analysis, the success of our efforts will be measured as much in terms of reaching the minds and hearts of the peoples of the less-developed nations as in helping them to achieve material progress. It is a difficult role, but it can be as rewarding as it is challenging. I have every confidence that you will prove equal to it.

Effective Labor Regulation Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in this morning's New Herald Tribune, commenting on Senator KENNEDY's labor bill:

SENATOR KENNEDY IS OVERLY OPTIMISTIC

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is off to a fast start with a labor reform bill that would "virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business."

That, of course, is only what the Massachusetts Democrat says. For it is hard to see just how KENNEDY reasons that this bill would stop the boss of the Teamsters Union. What the Senator offers is pretty much a re-run of last year's legislation, which failed in the closing days of Congress chiefly because some Members of the House thought the bill wasn't strong enough and others didn't want to annoy the unions in an election year with even a pale variety of regulation.

Now the problem is still not so much what is in the Kennedy bill. Nobody can seriously argue with its content, which could almost be described as noncontroversial. But the real rub is about what KENNEDY has left out.

For instance, among the most potent weapons of Hoffa and his kind are:

1. The phony picketing where, for instance, a storekeeper can't get goods delivered unless he signs up with the union;

2. The secondary boycott where an innocent third party is made to suffer in a labor hassle.

KENNEDY's bill does nothing to strike down these two evils. There is more of this kind of omission, but that's enough to show that Hoffa & Co. needn't fear yet about losing the franchise.

Of course KENNEDY hardly approves of the aforementioned malpractices. He just says these ought to be handled sometime later when Congress gets around to amending the Taft-Hartley Act. This, however, is extremely tenuous assurance.

Meanwhile the Senator says the hearings on his bill, beginning next week, should be completed in 9 days at most. Not long thereafter, one assumes from KENNEDY's prediction, Jimmy Hoffa will be hastening to abdicate.

Want to bet, Senator?

Integration in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting address concerning integration in Washington, D.C., was delivered by Isaac Franck before the 85th annual forum of the Conference on Social Welfare in Chicago, Ill., in May 1958. Mr. Franck, a member of the faculty of American University, is executive director of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. The address was reprinted in the August 15, 1958, issue of Commonweal and I am pleased to commend it to our colleagues:

INTEGRATION IN WASHINGTON

By Isaac Franck

In dealing with the subject of racial desegregation in the Nation's Capital we confront not only one of the most interesting theoretical problems of our time but one of our most imperative practical problems; and the social changes which have taken place in Washington within the last decade are of particular moment at this juncture in our national history. Washington is a Federal city, marked off by artificial and arbitrary boundary lines from a large and expanding hinterland of suburbia in contiguous counties of Maryland and Virginia. At the end of 1957 the total population of the metropolitan area was about 2 million. Somewhat less than half this number live within the boundaries of the District of Columbia, and of those within the District proper about 45 percent are Negroes.

These figures take on new meaning when we realize that they show the population to have doubled in some 17 years. The sheer doubling of the metropolitan population in such a short period is in itself impressive. What is most relevant here, however, is the growth of the Negro population in Washington proper during this period. The growth in the Negro population of Washington is, of course, nothing exceptional. Similar and even greater increases in the Negro populations in urban centers are reflected all across the country. This is part of the general trend toward urbanization in the United States. That many of the Negro immigrants into Washington have come from southern rural areas with inferior schools for Negroes is particularly relevant to our school situation, and to the glaring inequalities between the Negro and the white schools brought to light after integration.

A graphic description of some of the aspects of the Washington situation about 10 years ago is contained in the 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, entitled "To Secure These Rights":

"If a Negro stops in Washington . . . with a very few exceptions, he is refused service at downtown restaurants, he may not attend a downtown movie or play, and he has to go into the poorer section of the city to find a night's lodging. The Negro who decides to settle in the District must often find a home in an overcrowded, substandard area. He must often take a job below the level of his ability. He must send his children to the inferior public schools set aside for Negroes, and entrust his family's health to medical agencies which give inferior service. In addition, he must endure the countless daily humiliations that the system of segregation imposes upon the one-third of Washington that is Negro."

Let me fill in a number of additional details. Ten years ago Negroes and whites were assigned separate recreational facilities, public facilities, including the playgrounds and swimming pools of the District of Columbia Recreation Department and the swimming pools under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, as well as such private facilities as bowling alleys. In addition to separate movie houses for Negroes and whites, the crazy-quilt pattern of segregation made it possible for Negro performers to appear on the stage of legitimate theaters, but barred Negroes from the audiences; while in Constitution Hall the reverse was the case: concert audiences were admitted without distinctions of color, but no Negro performers were allowed to appear on the stage.

Segregation was the practice in private social agencies. The Police Boys' Clubs were rigidly divided into white and Negro units. No Negro physicians were admitted into the District of Columbia Medical Society; no Negro lawyers were given membership in the District of Columbia Bar Association; no Negro nurses could be members of the District Nurses' Association. The Fire Department was strictly segregated into Negro and white companies. Hiring and promotions of Negroes in the Metropolitan Police department left much to be desired. The public transportation system refused to employ Negroes as motormen or bus drivers. Except for Federal Government agencies, employment of Negroes in other than low level jobs was almost unknown, either in the District of Columbia government, or in public utilities, or in private employment in department stores, offices, or other businesses. No Negro architects were employed by white architectural firms. Churches were, on the whole, separated into Negro and white churches, and it became a cliché to say that the greatest amount of segregation in Washington took place on Sunday mornings at 11 o'clock.

Many other details could be added to this melancholy recital of the unmistakably "Jim Crow" character of our Nation's Capital a decade ago. These objective facts were accompanied by a widespread assumption that this situation had existed from eternity, and would continue to exist as part of the essential nature of the city and its patterns.

However, much has changed in the intervening 10 years. And while there is still much segregation, while there are still multitudinous discriminations, while it is not possible to assert dogmatically that there has been a great change in mass attitudes, it is unmistakably true that a major social revolution has taken place in Washington. Today, Negro and white youngsters attend the same public schools. Negroes and whites go to the same movie houses, theaters, and Constitution Hall, on the stage as well as in the audience. Recreation facilities, including playgrounds, swimming pools, and privately owned bowling alleys, are unsegregated. Negroes and whites eat in the same restaurants. The public transportation system employs Negroes as motormen and bus drivers. Some of the public utilities have begun employing Negroes in such positions of high visibility as secretaries and account clerks in the front offices. The district government has instituted a nondiscrimination employment policy. Police Department hiring and upgrading of Negroes has shown marked improvement. Some beginnings have been made in desegregating the fire department. Negro physicians are admitted into the District of Columbia Medical Society. Negro nurses are members of the District of Columbia Nurses' Association. The District of Columbia Bar Association is still in the throes of deciding about admitting Negro lawyers, but there is little question about the outcome.

Voluntary social agencies are in a process of transition, and many of them are now

completely integrated. There are a number of integrated churches in Washington, and more on the way. The staff and all activities of the Council of Churches, including its many, well-attended institutes and seminars, are completely integrated. We have reason to believe that in the next few weeks a number of large department stores will begin hiring Negroes as sales people. Hospitals accept Negro patients, and Negro doctors are free to practice their profession in the hospitals. At the drawing boards of a number of architectural firms Negro and white architects work side by side. Negroes, on the whole, have no problem in obtaining lodging in first-class downtown hotels.

It is easy to rattle off, machinegun fashion, this cavalcade of progress. But only those who have personally known Washington during this past decade can fully appreciate the revolutionary character of the changes; and only those who have themselves participated in bringing about these changes can know what went into this exciting and inspiring process.

Almost every one of these social changes was preceded by dire predictions about the consequences of the change. At best, people were sure that the change just would not work. At worst, disturbances and violence were predicted. It is important to note, however, that this decade of progress was punctuated by only 3 minor disturbances connected with swimming pools and high schools. Firm and intelligent police handling and public statements by the Superintendent of Schools, with helpful editorializing by the city's three newspapers, brought the students back to their classes within 3 days.

What were some of the ingredients which made possible this relatively peaceful transition? First, there were a large number of individuals and organizations who refused to accept three myths, and who succeeded in persuading others to refuse to accept these myths: the myth of unchangeability of any situation; the myth of the inevitability of violence if integration is effectuated; and the myth that there is a necessary order of priority which must be followed in a program of integration.

I recall vividly the conferences with our newspaper editors in the summer of 1950, after they had editorialized on the Interior Department's decision to integrate its swimming pools, and had expressed fears that such integration would result in riots by irresponsible elements. We argued that the newspapers must liberate themselves from the myth of the inevitability of violence; that in predicting violence they were contributing to the creation of an atmosphere permissive toward violence, and thus giving encouragement to the irresponsible elements whose inclinations they deplored; that as community institutions the newspapers had a responsibility to create an atmosphere conducive to the maintenance of law and order and to the acceptance of progressive social change. The newspapers were persuaded, and since then have on the whole been an affirmative force in the history of desegregation in Washington. Other institutions, elected representatives, and community leaders also had to be persuaded, and this process of persuasion did not proceed without considerable resistance. Moral suasion, careful social and psychological analyses of the problem, and dedicated persistence contributed to the lowering of resistance.

The second ingredient worthy of note is the cooperation of and preparation by various community organizations and institutions. In 1951, when the litigation took place which established the validity of 19th-century civil rights laws, and resulted in the desegregation of Washington's restaurants, community groups joined together in filing briefs as "friends of the court," in support of the validity of these laws. Later, in the

school desegregation case, community organizations joined in submitting an amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court, in support of desegregation. These groups included leading Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious and civic organizations, such as the Council of Churches, the Jewish Community Council, the Catholic Interracial Council, the American Friends Service Committee, as well as other citizens' groups such as the Urban League and NAACP. Each time the newspapers and newscasters made public the fact that a large and heterogeneous group of community organizations supported racial desegregation, public opinion was affected. Nor must one slight the moral impact of the three religious groups, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, speaking out jointly, in conferences, in legal briefs, and in public pronouncements, in support of desegregation.

There were other kinds of preparation also. The Catholic parochial schools quietly initiated integration 3 years before the Supreme Court decision. The religious leadership, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, carried on educational work within their respective constituencies, and preached from their pulpits. The Park Police and the Metropolitan Police Departments gave their men training in intergroup relations, and in the professional responsibilities of police officers maintaining law and order, and protecting the life and safety of all human beings in the community. Intergroup relations and intergroup education workshops, for teachers and community leaders, were conducted by universities and by community organizations, such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Friends Service Committee. These and other groups thus made sure that the preparation consisted not merely of exhortative appeals but of cooperative community action, and of professional training for those involved in the day-to-day business of human relations.

The third ingredient, particularly in the peaceful process of school integration, was clarity, authoritativeness, moral firmness, and lack of ambiguity in the pronouncements of the Board of Education and the implementation of the desegregation plans. It is to the credit of the District of Columbia Board of Education that it issued a clear and unequivocal policy statement shortly after the Supreme Court decision, and that it approved a carefully worked out desegregation plan, and proceeded to carry it out with dispatch and determination. When the Board of Recreation, on the day following the Supreme Court's decision, finally integrated all the District of Columbia facilities at once, the action was accepted by the community without a ripple of protest.

It should also be noted that Washington's status as the Capital of the United States made possible in this instance the added voice of moral authority and rightness behind the process of integration in the public statements of the President of the United States and of other high Federal officials. Thus Washington's experience furnishes additional evidence in support of the contention that morally right, authoritative decisions on desegregation, announced by high-level leadership, and carried out without equivocation, ambiguity, or delay, will be accepted by the community without disturbances or violence.

There is much work still to be done before Washington begins to approximate the full realization of the goals of American democracy, and of healthy intergroup relations. The progress we have made must not blind us to the need for further progress. But we must also be realistically aware of the impediments to further progress.

There are these difficulties: First, Washington's geographic location makes it a border city, between North and South, in whose population ambivalences concerning race relations will persist for some time to

come. Second, the phenomenon of suburbia reinforces in the minds of some people the fantasy or delusion that one can escape desegregation through joining the flight to the suburbs. As long as these delusions persist, as long as people fail to ask themselves realistically how far they can continue to flee, and how long they can continue to escape the inherently American trend toward integration, our progress will be impeded. The third impediment is contained in the fact that Washington is a city whose residents have no franchise. Washington has no home rule, and its citizens have no power to make their own decisions. The legislative body for the city of Washington is the Congress of the U.S., which has a few other things of importance to be concerned about. Some Congressmen, from some Southern States, seem to want to maintain a Washington which conforms to their cherished image of a Jim Crow town in their native State. Finally, there are still some elements in the power structure of the community who fear that integration will lead to changes in the power structure, and to consequent uncertainties about their own position within it.

However, in spite of these impediments, progress will continue. The most recent episode in this decade of progress was the official order issued several weeks ago by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (the three Commissioners perform functions similar to those of a mayor in a normal municipality), creating a Human Relations Council in the Government of the District. This council will deal with problems of discrimination, segregation, and intergroup relations. And to the extent to which the element of right governmental authority is a factor of importance in facilitating the process of integration, to that extent the creation of the Human Relations Council gives us additional reason for looking forward to further progress in the Nation's Capital.

Tipping Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which requires that the amount of tips be considered as wages for the purposes of computing social security benefits. This bill, which is No. H.R. 1342, received serious consideration in the 85th Congress, and is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee in this 86th Congress.

An article by Tom Brooks regarding tipping practices spells out the nature of tips and the reactions by the tipper and the serviceman. I believe a reading of this article will prove informative and enlightening:

The obscure 18th century English innkeeper who posted a box at the foot of the stairs labeled "To insure promptness" hardly could have realized the change he was initiating in the customs of mankind. Before the coming of the tip box, the good servant might have picked up an occasional windfall in a hastily flung coin according to a master's mood. But the standard practice of tipping was introduced by an English innkeeper systematically seeking an extra coin for better service.

Today, tipping is a widespread practice. Some 2 million Americans depend upon it for much of their livelihood. Most of these earn their money by offering some kind of service. Those who receive tips in the course of their duties run the gamut from altar boys at a wedding to waiters; their ranks include taxi drivers, caddies, mailmen, movers, delivery boys, expressmen, messengers, janitors, barbers, bartenders, busboys, beauticians, porters, garage attendants, pinboys, and an occasional organ grinder. Some of them of course get only an occasional tip, such as the annual Christmas gifts to the postman and to apartment-house building service employees. For most, tips are the hard coinage of a living wage.

To the tipper, tips are an added cost not always easily or cordially borne. One out-of-town executive estimates that a business trip to New York City costs at least \$20 a day in tips. He breaks it down this way: Redcap, 50 cents; bellhop, 50 cents; 5 taxis, \$1.25; 4 doormen, \$1; 3 hatcheck girls, 75 cents; 2 bartenders, \$1.25; luncheon waiter, \$2; dinner waiter serving 4 people, \$7; captain, \$5; wine butler, \$1; cigarette girl, 25 cents. This does not take into account the shoeshine boy, the barber, chambermaid, or valet, if he should need their services.

A market-research company spokesman once estimated that in 1 year, the average businessman pays about five times the original price of his hat to hatcheck girls. This is vigorously disputed by another spokesman—for the Hat Research Foundation—who says, "I just don't believe that anyone except an occasional playboy would spend that much (about fifty dollars a year) for hat- and coat-check tipping."

Both gentlemen might be dismayed to know that those quarters don't go to the lovely blonde who takes his coat and hat at his favorite night spot—nearly all hatcheck girls get a straight salary from a concessionaire.

A Diamond Jim Brady leaving a one-hundred-dollar bill in the hand of a Delmonico waiter is a thing of the gay nineties past. Even in this expense-account age, no company treasurer or auditor would ever approve a three-figure tip. "It's the nickles, dimes, and quarters that add up," says a waitress at a fast-service restaurant. "But the dough ain't always there," says her glum-faced sister behind the counter, pointing to the bare space next to the dirty dishes left by a retreating customer.

"There are peaks and valleys in this business," says an old-time hackle. "Some days, you think you never had it so good. Others—?" Another cab driver, picking up a rider just after a downpour, tells this story: "I see this dame in a mink coat standing on Broadway; it's pouring, and she hails me. 'Grand Central,' she says, as grand as you please. When we get there, the meter says 75 cents. And, you know what? She hands me a nickel tip. A stinking nickel. So I throw it out on the sidewalk after her. And, you know what she does?" He shakes his head in wonder. "She bends down and picks it up."

Waiters, and others who earn their living from tips, are understandably upset over the lack of tipping savvy on the part of callow youths and out-of-towners, as well as lavishly dressed women. The harassed tourist worrying over a handy pocket tipping computer or a frugal man's guide to tipping isn't any more frustrated than the waiter who picks up a dime tip after serving a \$2 meal. "New Yorkers," says one waiter, "are educated." A spokesman for the New York State Restaurant Association says, "The public usually tips about 10 percent in inexpensive places, 15 in a better spot, and 20 for special service or in entertainment spots."

"But," says a New York waiter, "the 15-percent habit is only wishful thinking.

When you take into consideration, the 'stiffs' and the 5 percenters, we're happy if we make 10 percent of our total sales before paying the busboy."

Emily Post, however, warns that the "10 percent of yesterday is today anywhere from 12 to 15 percent." A minimum permissible tip, according to that impeccable guide to etiquette, is 25 cents for one person and 30 cents for two. "In a restaurant," she says, somewhat indignantly, "where the serving is done by waitresses, patrons are inclined to be very unfair in giving them no more than half (and even less) than the amount they would think of giving to waiters." This may be blind justice balancing her scales; for among tiptakers, women are generally rated poor tippers. "A woman can't do percentages," explains a philosophical hotelman. "She can figure out 10 percent in her head, but certainly not 15. So she leaves 10." Psychiatrist Gregory Zilboorg says, "In her traditional protected role, woman is not man's equal, but a plaything who does not consider it her business to tip."

Tiptakers rate salaried men, especially those in the liquor, tobacco, and advertising businesses, out-of-town buyers, and stockbrokers as among the most generous of men. Doctors, dentists, college boys, actors, politicians, musicians, company presidents, and expensively dressed people are poor tippers, according to those who ought to know. "Tips are expected according to appearance," says one authority, so, perhaps, in the last instance, clothes lead to higher expectations and greater disappointments. The most generous tippers, considering their income, are waitresses and taxi drivers.

How much is earned from tips? The Internal Revenue Service would like to have a hard and fast answer to that one. According to a restaurant-industry spokesman, the minimum that agency will accept for income-tax purposes is a report of at least \$3 a day earned by waitresses in a chain restaurant of middling range. Internal Revenue denies the use of any such formula. In any case, such a rule-of-thumb estimate cannot be a reliable guide to earnings among the uncertain and inconstant byways of tipping.

Earnings from tips are hard to pin down. Unions representing workers who depend on tips for a living are reluctant to discuss the question. Tippers almost always overestimate the take of what they often consider "grasping, outstretched hands." And the tip earners, themselves humanly fallible, frequently underestimate the amount of their take-home.

A waiter's minimum wage, as specified in the contract of a New York City hotel and restaurant worker's union, is \$32.40 a week. An informed guess is that the average take-home in that segment of the food-service industry would run about double that or somewhere around the average weekly wage of a factory worker—about \$80 a week. Other estimates, however, give the average waiter four times his daily wage in tips. In the swankiest white-tie hotel dining room, a waiter may make upwards of \$200 a week. At the other end of the tipping scale, the average chambermaid will earn very little from tips.

Most bartenders and taxi drivers earn about half their living from tips, although cabmen also earn in commissions a percentage of the meter take. Here's what one cab driver calls an "average day." He puts \$20 on the clock by picking up about 30 rides. He gets in commission, "say about eight bucks; the boss gets 12." He averages about \$4 in tips. "Some days, I do better; others, worse."

Service captains and doormen earn about two-thirds of their income from tips. Very few live on tips alone, although a doorman of one very fancy nightclub is reported to

live very well on just tips. Apartment-house elevator men and doormen, janitors, and superintendents, who are tipped generally once a year, of course, do not depend on this source for income. One middle-income housing co-op—with 294 families—taxes each room a dollar, once a year, to raise about \$1,200 to be divided among a superintendent, 2 guards, a firekeeper, 2 handymen, and 3 porters. This gives each man roughly \$130, which may be some kind of average for this kind of tipping.

Tipping, from time to time, comes under attack from various quarters. For example, when unions were first organizing the restaurant industry, liberal-minded people used to leave a card reading, "I do not believe in tips; organize for a living wage," in place of the usual coins. But, neither the waiters nor the unions representing them were out to abolish tipping; they were seeking a "floor" under wages, and improvements in working conditions.

Nonetheless, opposition persists and is shared by persons of otherwise divergent views. An out-of-town businessman puts it this way: "It's not my responsibility to pay other people's wages. I only tip when I get extra favors." Some riders of taxicabs express their hostility by leaving the door open when they get out, if the driver fails to say "Thank you" when tipped. A union official says that the employer charges the customer for food and service, then pays waiters such low wages that he forces the customer to pay part of his wage bill.

In a backhanded sort of way, psychiatrist Zillboorg agrees with the critics. "Tipping," he says, "has nothing to do with service. There is a long, silent tradition that humans are either master or slave. The moderate tipper caters to frugality, but he thinks: 'Don't spoil the slaves.' The lavish tipper says money means nothing and believes all men are beggars."

Recently, a number of tip-wage earners have found that while they had to pay income taxes on the money they earned—whether in tips or wages—they only get social-security payments based on their wages, excluding tips. For many this has meant hardship. The Government, for its part, points out that it hasn't been able to collect social-security taxes on tips so there is nothing to do but pay benefits only on wages earned, which, in many cases, are very low.

The problem has become more acute as more people are now coming up for retirement. It was highlighted neatly in a recent case involving a banquet waiter for a New York hotel.

A banquet waiter earns his tips in a slightly different fashion from, say, an à la carte waiter. The latter depends wholly on the whim of the customer, who may or may not leave a tip as he chooses. But the banquet waiter is guaranteed his tip in the charge the hotel makes for the meal served. Actually it is more a surcharge than a tip. When someone contracts for a banquet, a menu is picked, a price agreed upon, and then the hotel adds a 15-percent charge to cover tips. This 15 percent is divided among the people who serve the meal. A record of this is kept by the hotel.

When this particular banquet waiter retired, he found that he was only to get minimum social-security payments—a figure based on his wages alone. Believing he was entitled to the full benefit, based on his wages plus tips, the waiter appealed. It was decided that where service charges are placed on the bill, tips come under the Internal Revenue Service's definition of wages or moneys that may be credited for social-security purposes. Tips can be counted as wages, however, only if the employer requires from the employee an accounting of the actual or estimated amount of such tips. The ruling extended this narrow regulation

to cover the banquet waiter's case. The court held that it was clearly evident the banquet department had the equivalent of such an accounting.

However, the same cannot be said of other restaurant employees, the à la carte waiters, or the many others who depend upon tips for a living. They still must pay income taxes on what they earn; but since most employers do not demand an accounting of what they earn in tips, they are not taxed for social security on wages plus tips. In effect, they suffer a loss when retirement takes place.

New York State encountered the same kind of problem many years ago in administering unemployment compensation. How much compensation is an unemployed worker, who earns part of his living in wages and part in tips, entitled to? If his employer is taxed on wages alone, the worker is entitled to a limited benefit, and certainly not the amount he would be entitled to if he worked in another job where he earned an equal amount of pay.

New York's solution was to empower the Industrial Commissioner to make rules concerning the value of board and lodging, tips, and gratuities. The value of tips is determined by a code that covers beauty-parlor operators; garage, gas station, and parking attendants; service employees in restaurants; dining-room employees in American-plan hotels and eating clubs; hotel-service employees; taxicab drivers; barbershop employees; baggage porters; pin-boys; checking-room attendants; and maritime-service employees. The rules covering each situation were worked out after a full public hearing in which employees, union representatives, businessmen, and others were heard. They have been in effect now for over 10 years.

The rules vary and were drawn up on the basis of tipping experience in the respective trades covered. For example, the value of tips to beauty-parlor operators, for unemployment-compensation purposes, is determined on the basis of an amount equal to 10 percent of the wages paid to them by their employers. The value of tips to banquet waiters is assessed at 100 percent of cash wages.

Applied to à la carte waiters, the procedure works like this. The waiter has a choice. He can declare in a signed statement to his employer the true value of what he has earned in tips or he can simply forget it. In the latter case, the employer must file a report in which the value of the tips is arbitrarily fixed at 7½ percent of the total table sales. The employer must pay his unemployment-compensation tax on wages plus this allowance for tips—or on the declared true value. Thus, the unemployed waiter gets the unemployment compensation to which he is entitled according to the intent and purpose of the law.

The hotel and restaurant unions in this State have urged that the Federal Government adopt a similar approach and apply it to the financing and payment of social security benefits. The problem has been discussed before congressional committees. Hotel and restaurant associations have testified that such formulas are not workable. "We cannot find how much the tips to our employees amount to," one hotel spokesman declared.

The Social Security Administration has been devoting considerable time and effort to studying the question of counting tips as wages. The agency is alive to the element of social injustice in the situation and has asserted its desire to find a just and satisfactory solution.

One of the difficulties in applying the New York administrative system of assessing the value of tips is the variation in tipping practices throughout the country. New York State had the same problem initially. The

amount people leave as a tip in Buffalo is likely to be somewhat different from the amount left in a comparable New York City restaurant. But, considering the administrative headaches saved by the system—and the relative absence of resulting conflict between employers and employees—New York felt it was worth the risk of an imbalance. But the Federal Government would have a far greater disparity to cope with; therefore, Federal experts tend to favor some sort of compulsory reporting by tip earners.

In New York, more and more tip earners report true value rather than count on the employer's report and the arbitrary percentage-basis assessment. Perhaps one of the reasons for this has been the increased tightening in Federal enforcement of income tax collecting. Keeping the necessary records for a true report of tipping value to the New York State Division of Employment facilitates the accurate report of income to a Federal agency. With the same degree of compulsion, a Federal system of true value reporting would most likely set true retirement benefits.

The Crime of Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 29, 1958:

CRIME OF BOMBING: SHOULD FEDERAL LAW APPLY?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is good reason to give serious second thought to the proposal which will come up in the new Congress that the bombings of schools and churches be made a Federal crime.

This legislation will have reputable sponsorship from Democrats and Republicans alike—from Democratic Senators KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and IRVIN, of North Carolina, Republican Senators SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and KEATING, of New York, and others.

It is an easy solution. It is an attractive solution. It will be politically painless to support it and, perhaps, for a time politically embarrassing to oppose it.

But is it the wise solution? And is it the effective solution? I am not assuming that I have the final answer, but I do know that there are high officials in Washington close to this problem who question whether there is merit in making the bombings of schools and churches a Federal offense, and whether by so doing the law-enforcement agencies could perform a better job in coping with them.

The arguments which these officials would like the country and Congress to ponder are these:

1. Crime is primarily a local problem, and the primary, first line of defense must be at the local level.

2. Unless the local citizenry and local police have the authority and legal obligation to secure the peace, they cannot be expected to accept the responsibility. To dilute the obligation is to dilute the responsibility.

3. If the bombings of schools and churches be made a Federal crime—crimes which especially stem from local conditions—the effect of such a shift of authority is to cause local

officials to wash their hands of their duty. This makes it harder, not easier, to enforce the law.

4. Obviously there is much which the FBI can do in working with local authorities in dealing with this special kind of crime. But those who have first hand experience in these matters are convinced that the FBI can actually accomplish more without a new statute than could be accomplished under the terms of any new legislation thus far proposed.

The sum of these judgments is that to make such bombings exclusively a Federal offense or to divide enforcement responsibility would hurt the cause of law enforcement rather than help it.

No doubt the Senate and House will hold full hearings before Congress takes any such step. They will undoubtedly seek the opinions of Attorney General William Rogers and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and I would expect that they would testify to views very similar to the foregoing.

Mr. Hoover, for example, is already publicly committed to the proposition that the Federal Government ought not to weaken local responsibility. In the December issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, he says: "Just as experience proves that crime is a local problem, so the present threat from bombings can be most effectively diagnosed and combated on the local level."

Mr. Hoover puts a very high value upon an aroused public as a needed tool in dealing with all kinds of crime and it seems to me to be implicit in his recent statement that he thinks that making bombings a Federal offense would make it far more difficult to rally public opinion since responsibility would be shifted from the scene of the crime to Washington.

"There is," Mr. Hoover says, "no more powerful weapon against hatred and bigotry than overwhelming public indignation—embracing all creeds and races—against those individuals who by their vile deeds would desecrate our way of life."

It needs to be understood that the FBI can and is giving full-scale cooperation to local authorities in connection with these bombings, whether the FBI has jurisdiction or not. It is free to cooperate and it does. Can the FBI do more than it is now doing without taking over too much authority? And to divide authority tends to weaken, not strengthen, law enforcement.

On the Rounds With the General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in Iowa all of us are proud of the honors conferred upon Dr. Lonnie Coffin, of Farmington, Iowa, who was selected by the American Medical Association as the General Practitioner of the Year 1958. I am especially proud because Dr. Coffin is a constituent of mine, and it pleases me to see this recognition come to a man who has unselfishly devoted himself to serving his fellow man.

An article by William Barry Furlong, of the Chicago Daily News, was printed in the magazine section of the New York Times for Sunday, January 11, 1959. It is a wonderful tribute to Dr. Coffin, and,

under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

ON THE ROUNDS WITH THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER OF THE YEAR

(By William Barry Furlong)

FARMINGTON, IOWA.—On a recent weekend Dr. Lonnie A. Coffin, of Farmington, worked as usual—he saw 15 patients on Saturday, 4 on Sunday. "But I took Saturday night off to go to a party," he says, a little apologetically. The reason for the hometown party was Dr. Coffin's selection by the American Medical Association as the general practitioner of the year 1958.

At 68, Dr. Coffin is an anachronism in modern medicine. His career has spanned the eternity from horse-and-buggy medicine to the rocket age, but his philosophy has remained serenely unchanged: To take care of sick people, whether it's day or night, whether they're near or far, whether they're rich or poor. "That's the job of the doctor," he says firmly. "That's the least he can do."

For 10 to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year for 42 years, Dr. Coffin has done his job. He has done it by horseback, buggy, by mule team, by rowboat, and by railroad handcar, as well as by auto. "One New Year's Eve," he says, "I took a mule team up to about 5 miles from a town named Croton. Then I got on a handcar and pumped 5 miles to town to deliver a baby." He grunted and half smiled. "That was a helluva New Year's Eve party."

He has done this kind of thing even when he knew there was little or no chance of payment. "All the time I stayed at their house," says a girl who formerly lived with the doctor's family, "I don't think he got a full night's sleep. Every night he had to go out on a sick call, sometimes going 30 miles on muddy, back-country roads. And that was during the depression, when he knew he wasn't going to get paid."

To the 899 people of Farmington, Dr. Coffin (for years he has met all humorous remarks about his name with, "Well, that's what they carry you off in and you don't have to worry about that") is as much a part of life as the frigid winters or the pine forests near town. He has spent almost his entire life in Farmington, delivered some 2,500 babies—2,000 of them, at homes, he says, "where babies should be born"—healed people when they were sick, advised them when they were unsure, solaced them when they were grieved.

His selection by the AMA, meeting in Minneapolis, touched off a celebration by the whole town. Hundreds of townspeople, along with the high school band, drove the 90 miles round-trip to the airport in Burlington to greet him when he returned from Minneapolis. Scores of others painted long, red-white-and-blue banners ("Welcome home, Doc" or "Home of doctor of the year") and hung them above the town's snow-packed streets.

"I couldn't have been prouder if it was my own father," said one woman.

"He's not just the outstanding general practitioner of the year," said one man. "He's the outstanding general practitioner of our time."

The attachment of the doctor to his town is deep and moving to see. He has observed the best and worst in its people and every home, every doorway, stirs up memories—some tender, some wry, all pleasant. Not long ago, on a 12-mile drive into the country to take care of a 72-year-old woman who had suffered a stroke, Dr. Coffin recalled a case and laughed. "About 4:30 one morning, the wife of this man calls and asks me to come out. He's a pretty old man—80-some—so I get out there right away. 'What's the matter?' I ask him. 'Got a cough, Doc. Got a bad cough,' he says. 'Uh-huh, how

long you had it?' I ask. 'Since I was about 3 years old,' he says."

Dr. Coffin, a warm, happy man, laughed again. "Well, a lot of doctors who don't like night calls say that people are sick all day but never call you till it's night," he said. "That may be so—but that's because they feel a lot worse at night. And that's when you've got to go to them. You won't ever have to worry about socialized medicine as long as the doctors go to the sick when they need 'em."

Vigorously independent—and in no way a simple rustic—Dr. Coffin maintains a trenchantly practical attitude toward a problem which most physicians treat as gingerly as a third-degree burn.

In 10 or 15 years, if we don't change, we're going to see socialized medicine, he says. "I don't want it and I don't think most people want it. But it's going to come unless we do one thing to stop it: If the medical profession will go and see sick people and charge 'em a decent fee, you'll never hear any more about socialized medicine. That's all it takes—go and see the sick people and charge 'em a decent fee. Now, I might get cussed out by some of the big boys for saying that, but I don't give a damn."

What fees does Dr. Coffin charge? "Well, when I started it was \$1 for an office call, including drugs," he says. "I make up my own prescriptions. Then it was \$1.50 for house calls and \$2 for night calls. Today it's \$3 for office calls, including medicine, and \$4 for house calls and \$5 for night calls. But I don't charge 'em extra for night calls."

Obstetrics? "When I got started, the fee was \$10," he says. "Then we"—the doctors in the county medical society—"got it up to \$15 and then \$25 or \$30 and finally \$50. Well, I thought \$50 for delivering a baby was just wonderful."

Through the years, Dr. Coffin has maintained a certain insouciance toward financial matters. "I never ask 'em for money. I never send out bills," he says. "If they aren't able to pay, then I don't want 'em to pay. If people are honest, they'll pay eventually. If they're not honest, they won't pay—I don't see that it's worth while worryin' about."

The duties of the country doctor go far beyond medicine. Dr. Coffin has straightened out marital problems, picked up and delivered the groceries ("and paid for them if he knows his patients can't pay," says a friend), bought tickets for basketball games for youngsters who couldn't afford them and bought gowns for high-school girls who couldn't go to the junior-senior banquet without them.

Similarly, payment to the country doctor goes far beyond money. It is expressed in a muted gratitude and sometimes a depth of friendship that transcends the awkwardness over money. "When the bank failed in Farmington back in the depression, I lost everything but the money in my pocket," says Dr. Coffin. The next day, an old friend and patient dropped into his office. "I'd delivered 10 babies to his wife, I every year for 9 years, then skipped a year, then the 10th one," recalls Dr. Coffin. The friend said that if Dr. Coffin ever needed money, not to worry; just go to the bank in Keokuk, identify himself and everything would be taken care of.

A few days later, another friend and patient made the same arrangement. As it happened, Dr. Coffin needed \$500 to pay a bill immediately. So he went to the bank in Keokuk and found his patients were as good as their word. "You just don't find that relationship in city doctoring," he says.

But Dr. Coffin concedes that city doctoring has become the trend in medicine. When he opened his practice in Farmington, four other doctors were already here. The other four have all since died—and no young doctors have arrived to replace them. "Today they all train for work in hospitals and

when there are no hospitals in a town they just turn thumbs down on it," he says. (Farmington has never had a hospital. The nearest such medical facility is a 23-bed hospital 18 miles away.)

Human nature stays pretty much the same, says Dr. Coffin, but medicine does not. The two most important advances in his time, he feels, are wonder drugs and transportation. "When I started a practice in Farmington, all five of us doctors together couldn't treat in a day the number of patients I handle alone now. We'd make one or two house calls a day and our whole day would be shot."

When he was born—on a farm 7 miles from Farmington on June 13, 1890—he weighed only 3 pounds. "His grandma put him in a shoe box on the open door of a warm oven to keep him alive," says a relative. When he was 5, the family moved to town and his father went to work as a clerk in a hardware store for \$10 a week. Sometime later, his mother went to work in the woolen mills. So did young Lonnie. "That was my first trade, operating a loom in the woolen mills," he says.

The family had one dream in common: to send Lonnie to medical school.

By the time he had graduated from high school, the family had saved \$2,000. "That's all it took—\$2,000 to get through medical school," he says. At the Drake University Medical School in Des Moines, long since discontinued, he attended lectures and labs from 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily and for 4 hours on Saturday. In his spare time he earned his meals by washing dishes in the YMCA.

He interned at the Iowa Methodist Hospital and there met a nurse, Gretta Harmon, whom he married. (He has two daughters. His wife died in 1957.) In 1914 he returned to Farmington to set up practice. He borrowed \$200 from the bank for an office and a second-hand Overland automobile. "I guess I've used up 15 or 20 cars since then," he says. "Those old high-wheeled model T's—they were the mud cars. Could go through anything. You'd upset 'em, then get out and set 'em back on their wheels and they were as good as ever." Today Dr. Coffin drives a red-and-white Ford.

Except for 2 years of service in the Army Medical Corps in World War I, Dr. Coffin has been in Farmington ever since 1914. There were good times and bad times.

"I delivered a lot of babies by coal-oil lamps and assisted at a lot of kitchen-table operations lit only by a lantern," he says. "I'd go to one house out in the country and all the folks out that way would come over to meet me there. That was the only way to get around to all of them."

Eight years ago, just after Dr. Coffin recovered from a heart attack, 26 local youngsters (including 3 of his 4 grandchildren) were stricken with polio. By that time he was the only working doctor in town. "That was a pretty strenuous time," he says. "In a polio epidemic, everybody is watching to get sick, and when they do they all think they're getting polio. So you've got to work harder than ever to take care of them."

As a general practitioner, Dr. Coffin can treat about 80 percent of all his patients without the help of a specialist. He deplores the rush toward specializing among doctors and among medical schools.

Nevertheless, medical education has greatly improved in Dr. Coffin's view. "I'll say this: The men who come out today are brilliant. But they're awfully dependent on a laboratory and a lot of equipment. I came out with my stethoscope and that was it."

Through the years, Dr. Coffin has developed some highly epigrammatic views on life, its pleasures and its temptations.

On liquor: "There are only two classes of people who should drink: Those who can control it and those who can afford it."

On hunting and fishing: "I used to like to hunt, but I can't walk so much in the cold

air since my coronary. So I like to go out on a lake and fish—I can do that sitting down. If you catch something, fine; if you don't, you can lie about it."

On smoking: "Oh, no doubt in my mind it's bad for you. I gave it up for a year after my coronary." He paused to light a cigar. "And I've given it up several times since then, too."

Dr. Coffin has lived a full, vigorous life in addition to one dedicated to taking care of the sick. He has been president of his county and State medical societies, and served 15 years on the Farmington School Board and 4 years in the town council. He has also known what it is to be one of the sick, himself; in addition to his heart attack in 1950, he suffered a cerebral hemorrhage in 1944, and he has been plagued by spinal arthritis for about 30 years.

"But you can't stop to think about how sick you are or when you're going to retire," he says. "All you can do is keep on going out to take care of the sick. That's what you're a doctor for."

The Businessman's Moral Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Dr. Louis Finkelstein which appeared in the September 1958 issue of *Fortune* magazine.

Dr. Finkelstein is chancellor and professor of theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York City. He is a student of the civil and ritual law of the Talmud and was the pastor of a congregation in the Bronx before taking up his assignment with the seminary. One of the seminary's interests is the Institute on Ethics, in which many Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders participate. These include F. Ernest Johnson, study consultant of the department of church and economic life of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; R. M. MacIver, Lieber professor emeritus of political philosophy and sociology, Columbia University; and George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College of the city of New York. The article reflects numerous conferences Dr. Finkelstein has had with these men, as well as with outstanding business leaders.

The article follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN'S MORAL FAILURE—A DISTINGUISHED RABBI ARGUES IT IS A FAILURE THAT MAY DESTROY OUR SOCIETY

(By Louis Finkelstein)

If American businessmen are right in the way most of them now live, then all the wise men of the ages, all the prophets and the saints were fools. If the saints were not fools, the businessmen must be.

Too many businessmen never stop to ponder what they are doing; they reject the need for self-discipline; they are satisfied to be clever, when they need to be wise. They worry about their place on the economic ladder, but are not concerned sufficiently with whether the civilization in which they work is likely to collapse. They can defeat a local

competitor, but may well be defeated by the competitor of us all, which is moral decay.

Now the American executive is very often a man of some vision, motivated by a spirit that generates great energy. Underlying the efficiency of our business community there is the principle of teamwork, cooperation, a reasonable degree of pleasure in the success of coworkers, a comparatively broad welcome to talent, and freedom in human relationships. Granted, these are virtues of no mean order. But the American businessman is losing his insight into the moral sources of American economic strength.

Our country could not have reached its present heights without the blessing of natural resources; but the United States would have failed at the outset without a philosophy developed by men more concerned with the betterment of the human spirit than the comforts of the body. These men were inspired by the writings of immortal philosophers and religious thinkers. The modern business leader is more often than not bewildered at the suggestion that the future of the Republic is in some way related to the ideals and ideas of John Locke, not to mention Spinoza, the medieval scholastics, the rabbinic sages, and the ancient Greek philosophers.

Ask the U.S. businessman why he is successful today, and he may explain to you the advantages of capitalism, the profit motive, and the American system. He may, with due modesty, point out the superiority of his own products and marketing. But he will largely ignore the philosophic foundations of the American system. He tends to ignore the great ethical laws as they apply immediately to his work. The truth is that he is preoccupied chiefly with gain, coasting on the spiritual momentum of the past, divorced from our sources of inspiration. He is the leading citizen of a largely hedonistic nation propelled by meaningless drives toward materialistic and frequently meaningless goals.

Clearly no institution will survive if it is dedicated only to self-preservation. A business has a goal beyond simple success. It is not a biological organism whose survival is a virtue in itself. Rather, it is a man-created institution, an integral part of our culture, and as such must make a contribution of service to society (as well as a profit for itself) if it hopes to survive. It cannot do this out of a focus on self gain or pride.

Why do I single out the American businessman for indictment, when he is probably no more materialistic than any of the rest of us? I do so because of the responsibility he bears, because his role in American society is so great. Ours is an industrial society, and the customs and morals and attitudes of businessmen pervade our whole life. Virtually all of us in America have adopted in some degree the pragmatic ethical standards of our business society; and to that degree we have abandoned our ethical and religious traditions.

THE AMERICAN TRAGEDY

Our American tragedy is that we fail to see the signs of our decay. But the signs are apparent in the vulgar ostentation all around us, in the sexual laxity revealed by the Kinsey studies, in the demoralization of American captives in the Korean war, in the widespread defiance of law. The signs are apparent in our general toleration of wrongdoing, which is itself an evil and corrupting force.

Curiously, this breakdown of moral discipline has occurred when institutionalized religion is flourishing as never before. But even religion in America now tends to be superficial. For many laymen it consists of writing an occasional check and sporadic attendance at church or synagogue, rather than in personal commitment. There is a dearth of saints, and many ministers themselves are

unduly concerned with security in this world. While the percentage of truly dedicated pastors may be no smaller than in previous generations, today they suffer a special disability—a failure to communicate with the members of their flocks.

Human history is studded with the ruins of empires that came to a similar pass. Nations have been wrecked because they lacked an overriding moral goal to which individuals could commit themselves. History shows us that when we become success-dominated, we lose sight of our real reasons for living.

In its youth, America was ideal dominated. Both individual citizens and the country as a whole had an impelling motive in life that was not limited to industrial, political, or economic growth. The men who gathered in 1787 could muster all their intellectual energies to formulate the national charter, overcome differences of background and interest—all because these men were laboring for a larger goal.

An equally vital role awaiting the American businessman today will be suggested at the end of this article. Time and again in American history the businessman has transcended his industrial role and become the buttress not only of Government but of the public welfare. Today's crisis demands of him leadership in still another dimension—one where he has thus far conspicuously failed.

THE BOY IN THE DITCH

A young executive rapidly moving up the financial ladder unequivocally stated in private conversation with me: "It is impossible to conduct business in the United States today without breaking the law."

If the statement is exaggerated, it nevertheless retains distressing validity for one like myself who was educated in New York City and has resided there over half a century. A considerable portion of my time has been spent with men engaged in a great variety of businesses, who keep an equal variety of balance sheets.

The most casual observer is aware of the transgressions that go on daily in the American business community. He hears of tax returns that are outright perjury; he hears of purchasing agents who are taking bribes from suppliers, of businessmen offering bribes for false testimony or for police protection of some dubious enterprise. He reads of industries attempting to suborn State legislators for favorable legislation. He reads of businessmen bestowing favors on government officials to win special privileges. Even in my ivory tower on Morningside Heights, I have been urged by businessmen to accept a gift for the theological seminary in return for admitting a student—and have been threatened with withdrawal of contributions to the school if I failed to do so.

We hear of businessmen using wiretaps to obtain information about their competitors, of management acting in collusion with racketeers, of men using prostitution to promote the sale of their goods. We hear of businessmen violating the most elementary requirements of city building codes and profiting from rat-infested tenements. We hear of financiers deliberately lying about their operations and the financial condition of their companies to mislead investors so that insiders can make killings in stock.

There are less overt practices in the business community that may appear to be only on the borderline of unethical behavior: for example, concealing the true price of goods behind time-payment schemes that are actually usurious; employing advertising that is actually a flagrant misrepresentation of a product's worth. These and other clever dodges are accepted by many as normal phases of competition.

I would not deny that competition is the basis of our free enterprise and of our in-

dustrial success. Competition surely induces better efforts and greater production. But to compete in ways that are designed to destroy someone else is very different from competing in terms of doing better than your rival. Years ago in Lithuania, Rabbi Israel Salanter found two boys quarrelling over which was the taller. One forced the other to stand in a ditch to settle the argument. Seeing this, Rabbi Israel sadly commented, "Isn't this characteristic of the world where to prove his superiority man must prove others inferior? After all, the same purpose could have been achieved by standing on a chair."

When two companies are each trying to produce superior values, one may well be more successful than the other, and deservedly earn greater profits. But to seek a crippling advantage over another company is hardly fair competition and is certainly miserable ethics.

It seems to me that a management which is worthy of success is very different from a management which just wants success. One management conducts its affairs in the spirit of contribution, the other in the spirit of selfishness. Contributions to the general good have of course been made by men seeking only their own advantage, but selfishness cannot be made a principle of life and in our time might easily be fatal. Management worthy of success remembers that the true justification for profit is an incentive to serve the community. Success is paid to business by the community for the services it renders. In this sense, profits must clearly be an earned increment.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF ETHICS

This reasoning can certainly be understood if stated in terms of the individual. We understand the meaning and value to the individual of a good reputation. Every businessman knows that his reputation for integrity is one of his major assets. Certainly, a man's progress in a corporation depends in large measure on the reputation he earns through his daily behavior. It is immensely difficult to falsify such a reputation over any extended period of time. We are soon known by those around us for who we are rather than what we would like others to think about us. This is a man's character in the profoundest sense of the word.

I was interested to hear a major executive point out that the criteria he uses for selecting employees run in this order: character, intelligence, experience. "A really bright executive picks up experience very quickly," he told me. "But the man we need and want most, in important places, is a man with character sufficient to resist many kinds of pressures when the going gets rough. We find, then, that character is the most important ingredient of all, particularly if the man is to be responsible for policymaking. An executive can buy brains and can buy experience, but character is something he must supply himself."

And what is a man's character but his personal moral dimension, the goals he sets for himself, his sense of honesty and of responsibility, his relations with others? This does not mean, however, that the value of character derives from its contribution to success.

Unquestionably, ethics have a practical value, inseparable from their ultimate one: the creation of better men and women. Rivalry for goodness should, in the long run, make for pragmatic gain. But it is not enough for the individual or the corporation merely to mean well. Men as individuals and as corporations must make an effort to understand what they are doing, and why they are doing it.

The first step in the ethical life is self-criticism. As the Talmud puts it, "Cleanse yourselves, and then cleanse others." Ethics is a branch of thought starting with self-

discipline. Discipline, whether among children or adults, whether self-imposed or external, is not popular in America today. And a welter of codes—in companies, in industries, in combines of industries, in labor—do not meet the situation.

Before anyone can think creatively about the moral life, he must feel in his bones a few principles that are part of any civilized ethic, without which civilization would be meaningless. I wish I could say with hope of being understood that of these the most important is awareness of God and love for Him. But as those words tend to become clichés, I say instead that we have to feel the wonder and significance of life and its unique opportunity for achievement. Each of us has only one life on earth. When that life is used unwisely, the loss is irreparable for oneself and for one's fellows.

A businessman who understands these truths will develop an almost automatic pattern of behavior. Certain ancient rules apply with equal force to Jew and Christian, atheist and agnostic, to all men in all situations. These immutable laws are expressed in various ways. The Pentateuch reveals the Decalog and the Golden Rule of Leviticus 19: 18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which the Gospels restate in Matthew 7: 12: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Similar commandments are promulgated in the literature of the other great traditions of East and West.

Yet these and other binding commandments are often violated in the American business community. A man fears he may be risking his business if he obeys them, forgetting, however, that if he violates them he risks the world.

Business leaders who generously advised me in the preparation of this article said, "The majority of the American business community are not evil men, and want to do right. Let us say we admit the indictment and accept our responsibility—what can we do?"

To begin with, a businessman can develop an awareness that every decision of his life involves moral considerations. He can help develop this sensitivity in employees and associates, through example, through discussing with them the moral implications of company actions, through constant reminders that he has values in life above profit or economic security.

There are some corporations which insist that their executives assume responsibility for civic and community improvement. But the businessman can go further. In his training school for management he can introduce students of ethics, as well as management experts and psychologists, to consider the responsibilities of the business executive. He can overcome his anti-intellectualism. He can try to gain knowledge that will clarify the problems of wise decisionmaking.

WITHOUT MORALIZING

The businessman must realize that the inculcation of moral sensitivity starts in early childhood and continues throughout life. American society has achieved this kind of indoctrination in other fields. To take two familiar examples: virtually every American child is brought up with a concern for personal hygiene; virtually every female child is indoctrinated with the need to be as physically attractive as possible. Our culture is probably unique in the emphasis it places on these two patterns of education.

The businessman can, without moralizing (which would be deadening and self-defeating), transform his home into a school for moral responsibility. Avoiding precept, the businessman can make even his conversation at table serve the vital end of character education for himself, his wife, his children, and his guests. The stories he tells, the gestures he makes, the conversation he

chooses and avoids, can all show that he has at least some notion of what life, America, and freedom are about. Without being in the slightest degree priggish, and eventually without self-consciousness, he may help his family and friends obtain insight into the ethical life.

The American businessman, then, should literally place ethics on the agenda—for himself at home and in the office, for his company and trade association:

His calendar should include regular meetings of management to discuss the moral dimensions in his specific business. One firm that instituted such meetings finds it continually gains valuable insights into new relationships with the many other organizations with which it does business.

He should seek expert advice on ethics. Existing resources in the field will gladly be made available to him.

He should put moral health on the same level as mental and physical health, indeed above them. This means he should read literature dealing with ethics; devote time to the study of ethics, alone and with colleagues and scholars; work for the establishment of research in ethics, as he has worked magnificently for the development of research in science and technology.

THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM

Whatever else may or may not be involved in the application of such principles, it will demand direction of effort—not merely doing what one happens to like at a given moment and following the easy path of self-indulgence. Wisdom begins with sacrifice of immediate pleasures for long-range purposes. There is a widespread view that belief in God and personal immortality leads to this discipline. The fact, however, is that the discipline itself is also indispensable to real belief in God and human immortality. That is why the role of the businessman in American ethics is no less crucial than that of the religious leader or scholar.

Today's crisis demands the businessman's leadership in the area of human behavior. The kind of criticism with which enlightened businessmen could confront philosophers and theologians could be a challenge. Then superficiality in religion would cease to be fashionable, and laymen would soon detect its shallowness. Morally sensitive and informed businessmen can compel American philosophy and religion to focus on the basic problems troubling mankind.

We Americans will then no longer warrant William James' description of us as worshippers of "the bitch goddess, Success." Our best young minds would strive for genuine, rather than apparent, achievement. If we can overcome the tendency to measure intellectual productivity by quantity rather than quality, America might produce works and insights into the ethical realm comparable to the eternal creations that have emerged from other civilizations. Without such creations, rallying the spiritual energies of all men, America and the free world will not endure.

ONE MODEST STEP

Civilization needs men and women whose every act and decision will bear the stamp of responsibility. The world cannot long survive, at least in freedom, if decisions are made irresponsibly—that is, without disciplined consideration of individual and general consequences. At the present moment, this may seem almost impossible to achieve. Yet without many dedicated men and women exercising disciplined consideration of each of their actions, none of the great philosophic or religious traditions could have survived.

Modest steps to focus different types of experience on the complex issues of our day have been taken in various ways, one of which is the work of a group of scholars who drew together in 1939 in New York. The

group includes physical scientists, social scientists, philosophers, and theologians of different faiths, who were stirred by the apparition of nazism but recognized it as a symptom of a chronic disease of our time rather than the disease itself. They hoped they could clarify today's moral problems. Once a year, sometimes once in 2 years, these scholars have met. Some participants are frankly agnostic, some atheistic, others devout. For a long time their discussions were at cross-purposes. There were frequent outbursts when varied types of mind and experience confronted one another. Gradually, they arrived at an astoundingly simple conclusion: the problem of their concern may be summed up in a single word—"responsibility."

This conference of scholars is hopeful of establishing nothing less than a World Academy of Ethics and an Institute for Practical Ethics for Everyday Living, drawing on the wisdom not only of Christianity and Judaism but of Islam, Buddhism, Confucianism, and other traditions. The scholars need the help and participation of businessmen.

Does all of this sound as though the American businessman had to take on new burdens, and rush even more prematurely to his grave? On the contrary, one of man's primary duties to himself, his family, the community, and to God is preservation of his life on earth, so that he can realize his potentialities for good. The businessman who will take time to contemplate and to ponder the ethical dimension of life will discover new realms in which he can develop his talents, freeing himself from the bondage to private gain that menaces the maturing business executive. Clearly understanding the principles of a meaningful life, he will share them with his family, especially with his wife. He will accept philosophically the occasional defeats and frustrations of his business career. He will carry his burdens serenely and thus preserve his own life, as well as that of the community.

A POTENTIAL MOSES?

Before he decides that the moral discipline required to build a better society is too arduous for him and that he is too busy to master a new dialect of thought, before he flees his responsibility, he might do well to ponder the story of Moses in the third chapter of Exodus.

The father of prophecy was heavy of tongue. He, too, preferred the ease of Midian and the pleasures of shepherd life to the burdens imposed by the leadership of men. He could not believe that the task presented to him could not be done by another. For a moment he doubted that it could ever be accomplished. But sometimes, because of unique combinations of circumstances surrounding him, an individual is indispensable for a specific role in history. Whether or not he wished it, Moses was one of the great spiritual leaders of mankind. He could neglect his duty, but he could not assign it to anyone else.

To rise to his full stature, the American businessman—who at his best embodies many of the prophetic virtues—must also shoulder a unique burden of responsibility. The fate of the world hangs on his decisions, for above all the world needs ethical leadership from those it respects as supremely practical.

The words spoken by Moses to his contemporaries more than 3,000 years ago apply literally to us in this latter day: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." If the American businessman can bring himself to choose life and good, he can save not only our own but future generations. Surely he will heed the ancient Prophet's plea. "Therefore, choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and they seed."

Hail Columbian Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 21, 1958, was a historic day in the annals of the legal profession of New York. Fifty-three members of the Columbian Lawyers Association were admitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. Two of them were women.

The Columbian Lawyers Association is a young bar association operating in the first judicial department of the State of New York. Its membership consists of more than 500 lawyers and is composed of lawyers of Italian origin who practice principally in the city of New York. Many of them are leaders in their respective communities. They are guardians of our traditions and the architects of our future.

This organization has among its aims the maintenance of a high standard of conduct for the legal profession and the selection of capable and learned judges to serve in our courts. They believe that in order to realize the American goal of equal justice before the law, lawyers must be skilled advocates with high standards of conduct and justices of courts must be learned and experienced.

I had the high honor and privilege of sponsoring 28 of these members for admission to the U.S. Supreme Court. My former associate in the New York County district attorney's office, now a justice of the domestic relations court, Louis A. Pagnucco, sponsored the admission of the other 25 Columbian members.

I was not surprised to note that Judge Louis Pagnucco, who guided and coached me when I was a fledgling assistant district attorney in the office of Frank Hogan, still befriends and guides other attorneys in their aspirations and endeavors. It was a pleasure for me once again to be with my dear friend, Judge Pagnucco, who was one of the greatest assistant district attorneys in the homicide bureau during the administration of District Attorneys Thomas E. Dewey and Frank S. Hogan. Judge Pagnucco, who possesses a doctorate of laws, is not only a brilliant lawyer and judge but also has the unusual talent of speaking seven languages fluently.

This journey to Washington was the realization of a dream of Thomas Cartelli, the first president of the Columbian Lawyers Association. Much planning and work was done to transport 53 active lawyers to Washington from the city of New York to house them and to prepare a program. Great credit goes to Mr. Cartelli and Sylvester Cosentino, the second president of this vigorous bar association.

Prior to being sworn in by Chief Justice Earl Warren, this bar group had the distinct privilege of meeting with As-

sociate Justice Tom C. Clark at a private hearing. Justice Clark renewed old acquaintances with some of the candidates. One of them, Arthur R. Martocchia, served as a U.S. assistant when Justice Clark was U.S. attorney.

Justice Clark addressed the candidates and enlightened them as to the workings and practices of the members of the court in arriving at a determination of an appeal before the highest court. As a consequence, the Columbian group can understand events which would otherwise have been mysteries.

One newly admitted member of the group was August Massa, who despite his complete blindness, is an active and successful barrister. Mr. Massa was a classmate of Justice William Douglas at Columbia Law School in the early twenties. It was a thrill to see Justice Douglas greet his blind classmate. They had not met each other in over 30 years.

My colleagues, JOHN J. ROONEY, Democratic Representative, of New York, and ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Democrat, of South Carolina, were present at the Supreme Court to witness this historic occasion and to lend their moral support.

After the admission to the Supreme Court, the Columbian lawyers had luncheon at the Congressional Hotel. Several Members of Congress attended the luncheon. Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of Brooklyn; PAUL A. FINO, of the Bronx; JOHN J. ROONEY, of Brooklyn; JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; ROLAND LIBONATI, of Chicago; ROBERT CHAIMO, of Connecticut; and I, ALFRED SANTANGELO, addressed the group pointing out the significance of their membership in the U.S. Supreme Court and the pride that we felt in this legal demonstration. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, sent greetings.

On the evening prior to their swearing in, Mr. Gaspar Morell, a successful Washington builder, formerly of New York, held a reception for the Columbian lawyers at his beautiful home on Kalorama Road on Embassy Row. His Excellency, Manlio Brosio, the Italian Ambassador, was an honored guest. He was accompanied by Dr. Paolo Savina, labor counselor of the Italian Embassy. Also greeting the lawyers was Commissioner Joseph Minetti. I cannot express fully the appreciation I and the Columbian lawyers feel for the hospitality of Mr. Gaspar Morell and his lovely wife, Anita Morell.

The roll of the newly admitted members to the Supreme Court is as follows: Andrew A. Adinolfi, Italo Henry Ablondi, Pasquale J. Amico, Anthony J. Cannistraci, Joseph Captain, Vito A. Cardo, Thomas Cartelli, Vincent S. Conti, John Copertino, Sylvester Cosentino, Genaro L. Crispino, Joseph F. Cuccia, Mario J. Cusati, Alexander A. Delle Cese, Leonard P. DeNatale, Joseph F. Periconi, Vincent John deRosa, Vincent J. DiStefano, Anthony J. Edwards, Angelo C. Ninivaggio, Adolph C. Orlando, Edward Papantonio, Christopher L. Ribaudo, Henry D. Sforza, Frank C. Termini, Joseph J. Verdicchio, Miss Theresa E. DiCrocco, Lawrence N. Fariello, Miss

Josephine Ferro, Joseph F. Fichera, Joseph W. Genzardi, Joseph N. Giambol, Vincent A. Giaquinto, Michael A. Greco, Philip A. Greco, Nicholas P. Iannuzzi, Michael W. LaPenna, Salvatore A. Locurto, Richard D. Magro, Arthur R. Martocchia, Augustine F. Massa, Michael F. Mazzola, Anthony J. Mercorella, Mario Merola, Alexander Minella, Ferdinand J. Mondello, Richard J. Nardi, Louis C. Palella, Lino J. Pietrantonio, Joseph A. Robustelli, Thomas A. Signorelli, Vincent J. Vellella, Frank J. Zeccola, and Ray V. Manfredi.

The president of the organization is Ferdinand J. Mondello.

Now that these lawyers have returned home to New York, leaving Washington richer because of their visit, I say to them, "Congratulations and Hail Columbia."

The Bipartisan Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a new institution began this year on Capitol Hill and I, for one, hope that it will grow and become a part of the permanent orientation process for new Congressmen. The purpose of this institution, which is called the Bipartisan Seminar, is to encourage the confidence of new Members by broadening their understanding of the legislative process. The meetings, held at the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, were exciting and informative. Answers were given to perplexing problems which many times vex, annoy, and frustrate the freshman Congressman. Insight was given to us from our senior colleagues on the workings and the meanings of the rules by our beloved parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler; the problems of committee work for junior Congressmen by worthy and distinguished alumni of this body, Senator Engle, of California, and Senator Keating, of New York; the House as a changing institution was brilliantly analyzed and discussed by Senator McCarthy, of Minnesota, Senator Scott, of Pennsylvania, and George Galloway, of the Library of Congress. Particularly informative was the discussion by Congressman Baldwin, of California, Congressman Coffin, of Maine, Congressman Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, and Congressman Udall, of Arizona. Participating in the opening session was the chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, James Reston.

From this list of impressive and brilliant people one is quickly able to ascertain the importance of these meetings. I commend these gentlemen and I thank the bipartisan sponsoring committee: JOHN F. BALDWIN, Republican, of California; FRANK M. COFFIN, Democrat, of Maine; CARL ELLIOTT, Democrat, of Alabama; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Republican,

of Michigan; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey; JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; and STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona.

I also thank the distinguished foreign policy expert, Dr. Jay Cerf, of the Foreign Policy Clearing House; the distinguished political scientist William Gibbons, formerly associate director of the American Political Science Association and now director of the Foreign Policy Index; and Dr. Paul David, of the Brookings Institution. Mr. Speaker, I thank these men and the organizations they represent for helping to make this seminar a success.

Simple Justice—House Joint Resolution 20, by Representative Philbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House an editorial appearing on the front page of today's issue of the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, renowned weekly newspaper devoted to the interest of veterans of all wars, which endorses legislation being sponsored by our valued colleague and my good friend, the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

This measure is House Joint Resolution 20, which designates and defines veterans pensions as partial repayment of a debt owed by a grateful nation to its fighting men. The National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, which has raised its voice so effectively time and time again in the veteran's cause down through the years, signals the need for spelling out into law that our veterans are entitled to pensions, not simply as gratuities but as a matter of right.

Congressman PHILBIN has gained an enviable reputation as the devoted friend of the veteran. In this bill, once again he has shown his warm and humane, and ever active, interest in the needs and problems of the veteran and his dependents.

I am happy to join the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes in its endorsement of House Joint Resolution 20 and ask that the text of today's editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

PENSIONS ARE A RIGHT

In reading through the bills introduced in the early days of the 86th Congress relating to veterans and their dependents we ran across one particular bill with which the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes is in complete agreement. The proposed measure is a short one but its language is clear as crystal.

It was introduced by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, and is known as House Joint Resolution 20 and the text of the resolution follows:

"That all monetary benefits awarded veterans of the wars of the United States,

and/or their dependents, by the Congress of the United States, on account of physical or mental disabilities incurred by said veterans in defense of their country, are hereby declared to be, both in law and in fact, a partial repayment of a debt owed by the Nation to such veterans and/or dependents.

"That the common-law doctrine holding such awards to be, as a matter of law, a gratuity, is hereby abrogated and annulled."

The bill in question speaks of physical or mental disabilities incurred by veterans in defense of their country. Even the most biased antiveteran group will agree with this.

But we would go a step farther and include the payment of pensions to aged and physically disabled veterans as a right earned honorably by reason of their service in time of war.

In the past we have traced the history of pension payments to war veterans from the time of Solon to the present day, and we have always found that a grateful country was quite willing to care for its old war veterans as a recompense for their service when their country needed them.

We say this down to the present day, but this is not correct for the past 20 years there has been raised a great outburst at the possible costs of pensions to needy war veterans. The opponents of pensions have cited astronomical figures as to this cost but when these figures are analyzed it will be found that they have little or no foundation of fact.

With our curious mind we looked up the definition of pensions in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and find the following:

Pension: A stated allowance or stipend made in consideration of past services, especially a regular stipend paid by Government to retired public officers, disabled soldiers, the families of soldiers killed in service, etc.

Another definition of the word pension is something paid to one by way of subsidy or allowance whether as a means of securing goodwill, cooperation, or the like, or as a gratuity at to royal favorites or to men of eminence in art, literature, or science.

The definition as furnished by our authority is quite interesting. It speaks of a pension as something paid . . . to disabled soldiers, the families of soldiers killed in battle, etc.

It then goes on to speak of another type of pension which it calls "something paid to one by way of subsidy or allowance whether as a means of securing goodwill, cooperation, or the like, or as a gratuity, as to royal favorites or to men of eminence in art, literature, or science."

Now this second definition speaks of payment as some sort of gratuity, quite distinguished from the first definition.

Surely it cannot be said that the payment of a just pension to aged and disabled war veterans is a means of securing good will, cooperation or the like or as a gratuity to royal favorites. As a matter of fact, a check of the situation would indicate that if there exists such a thing as royal favorites in the United States of America, they cannot be counted in the ranks of the aged and needy veterans. The truth is that the very highest authorities in the land are opposed to granting pensions to such veterans.

This brings us down to January 14 when we were privileged to attend a dinner tendered by the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion to Members of Congress. Only one speech was made after the introduction of distinguished guests and that was made by Preston J. Moore, national commander of the Legion. We can truthfully say that our heart was warmed by his expressions on the policy of the Legion as it relates to war veterans.

After welcoming the distinguished visitors National Commander Moore gave the Legion's stand on national defense. Commander Moore went on to say:

"Building America's military, economic and moral strength for peace is our first obligation. To recognize this is not to deny the American Legion's historic and continuing responsibility to disabled veterans, their dependents and survivors.

"Nowhere are the needs of these Americans more completely understood than in the Congress of the United States. Nowhere is their entitlement to essential help more readily appreciated than in the Congress,

"You have built a sound structure of veteran benefits in response to the expressed will of a grateful people. In the veteran's hour of need you have extended America's heart and hand to him who served our Nation in its greatest hour of need. You have accomplished these things while advancing the best interests of our country.

"This service to America and its veterans requires and reflects a kind of statesmanship that merits the applause and appreciation of every citizen. We in the American Legion are especially grateful that you have given to our Nation's veterans and their loved ones your greatest understanding, wisdom, and leadership. As long as they are the beneficiaries of such responsible representation in the Congress we never need to fear for their future.

"America's future as a land of freedom and opportunity can be secured if we rely upon guided principles instead of guided missiles. We can safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy if we have faith in God, in ourselves, and in you who lead us."

As we have said, it was heartwarming to hear the leader of such a powerful veteran organization as the American Legion state in clear language the knowledge and understanding of the needs of our veterans and that his organization would not stand idly by if the veterans' cause was threatened from any source.

We are quite sure that all right-thinking men will agree that the veteran in need, who served his country in time of war, sometimes against his own desires but always with honor, is deserving of the Nation's gratitude when the time comes that he is no longer able to care for himself. If Webster's definition of pensions can be accepted then pensions become a right and not a gratuity as some sophists would have us believe.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of Nebraska has recently adopted unanimously a resolution memorializing Congress to enact a statehood for Hawaii bill. For the information of my colleagues, I wish to enclose that resolution, which follows:

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is vital to the defense of the United States; and

Whereas said Territory has greatly contributed to the economic and cultural life of the United States; and

Whereas the people of said Territory have demonstrated their maturity, responsibility, and willingness to accept in full, and ability to discharge, the responsibilities that accompany citizenship in one of the States of the United States; and

Whereas not only principles of fairness, but also considerations of mutual benefit to

said Territory and the States of the United States demand that said Territory be granted immediate statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled—1. That the Members of Congress are hereby memorialized to grant immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

DWIGHT W. BURNLEY,
President of the Legislature.

Stop the Use of U.S. Mail To Spread Hatred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the opening day of the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the most severe penalties for anyone bombing or attempting to bomb a house of worship, a school, or other public building. Closely associated with the recent wave of bomb terrorism is the dissemination of hate material through the U.S. mails which is a major factor in stirring up race hatred and inciting acts of lawlessness.

I am, therefore, now introducing two more bills which are intended as companion measures to my earlier bill to outlaw bombings. One of these measures seeks to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transmission through the mails of communications which are intended to incite hatred on account of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin. A fine of \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, is prescribed in this bill for anyone who knowingly uses the U.S. mails for delivery of cards, pamphlets, circulars, books, or other matter which is regarded as nonmailable under this act.

The other bill is very similar in language, except that it prescribes that material which is intended to incite racial or religious hostility shall not be conveyed in the mails, and shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe. In other words, this bill is intended to give the Postmaster General the authority to withdraw such matter from the mails or refuse to convey it, while the first bill makes it unlawful to mail such matter and prescribes a fine.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that my bills are not intended to hurt basic American freedoms, especially freedom of the press and freedom of expression. They are intended primarily and solely to strike against the peddlers of racial and religious hatred, the crackpots and the lunatic fringe who are

spreading poison against various segments of our people, without realizing how they themselves by their own vicious tactics are undermining American democracy, our way of life, our free institutions, and our religious faiths which are the strongest bulwarks and the most powerful influence in the struggle against communism.

The purpose of these hate sheets which are flooding the country is only to foment trouble and to arouse hatred of Negroes, Jews, Catholics, foreigners, and others. We live in a crucial era when unity of the American people is the crying need of the hour in order to be able to cope with a godless enemy who seeks to destroy us. At such a tragic period in human history, these irresponsible rabble rousers are playing right into the hands of the Communists by spreading dissension, mistrust, and hatred in our own ranks.

Our laws forbid the distribution of seditious literature through the mails because it is treasonous. They forbid the dissemination of pornographic literature because it corrupts our youth and incites them to criminal acts. What can be more treasonous or criminal than this hate material which is equally destructive of everything that America stands for? Pitting race against race, inciting one segment of our people against another, is no less seditious because it serves only the interests of America's enemies.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to put a stop to the deliberate use of the U.S. mails for spreading race hatred and to use it as a medium for hate propaganda. This is not what the mails are intended for. The demagogues and hatemongers are exploiting a major medium of communication to serve their own sinister purposes. Postal authorities report that in recent years the volume of hate material going through the mails has increased substantially, but under existing laws they are powerless to prevent the distribution of this material through the mails.

It is for this reason that I am introducing my bills. I believe that this problem can and should be dealt with through legislation. I urge the Congress to give these measures early consideration.

Protest on Federal Tax on Motor Fuels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication I received from representatives of member organizations of the Connecticut Highway Conference:

Representatives of member organizations of the Connecticut Highway Users Conference, present and voting at meeting today in Hartford, went on record unanimously as strongly protesting President's proposal for further increase of 1½ cents per gallon in

Federal tax on motor fuels and/or any increase in any of the Federal automotive excise taxes.

They adopted a resolution stating "The highway user is already carrying an excessive burden on taxation, at both Federal and State levels, and has borne the entire cost of the Federal trust fund since it was established in 1956."

Connecticut motor vehicle owners now paying grand total of \$51.8 million a year in special Federal taxes levied upon them, including \$23 million in present Federal tax on motor fuels alone. This in addition to State gasoline taxes and licensing fees and all the general taxes, Federal and State, that everyone pays.

Proposed increase in Federal gasoline tax would add more than \$11 million annually to Connecticut motor vehicle owners' taxes.

The Neglected Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows is, I think, pertinent to our situation in West Virginia, as it relates to the depressed condition of our coal industry.

I submit this in the hope that it will continue to call attention to a situation which has thoughtful residents of our State involved in consideration of the basic problem of how to survive in an economy based largely on the coal industry.

The article I submit is from the Charleston Daily Mail of January 19. It was written by Mr. John D. Maurice, the able editor of the newspaper, and whose views command wide respect in my State.

FOR SAGGING PEANUTS SOME PROMPT RELIEF—
FOR AILING COAL THE BACK OF THE HAND

When the price of peanuts begins to sag, something happens in Washington. The farm bloc goes into action, and something is done to spare the peanut farmer the severest consequences of overproduction in peanuts. Much the same is true of wheat, cotton, and corn.

If Wisconsin's dairy farmers can't sell all the cheese they can make—and they make plenty—the Government takes action. It doesn't necessarily make good sense, but the Wisconsin dairy farmer is not left alone to subsist on his miscalculations.

When the Bolivian economy begins to fall apart, thanks to expropriation of the tin mines, Washington takes notice. In the interests of solidarity and to shore up the Bolivian economy, the Federal Government is spending millions of dollars on and in Bolivia.

In all the free world, in fact, it would be hard to find a place where the American Government is not dedicated, for one reason or another, to relieving or countering the normal and often harsh application of strict economic law. Among the world's underprivileged nations, there is scarcely a one which has not appealed to Washington and received there some ointment for its economic bruises.

Indeed, it is now economic doctrine in the Nation's foreign policy, supported by both parties, that it is the inescapable mission of the United States to assist to the

limit of its abilities in raising the living standards of the whole world. The only remaining question is not whether or no, but how much.

Let the coal business hit the skids, however, let the coal miner go on relief, and what happens? The answer is very nearly nothing.

Washington sends polite word that what West Virginia needs is new industry and ought to set about getting some. As advice this is excellent. But it does not go unnoticed that only a short time ago Secretary Dulles offered to build the Aswan Dam for the Egyptians and would have done it, too, if Nasser had not overplayed his hand.

It leads to a question which may be stated something like this:

Why is it that Washington will consider almost any answer, including some palpably foolish and even ruinous ones, as an answer to the farm problem, and fairly dismiss the coal problem as something of no concern?

Or, why is it that Washington will program almost any form of technical assistance and outright subsidy, so long as it is headed overseas, and wash its hands of the depressed coal miner?

What is the difference?

The answer, we suggest, lies almost wholly in the kind of voice and appearance West Virginia makes in the Nation's Capital. For reasons which lie deep in the State's political history what happens to West Virginia counts considerably less in the determination of national economic policy than what happens in Wisconsin or Bolivia.

When the farm economy sags, the farm bloc goes into action. Something must be done to see that the farmer receives for what he has to sell a price commensurate with the price of what he has to buy.

When the Bolivian economy goes into a tailspin, the State Department takes notice. If at all possible, Bolivia must be propped up.

But when the coal business goes into a prolonged decline, throwing thousands of families on permanent relief, West Virginia cannot even get the audience normally extended as a matter of diplomatic courtesy to the bandit chieftain of some hostile tribe.

Address by Stanislaw R. J. Suchecki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address delivered in the Lowell Auditorium, Lowell, Mass., by Stanislaw R. J. Suchecki, national director, Polish American Congress, and president of the eastern Massachusetts division, at the ceremonies commemorating the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Polish settlers in Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608. These ceremonies were held on October 19, 1958. The address follows:

The Polish nation from its earliest beginnings, about 965, has been linked very closely with the Western World and its culture and civilization. By the earliest part of the 16th century, Polish culture was representative of the best of the European renaissance. This was the heritage which gave the world

such notable figures as General Kosciuszko, Count Pulaski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, Chopin, Paderewski, and Madame Maria Sklodowska Curie.

Recently when restrictions were eased in Poland, the people again turned to the West to renew their old bonds of friendship. For centuries, the West, and particularly the United States of America, have been a symbol of the freedom the Poles cherish so deeply. In fact, fully 12 years before the Mayflower came to Plymouth, the first Poles, attracted by these same ideals, landed on American soil in Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608.

The Poles are credited by historians with:

1. Helping save the first English settlement in America from total failure.

2. Building the first industry in the New World.

3. Saving the life of the colony's first president, Capt. John Smith.

4. Calling the first strike in America. This they won. But it should be noted that the strike was called to gain their right to vote in the new settlement along with the Englishmen, and not for economic gain. The first strike in America—not for higher wages but for civil liberties.

5. Manufacturing of the first export goods in America. Within 2 months of the arrival of the Poles in Jamestown, an English ship returned to England carrying the first export of manufactured goods, soap ashes, tar, pitch, green glass bottles, and vases.

All this and far more about the contributions of Polish craftsmen and workers are to be found in the dusty annals of American history, hidden far too long.

In reviewing the glorious history of the Americans of Polish descent in our Nation, let us not forget Poland today. If Kosciuszko and Pulaski were alive today, they would say: "Fight for the freedom of Poland. Do everything in your power to bring justice to Poland, because Poland is now the test case of freedom, as was your nation in 1776." Let us all repeat in our hearts the opening words of the Polish national anthem, "Poland is not lost, ere we live." "Jeszcze Polska nie zginela, poki my zyjemy."

Let us forever cling to our great traditions of freedom and never cease to fight for the freedom of Poland.

Today, when totalitarian tyranny from the East has again overwhelmed Poland and threatens the peace and security of the entire world, this spirit, the unconquerable spirit of men like Count Pulaski, whose anniversary we celebrated only last week, not only inspires the resistance movement of his fellow countrymen, but serves as a reminder to all mankind that there can be no compromise with evil.

If freedom fails in Poland, it will fail in all of Europe. Let us remember the great heritage of those who went before us so that it may guide us in our determination to defend the dignity of man everywhere as a creature of God.

Hon. George H. Christopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Holden, Mo.,

containing an editorial from the Pleasant Hill Times, Pleasant Hill, Mo., relating to Congressman CHRISTOPHER:

HOME SWEET HOME

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Miss Martha F. Redford recently wrote "Holden, 1858-1958, Town of the Prairie." It is a very fine book, but only those who have lived in the community will appreciate it completely. If anything, the community has become sweeter with the passing of the years. Many of the residents have followed the "Discipleship Pledge":

"I will live my life under God for others rather than for myself; for the advancement of the kingdom of God rather than for my personal success.

"I will do my utmost by prayer, investigation, meditation, and service to avoid drifting in my work in life, and to seek out the place and form of work where I can become of the largest use to the kingdom of God.

"As I find my place of largest usefulness, I will prepare for it and follow it, under the leadership of Christ, wheresoever it takes me, cost what it may."

My mother, Mrs. G. S. Reuter, and I enjoyed the celebration very much, but we liked the pageant the best. "The First Hundred Years" was directed by Mrs. E. Ben Cast. It was divided into the following scenes:

1. "New Frontier."
2. "A Town Is Born."
3. "Singing Rails."
4. "Strutting Our Stuff."
5. "Nineties So Gay."
6. "Turn of the Century."
7. "From Holden to Tipperary."
8. "Roaring Twenties."
9. "Turbulent Times."
10. "Vision of the Future."
11. "Happy Birthday."

Holden has always appreciated greatness and is quick to note it. One such example is cited from the Holden Progress of Thursday, October 16, 1958, page 2. This editorial was quoted from the Pleasant Hill Times, and it was very fitting. The editorial read:

"OUR EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESSMAN"

"GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, the Bates County dirt farmer who represents the Fourth District in Congress, is an extraordinary man.

"A horny-handed son of toil, this Congressman can hold his own in debate with the sharpest wits in the House and is an interesting man to listen to anytime he takes the platform.

"He has never been downed by adversity, either the kind that put him on the WPA in the early thirties or the kind that forced surgeons to amputate one of his legs early this year.

"He is a battler, and one of the greatest fighting advocates of true farm parity the Congress has.

"He is a liberal Democrat in the Roosevelt tradition and never a fence straddler, a Congressman who can always be depended upon to take the part of the small businessman and the laborer as well as the farmer.

"The Fourth District, mixture that it is of metropolitan and rural Missouri, is one of the few districts of its type in this country that is represented by a real farmer. The rural counties are particularly fortunate in having GEORGE CHRISTOPHER as their Congressman.

"It ought to be a whopping big majority they give him in November—just as they did in the August primary."

Holden was right again and Congressman CHRISTOPHER won by a large majority. This community of public-spirited citizens, fine homes, healthy businesses, productive farms, superior schools will continue to progress. The next hundred years will be even greater.

Britain's Fears of Two-Power Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following views of Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the news on January 20, "Today and Tomorrow—The Morning After":

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 20, 1959]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE MORNING AFTER
(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Anthony Nutting, writing from London on Mr. Mikoyan's visit, has succeeded in demonstrating how hard it is for even the friendliest nations to understand one another. Mr. Nutting reports that it is being seriously debated in London whether the United States is moving toward a two-power deal with the Soviet Union. After a long report on how much our motives are suspected in Europe, he proceeds to lecture us on what we must do to make our European friends feel better about us. What we must do, according to Mr. Nutting, is precisely what in fact we have been doing day by day, namely, to make a full and reassuring report to all our NATO partners, and to discuss and agree with them on future policies and procedures. "A failure to do these things, which we are doing," says Mr. Nutting quite solemnly, "would be playing Russia's game beyond the point of safety."

If this is the kind of uninformed suspicion which exists in London, it is enough to make anyone despair of the effectiveness of a free press. Here are two allies, both speaking the same language, both enjoying free institutions, both able to print and to read whatever they choose, both committed to the same international ideals, and yet a writer with connections in official quarters in London suspects us of being so foolish and so disloyal that we are contemplating a two-power deal at the expense of Europe.

For my part, I do not expect us to be understood or trusted in Moscow. But we have, I submit, earned the right to be trusted by our closest allies. We do not betray our friends, and the suspicion that we are so glibly that Mr. Mikoyan can sell us into betraying our friends is an affront to the honor of America and an insult to its intelligence.

The public part of Mr. Mikoyan's visit seems to me to show that between the Communist world and ours there can be on the great issues be little free and open communication. We live in very different worlds. We see things with very different eyes. We judge them with very different minds. The best we can do is to negotiate cautiously more or less at arm's length. But the kind of full understanding needed for political cooperation is a very long way off. It is, therefore, absurd to invite Mr. Mikoyan to subject himself to a public exhibition like "Meet the Press" and it is absurd for Mr. Mikoyan to accept the invitation to do that. The show on Sunday was as useful as an attempt to mate a whale which lives in the sea with an elephant which lives on the land.

Those who have studied carefully the problem of communication between the Soviet Union and the West know that the communication cannot be general but must be specialized. The mathematicians and the physical scientists can communicate with one another. So can the engineers or the

agriculturists. So can artists. So can experienced and sophisticated statesmen. So can ordinary tourists meeting ordinary people. But Mr. Mikoyan cannot talk to the American people in the mass nor could Mr. Nixon talk, even if he had the freedom of the Soviet radio, to the Russian people in the mass.

As to the results of Mr. Mikoyan's tour, they cannot be measured by the crowds and the headlines, by the curiosity of the people who saw him or by their courtesy. The results of the visit will be tested as we see whether or not we are moving toward negotiations on the whole German question. For surely that was the real objective of Mr. Mikoyan's visit, as it is the objective of the Soviet gambit in Berlin.

His purpose cannot have been to enter a popularity contest, for which he is at little qualified as he would be for a beauty contest. If the purpose of his visit was to open up the German question, he is not going home empty handed. For the President and Mr. Dulles have shown that they hope to make the German question negotiable if Moscow is seriously interested in negotiating.

The Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Paul Ord, editor of the *Childress Reporter*, at Childress, Tex., has posed a provocative and age-old question for the new year. In the January 15 issue of the *Reporter*, he has editorially submitted the question of the hour as well as his studied answer. The *Reporter* is a weekly newspaper which has served Childress and surrounding Childress County well for approximately 12 years. Under unanimous consent, I insert herein the editorial that all Members may have the benefit of Mr. Ord's splendid comments:

THE QUESTION

Just about everything in this country has been getting bigger.

This trend, the economists confidently tell us with hardly a dissenting voice, is not only sure to continue but to accelerate. They blueprint a future of ever-increasing incomes, ever-improving living standards, the mass enjoyment of luxuries which would have been beyond the imagination of man not long ago.

We are on the verge of explosive breakthroughs in physical sciences. The age-old mysteries of space are being fathomed, and soon will be mysteries no more. The miracles of nuclear physics are at hand. Longer, healthier, happier lives for all are promised. And we are not alone. All over the world, peoples and nations are swept along, to varying degrees, in the same tide.

This is fine. Almost everyone wants more money, more of the things that money can buy, more of what we know by the word "progress."

Yet a nagging question arises—the biggest unanswered question that confronts the changing world. While just about everything is getting bigger, is the greatest resource of all getting smaller? That resource is the individual. Not just people in the mass, but individual people—each different, each unique, each a spirit as well as an appe-

tite. Is the individual in very real danger of being dwarfed by the bigness around him, and of being reduced to a statistic?

It's easy enough to say that it can't happen here, even though we have all seen it happen in vast reaches of the earth. Easy enough, but untrue. This Nation was founded on certain concepts—the fullest freedom for all, an unflagging sense of the spiritual nature of man, a passionate regard for the worth of every individual human being. But these, like all other concepts and philosophies, will wither away to nothingness unless they are eternally prized beyond all else and faithfully protected. They must be supported in absolutely specific ways. They demand the highest degree of individual independence and responsibility. If, for instance, we give to government the initiative and the power to regulate and dominate our lives in the name of security, the ultimate end will be the security of the penitentiary. Power once granted to government must always be balanced against a greater power in the hands of the people.

We pride ourselves on our material achievements. But pride can result in a deadly blindness. Other nations, whose concepts are utterly opposed to ours, are producing their own wonders. Communist Russia and Communist China are, so to speak, moving mountains. The whip and the chain, used with dedicated ruthlessness, can also get out the goods, while the soul of man dies.

It took centuries of turmoil, war, and revolution to establish the rights of man—the rights of the individual. They can be lost overnight by sins of omission no less than sins of commission. A people whose eyes and minds are fixed on material ends alone will not long remain a free people. They will become merely instruments of power.

There is no foreseeable limit to what we, through our economics, social, and political organizations can achieve. It will be the ultimate irony if, in the light of this, we surrender the individual to material bigness—whether in government or anywhere else. We never had a more urgent need to uphold age-old principles and convictions that make for the only worthwhile kind of progress—confidence in something, faith in ideals, fairness, the determination to defend what one believes to be right.

Walt Whitman wrote, a century ago: "The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely, to you." Man in the mass must never hide the face of the individual man.

The Administration's Development Loan Fund Request: Shirking Our International Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the aspiring peoples of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America—those with the greatest need for help along the road toward economic development—may be our best friends in the future. Congress set up the Development Loan Fund 2 years ago in order to assist underdeveloped peoples by loans—not by grants—to help themselves.

The Congress felt that the "revolution of rising expectations" of people emerging from backwardness should be

assisted by us for its own sake. But we well know that the Communists are also exploiting this revolutionary surge in the underdeveloped countries for their own purposes. In less than 3 years, Communist Russia has extended \$1.7 billion in long-term low-interest loans for economic development. Communist trade agreements with underdeveloped countries increased from 49 in 1953 to 147 in 1957. Trade between the Soviet bloc and the underdeveloped areas is 50 percent greater than it was 2 years ago. Today, more than 2,000 students from these areas are studying in Moscow and other Soviet centers. Some 2,300 Soviet technicians are now at work in the underdeveloped areas.

The Development Loan Fund was off to a good start. Two years ago Congress gave it a needed 2-year authorization, to insure some continuity of administration. The congressional authorization for the Development Loan Fund for the current fiscal year, that ending June 30, 1959, is \$625 million.

Since the Development Loan Fund began operations just a year ago in January 1958, it has had a profoundly constructive, although limited, effect on the health of the underdeveloped world. Of the \$3 billion of applications made in the last year, to the end of January 1959, \$700 million have been committed in loans, \$500 million have been rejected as not sufficiently worthy, and \$1.8 billion of applications which are deemed worthy but for which no funds are available, are on file. Applications for further developmental loan capital are still pouring in. It is anticipated that valid applications on the order of \$3 billion will be on hand before the Development Loan Fund in a matter of weeks.

The Development Loan Fund is financing basic economic facilities, such as roads, ports, power, communications, and irrigation, and is loaning to private industry. The Development Loan Fund will also be a source of United States contributions and support to regional development institutions as they come into being.

Here are some illustrations of the type of loans being made by the Development Loan Fund:

In Taiwan a loan of \$21.5 million to assist in financing the cost of the Shihman Dam project in the northwest to produce power needed for further industrialization, flood control, and water supply. Shihman will increase the total power available to Taiwan by 15 percent and provide a water supply for 340,000 persons and irrigation of 140,000 acres.

In Pakistan a loan of \$4.2 million to assist the privately owned Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation in extending loans to private borrowers for the purchase abroad of machinery, equipment, materials, and services for economic development purposes.

In Liberia a loan to a joint American-Liberian private company of \$190,000 to assist in financing the costs of expanding existing sawmill operations.

In Honduras a loan of \$5 million to a large-scale road program being under-

taken by the Government of Honduras. Proceeds of the loan are being used to help construct a new 45-mile paved highway serving one of the most populated regions of Honduras and to improve a highway linking the capital with the Pan-American Highway and Pacific ports. The DLF financing supplemented a \$4,500,000 loan by the World Bank for the import of equipment, materials, and services required in this project.

In Ceylon a loan of \$1.6 million toward the purchase abroad of equipment and materials required to continue Ceylon's irrigation and land development program and to assist in rehabilitating 29 major reservoirs and 1,200 village reservoirs breached in the winter floods of 1957-58.

In Paraguay a loan to a private U.S. firm, the International Products Corp., of \$2.6 million to assist in modernizing and expanding its operations of ranching, meat packing, and production of quebracho extract.

In Turkey a loan of \$10 million to assist privately owned Industrial Bank of Turkey to make small- and medium-sized loans for the expansion of industry.

For many months now, the administration has been telling the people of this country, and of the world, that America's international responsibilities require, for the 1960 fiscal year, a considerably expanded use of the Development Loan Fund. It must be set up on more than a 2-year basis, the administration has rightly proclaimed, and it must have loanable funds at its disposal at a rate of \$1 billion a year.

Thus Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs C. Douglas Dillon, testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 11, 1958, said:

You may ask why, if the executive branch believed last year that long-term financing was needed for the Fund, we have not renewed the request this year.

We have not done so through any belief that the need has diminished. In fact, international developments during the last year have convinced us even more firmly, if possible, that long-term assurances of funds is necessary to obtain the maximum results and so is essential to the future peace and security of our country and the free world. However, we recognize that the House of Representatives determined last year that the Fund should be established with capital sufficient for only 2 years as a trial and that consideration of longer term financing should be postponed until the Congress can have for it the record of requirements and performance for this initial period.

We are abiding by that decision, and we are deferring until next year proposals for the longer term financing which I had said we are more than ever convinced is essential. In the meantime, our experience, thus far, has demonstrated overwhelmingly that the appropriation of the full \$625 million now authorized, is needed for the coming fiscal year.

Under Secretary Dillon, in an address to the Foreign Policy Association at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on May 21, 1958, said:

The less-developed countries are fully prepared to bear the major burden of their own economic development. But to acquire the industrial techniques and the machinery and

equipment which they cannot yet make for themselves they need help from the industrialized countries. As the greatest industrialized country of the world we must accept the responsibility for leadership in this field.

This means that we must lift our sights. In the fields of international development assistance, international finance, world trade and private investment we must find ways of doing more than we are doing now. For unless we meet the challenge of the times, our own safety, let alone our economic well-being, will surely be placed in the gravest danger. . . .

For the future, I believe that we should contemplate a higher level of lending from the Development Loan Fund, something on the order of \$1 billion a year. I believe that such an amount could be spent wisely in stimulating development abroad and would be warranted by considerations of our national security.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles spoke movingly to the United Nations General Assembly at New York City on September 18, 1958:

Economic development is, of course, an aspiration shared by all peoples. In the newly independent nations, and indeed in many long independent, there is a burning desire for economic and social progress, for higher levels of living, for freedom from the slavery of poverty.

Much has been accomplished already. The American people admire the vigorous efforts of the leaders and the peoples of less developed countries to help themselves. Yet much remains to be done.

The United States believes the time has come for the nations of the world to take stock of accomplishments to date and to chart anew long-term courses of cooperative action.

We propose that the nations dedicate the year 1959 to these purposes.

Let me mention some of the major steps that the United States would be prepared, subject to action by Congress as appropriate, to take or support in the coming year:

1. The United States will carry forward its existing development financing programs on a vigorous and effective basis. . . . The great challenge of poverty and disease can only be met by vigorous realistic action. The United States stands ready to play its full part in this great peaceful crusade.

Again, on November 7, 1958, Under Secretary Dillon, addressing the World Affairs Council of Northern California at San Francisco, said:

In my view a most serious threat of all is the Soviet economic offensive. . . . I believe that we must place our chief reliance in meeting the Soviet challenge on the mobilization of our economic and technical resources, both public and private, to help raise the living standards of the less privileged nations of the world. . . .

During the past 12 months, our country's responses to their needs has taken many forms. Perhaps the most striking is the Development Loan Fund, which has added a whole new dimension to foreign loan program. The Fund, which began operation early this year, represents a new hope for the underdeveloped countries. . . .

At the present rate of operations the Fund will have committed all of its available resources within a few months which means an annual rate of operations of about \$700 million. I believe that we should contemplate a still higher level of lending from the Development Loan Fund, something on the order of \$1 billion a year.

Three days later, in his address to the Colombo plan meeting at Seattle, Wash.,

on November 10, 1958, President Eisenhower joined the crusade:

Our task is a great one. It will take many years to fulfill. Yet if we undertake it boldly, with wisdom and determination, we can and will succeed.

What are the steps that we should take? First, we must keep in mind our goal. That goal is to enable free nations to achieve a momentum of economic progress which will make it possible for them to go forward in self-reliant growth.

Next, we must determine the means by which we are to achieve that goal. To this end, Secretary of State Dulles suggested at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 18 that all countries of good will should chart anew their long-term courses of action to promote the growth of less developed areas.

If both the less developed and the more developed countries move vigorously to carry out this proposal, their action could pave the way for the 1960's to become a decade of unprecedented progress toward our common goal.

The United States stands ready to play its full part in this great peaceful crusade to achieve continuing growth in freedom.

And on November 13, 1958, Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter told the International Cooperation Workshop in Washington, D.C.:

Among the five specific measures proposed by the President at Seattle, I should like to place some special emphasis on the Development Loan Fund.

This Fund is a major instrument in our effort to assist the less developed nations to carry forward their own plans for progress. It is important to realize that the Development Loan Fund will be substantially out of funds available for new commitments by January 1, 1959. Yet it will have a backlog of over \$1.5 billion of applications for loans to help on important projects in many countries. If the Development Loan Fund is to be an effective instrument for peaceful development, it must have resources for substantial increased activity on the order of \$1 billion a year. It must also have continuity over a period of years.

Only under such circumstances can the wastefulness of inadequate planning be avoided.

But in the last 2 months, something has happened. The administration has been seized by the magnificent obsession for balancing the budget at a low level, by whatever arithmetic tricks it can get away with, and with a fine unconcern for the future of the free world. Nowhere does this show up more shamelessly than in the Development Loan Fund budget request.

As Secretary Herter said, "If the Development Loan Fund is to be an effective instrument for peaceful development, it must have resources for substantial increased activity on the order of \$1 billion a year." The 1960 budget request is for a mere fraction of this, \$700 million a year. As Secretary Herter said, only if the Development Loan Fund has "continuity over a period of years, can the wastefulness of inadequate planning be avoided." Yet the budget request is for only a 1-year authorization, not even for the 2-year authorization which the administration had the courage to request, and Congress granted, back in 1957.

If there is one clear lesson in the politics of foreign-aid requests, it is that

in order to get at least part of what is adequate, the administration must ask what is adequate. How easy it would have been to have requested a 2-year authorization, now that the Development Loan Fund has proved its worth, as was successfully done in 1957, when the Fund was a fledgling. How easy it would have been to have asked for a \$1 billion authorization for fiscal 1960, as the administration has been saying for many months was vitally necessary. While the additional \$300 million request would have thrown the administration's paper budget out of balance by \$200 million, 10 times this \$200 million could readily be recouped, and a substantial surplus shown, if the administration were willing to plug some of the more outrageous loopholes in the tax laws.

And what nonsense it is to say that the country's economy could not stand the administration's sticking to its guns on the need for \$1 billion for the Development Loan Fund. More than 4,100,000 Americans are unemployed, some 6.1 percent of the working force; less than 75 percent of our manufacturing capacity is being used. Why shirk our international responsibilities just to keep our unemployed unemployed, and our unused industrial capacity still unused?

Mr. Speaker, the President movingly pointed to the need for "the 1960's to become a decade of unprecedented progress." His administration can practice what it has so eloquently preached by amending its budget request for the Development Loan Fund for 1960 to include authorization for more than 1 year, and for more than the \$700 million requested.

Five-Minute Rule of the House Should Be Universal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are few columnists in the United States, if any, who hit the target more frequently than Morris Kaplan in his "To the Point" column in the South Side News-Courier in the district that I am privileged to represent. My colleagues all will agree with me, I know, that Morris Kaplan is writing straight to the point in his column of January 14, 1959, which, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include.

Most chairmen at gatherings I attend do a pretty good job in brevity of introductions and holding speakers to reasonable time limitations, but when a chairman occasionally goes the other way all one can do is to sit and take it, silently hoping that the happy day will soon come when the 5-minute rule of the House is the law of this and every other land. One can say so very, very much in 5 minutes if he really has to put his mind

to it, and he can lose audience appeal as rapidly as falling off the top of a mountain when he has said all he has on his mind and keeps on talking.

The greatest chairman I ever knew was Harriet Taylor Treadwell, who worked with Catherine Waugh McCulloch, mother of the able and dedicated administrative assistant of the senior Senator from Illinois, in bringing suffrage to the women of America by getting passed in Illinois the partial suffrage State enactment that opened the door. Harriet Taylor Treadwell was the chairman of a league of women in Chicago, some 2,000 or more, and operated strictly under the 3-minute rule. If it were the Governor of the State, or the mayor of Chicago, or anyone else speaking, the very second the 3 minutes was up down went Harriet Taylor Treadwell's gavel, and there was not one more word said, even if the Governor or the mayor, or whoever he was, was left hanging in the middle of a sentence. The fact that Harriet Taylor Treadwell, working with Catherine Waugh McCulloch, won the battle of the votes for women is pretty good proof that even in the yesterdays Morris Kaplan's column had a point.

The column follows:

THE ORGANIZATION MAN

Every time I attend a meeting I am struck anew by the way in which presidents and chairmen flounder through the business at hand, allowing lengthy repetitious speeches from the floor, even when they are not germane to the issue being discussed. With a good chairman many of these meetings could transact their business in half the time. But it needs a firm hand, which knows when to loosen the reins and when to pull up short.

When an organization—be it civic, fraternal, service or social—selects a new presiding officer, the nominating committee or the membership-at-large usually bases its choice on the personality of the man or woman candidate. A reasonable amount of intelligence, warmth, ability to speak are usually considered necessary. How often, however, is knowledge of how to conduct a meeting, or the ability to keep a tight hold on proceedings taken into account?

A good chairman is strong enough to stop the man who loves the sound of his own voice, or the wisdom of his own set ideas. He doesn't allow the member with the most imperious manner and voice dominate every debate. Once any member is allowed to take over the prerogatives of the Chair, that organization is leaderless.

Memorial: "Gus" Cook

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of an individual who served for many, many years in an important position in the Capitol of the United States and whose death has brought sadness to all of those who knew him, and particularly to those such as myself who had the privilege of know-

ing him closely through a period of many years. "Gus" Cook was one of those rare individuals whose conscientiousness and devotion to duty set an example for all who came in contact with him. Through close personal relationship over a long period I had the opportunity to observe in him those characteristics which deserve emulation by all who serve our Government. My sincerest condolences go to his surviving family.

New Price Policy of American Can Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the growing importance of rising prices and their effect on the value of the dollar, and the concern of responsible officials over this trend, as expressed by President Eisenhower in his economic report, I would like to call attention to the efforts of one of the Nation's large concerns that recently instituted a new price policy that is expected to result in substantial savings to its customers. This program, instituted by the American Can Co., supplier of containers for much of the Nation's food and other commodities, involved an expenditure of \$32 million in a new coll-processing program which permits processing of tin plate and steel plate in their own plants.

Mr. Speaker, this is a large sum of a private company's investment capital, spent in a way which promises to reduce the cost pressures of recent years on food prices. It is evidence of a forward-looking company's faith in the future of American business and the soundness of the economy.

American Can Co. President William Stolk said when he announced the new price structure that it would eliminate the method of averaging metal can prices over broad geographic areas and, instead, establish separate f.o.b. prices at each of the company's plants for each type and style of container. This company has about 50 car-manufacturing plants strategically located near large agricultural areas in all parts of the country.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Stolk, presented to the press at the time the company instituted its new price policy: STATEMENT BY WILLIAM C. STOLK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN CAN CO., NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER 19, 1958

I have called this meeting to have the opportunity of discussing with you a number of drastic and far-reaching actions the American Can Co. is announcing today.

They are completely unprecedented in the metal can industry and are bound to have tremendous advantages for all of the can-using industries we serve.

I felt it was important to talk personally with you about these actions not only because of the widespread interest they will

arouse but also because of the many ramifications that are involved.

As I think all of you know, we formally opened our newest coil processing center at Hillside, N.J., 2 weeks ago. That was the eighth such facility we have installed in this country in the past 18 months and it completes the network of coil plants outlined in our original planning more than 2 years ago.

Our coil program is a revolutionary development in the can industry. It was undertaken by Canco—at a total investment of \$32 million—in order to effect substantial reductions in our can-making costs.

We decided to invest this sum after exhaustive studies convinced us we could accomplish important savings by processing tinplate and steel plate in our own plants. As a result, we are now doing the inspecting, shearing, stacking, and sorting operations which previously had been performed by the steel mills.

This undertaking dramatically illustrates our belief that unremitting action to hold down the cost of metal cans is essential. Cans represent 70 percent of American Can Co.'s business. Our cans are faced with competition as vigorous and determined as any you can name.

It is obvious that every possible economy must be injected into our operations if we are to serve our own interests and the best interests of our can-using customers.

It is most gratifying to be able to report to you today that the coil program already has amply justified our faith in the economies we believed it could produce.

More than that, the tremendous amount of study that has gone into this project has revealed other areas in our business where worthwhile economies can be accomplished. We are taking steps to effect these economies also. In so doing, we are eliminating certain pricing policies that long have been standard in the can industry.

As background, let me illustrate why we believe all of these courses of action are necessary.

Our two key costs are tinplate and labor, which represent as much as 85 percent of the cost of a can.

Since 1946 the base price of quarter-pound electrolytic tinplate, the type most commonly used for cans, has been raised 11 times, increasing its cost 109 percent.

In the same period, the average hourly wage in our company has gone up from \$1.08 in 1946 to \$2.63½ today. In addition, employee benefits have increased 46 cents per hour. These latter two figures represent an increase of more than 166 percent.

The two upper lines of this chart show the rise in these two costs during the past 12 years.

But since World War II, the price of a standard No. 2 can, made from the quarter-pound plate, has increased only 93.5 percent, as shown here on this line.

It is obvious from the spread between our two major can costs and can prices that we have been absorbing substantial proportions of these cost increases.

This situation, of course, has resulted in part from the intense competition in the can industry.

It has been necessary to find every means to help offset these drastically increased costs. Through technological improvements, new processes and new manufacturing and can-handling methods, we have made considerable progress. Had it not been for the economies that have been made, for example, a can that costs three and a half cents today might well have cost 15 cents if it were made by the same processes used in earlier years.

These accomplishments, of course, have been extremely valuable to us and to our customers. But they have not been enough to stay even with inflation, much less move ahead of it. It was apparent that we still

had to find new ways of cutting costs without sacrificing quality or service.

Over the past few years, we have made a searching reexamination of every phase of our operations. These studies have shown that some existing practices, which have grown up over the years in the metal container industry, have clearly outlived their usefulness. To us, they appear to be archaic and unrealistic. We are consigning them to the junk heap.

These are policies dealing with the pricing of cans that came into being in the earlier years of the present century. They reflect the industry concept of former times that "cans are cans."

There is a vast difference between the metal can industry today and 50 years ago. In the early years, there was one basic can, used primarily for packing food. Today, the industry produces tremendous quantities of cans—more than 40 billion of them a year—for a vast and growing number of products, each of which requires its own set of can specifications and features.

Whole new concepts have been evolved, for new cans, new techniques, new markets. New methods of processing and merchandising have appeared. In short cans and the services they perform have taken on a new look. We at American Can believe it is time to take a new look also at pricing policies.

In making these changes, we are following a company philosophy that every outmoded and impractical method or system should be junked just as quickly as an obsolete piece of machinery.

The practices we are discarding undoubtedly served a good and useful purpose in other times. Why or how they came into being is no longer important. In our view, they have no place in our business today.

Instead, we are adopting an entirely new pricing philosophy.

Our approach, frankly, is revolutionary. It will mean two basic and far-reaching changes in our existing practices.

The first is that every can will be priced in more direct and closer relationship to the process and the differing costs of raw material and labor involved in its manufacture.

We have already put this plan into effect, and will continue to reflect it in our pricing.

As you may recall, we announced this new method of the specific pricing of cans on September 25. Under the previous practice, when there was a change in can prices, a single, average percentage figure was applied uniformly across the board to all types of cans. Now we determine a separate price for each type and style of can.

The second pricing change, which we are announcing today, is also a clean break with industry tradition.

We are putting into effect on next January 1 for each type and style of can a separate f.o.b. price at each of our plants. This is in contrast to the previous policy of having two general pricing areas dividing the country east and west of the Rockies.

Under the new plan, our can prices no longer will be averaged over these two broad geographic areas. Instead, our prices will reflect to customers the freight-cost advantage of their nearness to the steel mills supplying our basic raw material.

The recent large increases in transportation costs on raw materials make the use of wide area pricing no longer fairly adaptable to the needs of our customers. From January 1 on our can prices will give effect to differences in freight charges on tinplate between a can plant located near a steel mill and one located farther away.

At the same time, we are eliminating the free delivery of cans which exists in certain metropolitan areas.

It is our conviction that all of these changes will provide long-range benefit to our customers. Together they will mean

more equitable pricing for the many can-using industries we serve.

The economies we have achieved through the coil program and the new pricing policies which the coil operation has made possible have given us the opportunity of making what in these days and times is an unusual, even startling, announcement.

We are passing economies resulting from all of these actions on to our customers.

On January 1 we will put into effect this new and more equitable pricing system which will mean lower can costs for most of our customers.

We will hold the line on these prices until October 1, 1959, except for adjustments that may be necessary to reflect any increases the steel companies might make in their tinplate prices.

In the aggregate, the price reductions we are making will mean a total saving to our can-using customers of more than \$9 million.

This will mark the first time in my recollection that any can prices have been cut voluntarily by a can company as the direct result of economies it has been able to achieve.

The action is all the more startling, we believe, because it comes at a time when our costs are still rising.

We are particularly gratified about our ability to pass on these savings to our customers for two reasons.

As I have indicated, we believe this to be the soundest sort of business practice. It is a virtual truism to say that the broader the economies we build into our operations, the stronger will be our competitive position and the greater the service to our customers.

The second reason is that it is in the public interest. We believe that under present conditions any voluntary reduction in the price level of a product as widely used as metal cans is a contribution to the economy as a whole.

Government leaders have made it abundantly clear that management, labor and Government itself share the responsibility for halting inflation. The American Can Co. endorses these views 100 percent.

To us at American Can, the action we are taking today stands as a clearcut example of the company's traditional policy of service in the interests of its customers and the Nation. It is on this philosophy of service that the growth of our business has been based. We are determined to continue to serve these interests, with all the strength and vigor we can apply.

Thirty of Thirty-four Schools Overcrowded in Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

MR. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune will give the Members some idea of the school crisis in the industrial Calumet region of Indiana. Gary is taxed to the limit to keep pace with school construction considering the influx of population during and since World War II. Federal defense industries have contributed greatly to this influx of population and overcrowded schools in Gary and other localities in this industrial area:

OVERLOADING REPORTED IN 30 OF 34

The frightening problem of overcrowding in Gary public schools was presented to the school board last night by Alden H. Blankenship, superintendent.

Blankenship gave each board member a 10-page summary of information on the school-building situation which showed that 30 of the city's 34 schools are overcrowded. Fourteen of the schools are crowded more than 25 percent over their capacity.

The report was termed "frightening" by Robert E. Penn, board member. Other members of the board agreed with Penn that the report should be publicized as much as possible to make citizens aware of the real problems facing the board in trying to find money and land to build the necessary new schools.

A related difficulty was pointed out by Chris Retson, board member, who said the city will be continually faced with overloaded schools and increasing enrollment unless something is done about new housing developments springing up in various areas of Gary, with no provisions made for schools to handle the children of the subdivision.

"This is the basic cause of tax troubles in Gary," Retson said.

Retson said that every day he drives past a new subdivision which displays an advertising sign: "Come to Gary and live in this subdivision; near new schools."

The Gary school system is asked to absorb people from neighboring communities, many of which have no open land like Gary, Retson said.

"The taxes from low cost homes don't produce enough money to educate the children from that home," he said.

"It's fiscal suicide," Retson said.

Blankenship, in his report last night, made special mention of the 14 schools which are crowded more than 25 percent over their capacity.

Heading the list of five heavily overcrowded high schools was Froebel, which is 122 percent over its capacity. This is expected to be relieved somewhat next fall with the completion of the Norton Park School.

Tolleston is overcrowded 63 percent; Roosevelt, 49 percent; Lew Wallace, 43.5 percent; Emerson, 42 percent.

Edison is 21 percent over capacity.

The other two city high schools are under capacity: Mann, 7.8 percent, and Wirt, 7.3 percent.

Leading the list of overcrowded elementary schools is Garnett, which is 70.6 percent over capacity. Others more than 25 percent overloaded are Banneker, Beveridge, Carver, Douglas, Lincoln, Nobel, Pittman Square, and Pulaski.

Blankenship pointed out that three elementary school areas will have special potential problems next fall.

The Aetna School was 4.3 percent above capacity in October 1958. Four hundred new homes are scheduled in an area between present homes and Lake Street. Sewers and streets are in, and exterior shells have been completed for many of these units.

In the Nobel School area, on Gary's far East Side, much of the area at Inland Manor has been prepared for new homes. Long-range plans include some 1,500, and eventually 2,500 units, Blankenship said. Nobel is now 26 percent overcrowded.

At Pittman Square in Glen Park, many new homes are being built east of the school. The school site is too small for another addition.

Pittman Square is 36.6 percent overcrowded, counting the addition which will be completed next month.

Blankenship said six new elementary schools are needed now.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Vice President, Richard Nixon

Alken, George D., *Vt.*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle
N. Mex.
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Id.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*.....3840 Lorcom Lane,
Alexandria, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club
R. I.
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Phillip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
Iowa.....way, Chevy Chase,
Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*.....1612 34th St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*.....4929 Hillbrook
Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*.....419 Raymond St.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham
Wash.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okl.
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*.....5020 Lowell St.
Morton, Thurston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*.....122 Schotts
Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine.*
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F.,
Kans.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase
(Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr.,
N. J.
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman),
Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Syming-
ton, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon,
Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Javits,
and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of
South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Hum-
phrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan,
Young of Ohio, Hart, Alken, Young of
North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams
of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell,
Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson,
Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of
Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible,
Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges,
Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt,
Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel,
Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Vir-
ginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington,
Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett,
Cannon, Bridges, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith,
Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and
Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson,
Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire,
Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey,
Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and
Keating.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear,
Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and
Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr,
Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas,
Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams
of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton,
and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Green (chairman), Fulbright,
Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse,
Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley,
Hickenlooper, Langer, Alken, Capehart, and
Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson,
Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt,
Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson,
Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Car-

roll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak,
Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Keating.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore,
Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche,
Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee,
Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey,
Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver,
Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, Mc-
Clellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd,
Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and
Martin.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy,
McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Ran-
dolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater,
Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits,
and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chair-
man), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough,
Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara,
Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy,
Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of
South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and
Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden,
Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis,
Javits, and Morton.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel
Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts,
3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852
Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut
Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037
Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van
Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey
Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823
Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St.
Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. *District of Columbia.*

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-
furter. *Maine, Massachusetts, New Hamp-
shire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.*

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan.
Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan.
*Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin
Islands.*

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren. *Maryland, North Carolina, South
Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.*

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black.
*Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia,
Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.*

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart.
Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark.
Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. *Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri,
Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.*

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas.
*Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana,
Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.*

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whit-
taker. *Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Okla-
homa, Utah, Wyoming.*

Appendix

The Partnership of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service—Address by Dr. Frederick M. Lange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a distinguished Texas citizen, Dr. Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas Community Chest trust fund, served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Ninth International Conference of Social Work, in Tokyo, Japan, last November 30 to December 6.

Dr. Lange was invited by several organizations in Tokyo to discuss the work of the Community Chest movement in America. As one of this Nation's outstanding Community Chest leaders, he has special qualifications for speaking on this subject. Among the organizations he addressed were the Central Community Chest of Japan, the Tokyo South Rotary Club, and the Tokyo Lions Club.

This eminent Texan has given high praise to the hospitality extended to him and Mrs. Lange in Japan, including assistance given by American Government personnel stationed there, particularly Mr. Robert J. Boylan, Chief of the Exchange of Persons Branch of the American Embassy, and his assistant, Miss Nancy Downing.

Dr. Lange was truly an ambassador of good will to Japan. Evidence of that is the fact that after his return to his home in Dallas, Tex., he was notified that the Central Community Chest of Japan had awarded him a special citation for his contribution to the Japan Community Chest movement. He is the first foreigner ever to receive a national Community Chest and welfare award in Japan.

Mr. President, Dr. Lange's address, as delivered in Tokyo, on "The Partnership of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service" is a scholarly discussion of a subject on which he is an expert. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PARTNERSHIP OF THE PRIVATE CITIZEN IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL SERVICE

(Address delivered by Frederick M. Lange, L.H.D., LL.D., executive vice president, Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund, while in the Far East as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Ninth International

Conference of Social Work, held in Tokyo, Japan, November 30 to December 6, 1958, before the representatives and leaders of the Central Community Chest of Japan, Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, Japan, November 26, 1958, Tokyo South Rotary Club, December 3, 1958; Lions Club, Tokyo, Japan, December 4, 1958)

Based upon the English poor law, which the English colonists brought to America, for roughly 300 years the major source of the necessities of life (food, clothing, shelter, and medical care) for needy residents in the United States, was the local government unit. This responsibility was written into the State constitutions of many U.S. States.

As the population and the welfare problem grew in the United States during the first two centuries, it became more and more difficult for the local governmental units to provide certain social services, such as institutions for the care of the feeble-minded, the mentally ill, the criminal, the tuberculous, and institutions for the education of the blind, and the deaf. Also, it became more difficult for the local governmental units to provide adequate health services alone. For these reasons, about 100 years ago, the State governments in the United States began to assume responsibility for these services. For many years longer, however, the National Government continued to limit its social welfare activities severely, especially in the area of financial assistance.

The business depression of the 1930's forced a change in this situation. The inability of both the States and the local units of government to provide for the needs of the millions of unemployed made it necessary for the National Government, which had taken over the taxing power with regard to many of the major tax sources, to assume responsibility for most of the financial assistance to needy U.S. citizens. This became a permanent responsibility of the National Government with the establishment of the social security program in 1935.

Early in American history voluntary agencies began to develop, some to do things not considered the responsibility of the governmental agencies, and some out of dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of some welfare services under governmental auspices. Voluntary agencies have continued to grow in numbers and importance throughout American history for these and other reasons. Many times voluntary agencies have closed down or altered their functions when the time came that their former services were no longer needed or were assumed by some level of government. It is some indication of their continuing health that this fall Community Chests and United Funds in 2,100 U.S. cities and towns will raise more than \$400 million to help finance a major part, but only part, of the voluntary health and welfare agencies in the United States.

From the beginning of American history to this hour, there has been an important and indispensable partnership between the Government and the private citizen in welfare matters.

We now have voluntary and government agencies at all levels working side by side, one helping the other. Since 1935, the major role of our private agencies has shifted from providing primarily relief in the form of food, clothing, and shelter, to supporting and carrying on new or pioneer programs, mostly in the prevention field. As newer methods

were discovered, or as new services were needed, it was usually the voluntary agencies in the 1930's which experimented and started them. As their value was proved, and as the new programs expanded, they were often incorporated into the methods and services of the large governmental programs. More recently the national governmental agencies, too, are experimenting, pioneering, and carrying on much research. In general, the governmental agencies have taken responsibility for the large mass programs directed toward providing food, shelter, clothing, and medical aid for those who cannot provide these things for themselves. The size of the national government programs is now far larger than that of the voluntary programs.

This, however, does not mean that the partnership between national and State governments and the private citizen is weakened. Particularly at the local and State levels, the governmental agencies try to keep close to the thinking of private citizens through the establishment of advisory boards and auxiliaries. Most government agencies are anxious to know what private citizens think and go out of their way to explain their programs, invite comments, and provide for citizen participation.

The private citizens, then, not only control the private agencies, but by serving on the advisory boards and committees of the Government agencies, influence and guide them too. Many of these citizens have been active in both kinds of agencies, therefore they know intimately what each does and what each is responsible for. This helps to coordinate the whole pattern of welfare service, keeps it close to the real needs and sees that the total effort is as efficient as possible.

I recently read a paper entitled "Social Welfare Services in Japan in 1957," by Mr. Chujiro Kimura, vice president of the National Council of Social Welfare. I was pleased to see the many similarities between the Japanese and American systems. You, too, have national, state or prefectural, and local government participation in welfare programs. You, too, have government agencies cooperating with voluntary agencies. The article gave me the impression that in Japan, as in America, the National Government is carrying the largest part of the financial responsibility. I also received the impression that your local councils for social welfare; voluntary organizations, are charged with much responsibility, even with the administration and provision of some services that are government financed.

I have the impression that while in the United States the role of the volunteer agency has long been very strong, the role of the voluntary agency in Japan apparently is only recently growing important. However, I was pleased to learn from the article how much your Government relies on your local voluntary welfare councils not only for the planning of local welfare services, but for coordinating them and actually giving some of the services.

The partnership between the Government and the private citizens in matters of welfare in the United States takes many forms. Most tax supported welfare programs were established because private citizens active in private welfare projects knew so well the need for the programs that they became their spokesmen. After public programs are established, private citizens working in private groups keep in close touch with them,

because Government and private agencies cooperate so closely on so many projects. Private groups know well the strength and weaknesses of the total effort. Private groups, through social action, through encouraging helpful welfare legislation, work for changes, expansions, or reductions in the government effort. These efforts are based on knowledge and facts gathered as results of working together. For instance, improvements in the services of our local Dallas County Welfare Agency was brought about because voluntary agencies working with some of the same families became aware of the severe limitations of the county program. Some members of the advisory board of the county agency were also active in the voluntary agencies. Their firsthand knowledge of the facts made changes possible in the county program.

Another way in which the private citizen keeps in touch with the Government agency is by volunteering his services. Many people in America are members of auxiliaries or voluntary committees whose members visit and donate their time, doing useful work in the agency, ranging all the way from helping to care for children to helping beautify the agency grounds. This visiting and volunteer service enables the private citizen to become acquainted with the service. Then, he can better influence not only the agency, but the Government which supports and controls it. The most outspoken and influential supporters of our Dallas Juvenile Department are the women and men who donate their time to help in certain phases of the work. In this way they know what the agency needs and can speak intelligently and forcefully to officials who control it.

We, too, have local welfare councils, which bring together all organizations, government and private, so that local services can be planned and coordinated. Here the government agencies and the voluntary ones map out who will do what, so that the total effort will produce most benefit. Here the partnership is very close. Some services are too broad and burdensome for voluntary agencies to carry, and government must be encouraged to assume responsibility.

As conditions change, some new services, never tried before, may be needed. They often must be started with private funds from campaigns such as the Community Chest or United Fund campaign, or perhaps by funds from a private foundation. America has increasing numbers of private foundations established with gifts from well-to-do persons, who wish to assure that the income from their gifts will be used for beneficial philanthropic endeavors.

In all this the total pattern of welfare services is kept in mind. As needs change, services change, and both government and private agencies work hand in hand. Each knows what is needed. Each does his part, without duplication. This is possible because the private citizen, working in private agencies, helping to raise money for voluntary causes, donating his help in the work of private organizations, is often the same citizen who serves on an advisory board or an auxiliary, or a voluntary group in the government agency. He is the same person, who through his activities in the local welfare council, knows who can and should do what.

This partnership with government keeps the Government agency close to the people who support it and use its services. This partnership encourages efficiency. It encourages a total welfare system which provides those services which the people are convinced are really needed.

A large proportion of the United States giving goes to support what we call prevention programs. By this we mean social services which can help to prevent problems which may require extensive help. When, at the invitation of the Austrian Ministry of Welfare, I spoke in Vienna to welfare

leaders, and also when I spoke in Stockholm to Swedish welfare leaders, there was much interest in this. They asked why Americans support so many services such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, youth centers, recreation centers, day camps, overnight camps, etc. They questioned whether such services could be classed as necessary welfare programs. We believe they are vital welfare programs because through constructive youth activities, they help to build sounder bodies, minds and personalities. Such youth have a better chance of growing into independent adults who can better cope with life, and therefore be less damaged by problems which require extensive aid. We look upon such programs as an investment in people, an investment which will strengthen them, not only to lessen their later dependence on welfare services, but to increase their ability to live happier, more productive lives, from which they and all people around them will benefit.

Our youth programs are largely voluntarily supported and directed. However, here again we have cooperation with government at all levels, for many of the physical facilities which these voluntary youth agencies use are provided by government. These voluntary groups use public school facilities, public playgrounds, parks, campsites leased for \$1 a year from government, etc.

While government cooperates, we prefer to leave the direction of such programs to voluntary groups directed by private citizens. This removes the temptation which may sometimes appear, for a particular political group to influence or exploit youth programs for political ends.

We feel that a welfare program which only provides social services to remedy or repair damage after it has happened is incomplete. While we must, of course, give first emphasis to helping people who are in trouble, we must also look ahead and try to help people so that they will not get into serious trouble. Obviously, this is not always possible because of accident, misfortune, etc., but by helping to develop strong minds and bodies we can lessen their vulnerability to trouble. In this way we help to preserve human values, which in the long run, is the objective of a welfare program—to increase the well-being of our people, mental, physical, and spiritual.

Although I have said little specifically about the activities of our religious bodies, they are the backbone of our voluntary effort. Our welfare efforts have grown from religious roots, and spiritual values are the foundation of our whole program, regardless of whether the program is directed by a religious or a secular organization.

While taxes in America, as in Japan, provide the bulk of support for welfare activities, the total of American voluntary aid is nevertheless tremendous. In addition, the role of foundations and trust funds is growing. More and more of our people with means are giving large sums of money which are used to finance needed services. Here, too, we have a partnership with government, since our laws and tax provisions encourage this practice.

I can speak to the role of the voluntary agency and of the trust with some authority, since I now direct such a trust. Also, during my 25 years of experience in social welfare, I have directed or influenced the gathering of over \$50 million in voluntary gifts for welfare purposes. This could not have been accomplished without the teamwork of the Government which believes that the dignity of every man should be upheld and preserved. Human dignity is enhanced through providing for human well-being. In this vital endeavor there is a place for government and for the private citizen. They need each other if the job is to be done right.

I have recently reviewed a report on "Public Health and Welfare in Japan" published

by your information service in New York City. Again, I was impressed with the similarities between your services and ours. Perhaps this is because human beings all over the world, basically, have similar needs and require similar services.

Perhaps the most significant research in the welfare field in America in the last quarter century concerns work done by Bradley Buell & Associates in St. Paul, one of our large midwestern cities. Painsstaking study indicates that the great variety of problems which plague people can generally be divided into four groups. Also, the great variety of needed services can in general be divided into four groups. I found that your problems and services can be classified similarly.

The first of the four categories relates to dependency, or the need for basic living essentials: food, shelter, and clothing. The second category relates to ill health, or the need for necessary medical care. The third category relates to social maladjustments, or the need for counseling or guidance services for personal difficulties. The fourth category relates to recreation, or the need to provide leisure time, adult education, and recreation activities, so that people can refresh themselves and maintain mental health.

I was struck in reading reports of your programs that each one of your services could be classified under one of these categories, too. However, there was different emphasis placed on them. Most emphasis in your program seems to be placed on provision of living essentials and providing health and medical services. The other two categories, counseling and recreation, were mentioned, but infrequently. I wonder if this is because the disruption of life due to the war has created such great needs for essentials of living, and for health services, that you have not yet been able to devote as much emphasis to counseling and recreation. It is obvious that living essentials and medical services must come first, but I would predict that as needs in these two basic areas are met more adequately, you will become more increasingly aware that problems and services in all four areas are interrelated. Lack of counseling for a personal problem may lead to a more severe problem which needs medical care and basic assistance, just as inability to provide living essentials can cause a health problem, or a health problem can cause inability to provide living essentials.

Much research is being carried on concerning how best to help families who have so many problems that they require help from a large number of specialized agencies, both government and private. Although most of this research is supported by private trusts and foundations, the results will be of greatest importance to the government agencies, since they are now giving the most help to these families.

So, here again, we have an example of teamwork. The government agency, which we call the public agency gets its support from taxes. It is controlled by law. It is set up by a city, county, State, or the National Government. It is administered by employees paid from taxes collected from the people. This government agency works cooperatively at every turn with the voluntary or private agency. When private citizens join together unofficially and voluntarily to help their fellow citizens in other ways than the government agencies provide, they do their work through voluntary or private agencies. These private agencies are administered and financed voluntarily by private citizens.

In our system, through the influence and activity of private citizens in both types of agencies, the overall program meshes smoothly, as gears in a machine. There is no competition, duplication, or waste. We are ever alert to preserve this teamwork, and would not permit a system where the government agencies could not readily be influenced by private citizen leaders.

We believe this sensitivity and response to what our private citizens think is best, is our guarantee that our future welfare services are not exploited for political or undemocratic purposes. We believe that this is the best way to assure that these services will strengthen human dignity through increasing human well-being.

Spiritual Ends Must Motivate the Deeds of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Wednesday evening a consecration service for our colleagues in the Congress of the Jewish faith, was held in Washington at Adas Israel Congregation. Along with many other Members of Congress, I was most honored to attend to witness a service of deep religious significance, and to hear Rabbi David H. Panitz deliver a splendid, moving sermon, which I want my colleagues, and those who read the RECORD, to share.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the sermon delivered by Rabbi David H. Panitz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON DELIVERED AT CONSECRATION SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS OF THE JEWISH FAITH ON JANUARY 21, 1959, AT ADAS ISRAEL CONGREGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY RABBI DAVID H. PANITZ

At the end of the third century of the common era, the Jewish community in Palestine was guided by the members of the rabbinical schools and academies. These teachers served as religious mentors, as pedagogs for young and old, as legislators in civil matters, as judges in the courts, and as advisers in intracommunity and in intercommunity affairs. They were rabbis in the fullest extension of the meaning of that term.

The head of the major academy in Jerusalem, the Nasi Rabbi Judah the Second, once sent three rabbis to traverse the land of Israel in order to survey the work of the local communal academies. They came to one town where there were no teachers, contrary to the tradition that one may not dwell in a city which has no teachers. The visiting delegation assembled the inhabitants and said, "Bring us the protectors of the city." The townspeople immediately summoned the military guard; "these are our guardians." "O no," said the rabbinical visitors, "these are not your protectors; in fact, these may be your destroyers." "Who then are our guardians?" The answer was brief and pointed: "Your teachers" are your guardians, your teachers who serve as legislators and judges, as the goad to your consciences, as your mentors in moral and ethical decisions, as your guides to the fulfillment of God's will. And then they cited the opening verse of Psalm 127: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord guard the city, the watchman wakes but in vain."

While these ancient rabbis were aware of the need to provide physical protection for their towns, cities, and country, they stressed

and reiterated the message that sheer power of arms and that even the ultimate conquest of universal nature will not suffice to bring peace and fulfillment to the individual hearts and collective lives of men and peoples.

This teaching, of course, is not limited to Judaism. It has become the common heritage of all religiously oriented men, and of all whose values stem from a divinely inspired message. It is a lofty legacy which impels us to view our every act and decision in terms of its consistency with God's will. Not material purposes, but rather spiritual ends should motivate the deeds of man, and the very use of material and physical properties of man and nature must be directed toward the ennoblement of human life and the sanctification of God's name. Habits and practices in the family and home, forms and norms in business relationships, broad interpersonal acts, indeed, the ideas we utter and votes we cast in the public forum, the halls of legislature and the sanctuaries of the courtrooms—all are potential moments of fulfilling the yearnings of the spirit and the quest for uninhibited truth and justice. This means, for example, that a vote in Congress should be viewed as a sacred opportunity to "labor in the vineyard of the Lord" and to obey the noblest promptings for the implementation of our spiritual ideals. The legislator is a teacher; he helps establish a moral and ethical tone; he points the way to amity and understanding for his fellow citizens near and far; he leads his neighbors in the path of cooperation for mutual advancement. He is a "guardian of the city."

We share the belief in one God. This means that there is a unity to all creation, there is a unity amongst all the children of men, there is a unity to our joint worldwide striving. Because God is one, man can be one. My brother's welfare is my concern because I am not complete without him, who like me comes from Him. This is man's role in the scheme established by the universal God. We have no alternative, then, but to find ways in which to help our fellow men to secure the freedoms and the blessings which may be achieved on this earth.

The Congress of the United States is the greatest forum, tribunal, and academy yet devised on this globe. As the sessions of the 86th Congress open, we lift our voices in joint prayer that its deliberations may be of lasting benefit to the people of our country, that its concerns may be a boon to all the nations, and that its actions may serve to strengthen the hands of all men of good will and lead in the path of meaningful peace and amity. May the Members of the Congress never falter in pursuing the will of God, and may the blessings of the Almighty be upon them. Amen.

Reclamation in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, with the taming of the Missouri River, which bisects South Dakota, a new era has been opened to our State.

It is an era which holds the promise not only of power and recreation but also of tremendous irrigation potential.

Recently, Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, addressed the

South Dakota Reclamation Association and outlined the progress which has been made in developing past irrigation projects in our State as well as the steps taken to develop new ones.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Dexheimer's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION W. A. DEXHEIMER BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION AT PIERRE, JANUARY 12, 1959

It was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation of Raymond Lund to participate in this meeting of the South Dakota Reclamation Association.

South Dakota and its problems of irrigation are not new to the Bureau of Reclamation, nor is the Bureau new to you in the western part of the State. We have not, however, gotten so well acquainted with you who come from east of the Missouri, but that is the direction in which reclamation seems to be moving as the need for greater water conservation develops all across the country.

Soon after the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, work began on the Belle Fourche project. Of all the investigations made in the State in those early days, this is the only project that showed feasibility. It has been constructed and has served the local area and the State for many years.

Because other areas did not appear feasible for development, not only was there no construction for many years, but even the collection of basic data was largely discontinued. The drought and depression of the thirties caused a renewal of interest in reclamation and under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, Deerfield Dam was constructed.

MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

During this period the Pick-Sloan plan evolved and the Missouri River Basin project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Changing values and increased needs opened the door and made additional projects. The lack of continuous data collection meant that some features were included in the Missouri River Basin project without adequate knowledge of conditions, and some mistakes were made.

We are just now reaching the point where the evidence may support a decision to irrigate from Shadehill Reservoir. We were obliged to abandon Bixby Dam because of poor quality of the water.

On the other hand, Keyhole Reservoir is beginning to serve its function of supplying supplemental water to the Belle Fourche project, and Pactola Reservoir has become the primary source of water for Rapid City and the Air Force base.

ANGOSTURA UNIT

The Angostura unit is a development to which you can point with pride as a remarkable example of the effect of the more intensive use of the resources of the State. Crop production and farm income from this unit are probably six times what they were prior to the availability of water for irrigation. This has made possible a quadrupling of the number of farms in the area, besides increasing the amount and stability of the income per farm.

This has been achieved early in the development period before the time that construction charges become payable under the irrigation district contract. A few years ago there was concern among the water users as to whether they could make a go of farming in the area.

I understand that at the recent annual water-users' meeting the story had completely changed. Now the comments are, "We

have licked the production problem and now are trying to improve our markets."

With respect to further development west of the Missouri, the outlook, frankly, is not too good. There is no feasible development on the Bad River and only a minor amount on the White. A small amount of new land along Rapid Creek can be served from Pactola Reservoir. Action there is dependent on wishes of the local people.

The real new value to South Dakota in the construction of the Missouri River Basin project can come from development along the Missouri River and in the eastern part of the State. The Corps of Engineers has been engaged in harnessing the river itself for flood-control and power purposes and has the job well along.

Since the first reservoir was completed at Fort Peck, the Garrison, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams have been constructed; closure was made at Oahe last year, and work is beginning at Big Bend. South Dakotans have made a major contribution in this river-control job by furnishing the sites for Fort Randall and Big Bend Reservoirs and much of the area needed for Oahe Reservoir and Lewis and Clark Lake.

DRAMATIC MOMENT

One of the dramatic moments and major events in the State's history occurred on March 15, 1954, when President Eisenhower pressed a button in the White House signaling former Governor Anderson to throw a switch at Fort Randall. This was the first generation of power from a Missouri River dam in South Dakota. In addition to Fort Randall, generators are spinning at Gavins Point and Garrison Dams, producing power for the benefit of South Dakota and the other States in the area.

The program of powerplant, transmission line, and substation construction has stimulated strong immediate economic activity both in the area and in the places where the materials have been produced and fabricated. But more important is the lasting impact of wide distribution of hydroelectric power throughout the Plains States. This impact is felt in city and country, in industry and on the farms where the farmer and rancher and their wives can produce more efficiently and with less drudgery and with opportunity for progressive, fuller living in the home and community.

The impact is also felt in areas where the relatively low-cost power is used for irrigation. This offers some real possibilities in your State. Along the Missouri River are a dozen or more small pumping units in South Dakota on which we are now completing a general report. These units vary in size from 500 acres to 7,000 acres, and will require pumping from the Missouri or one of the reservoirs. It developed they can provide a reliable feed base for livestock herds in the area, and stabilize agriculture well beyond the unit limits.

CHARLES MIX, BON HOMME

As a part of the investigation of these South Dakota pumping units we looked at land in Charles Mix and Bon Homme Counties, and found areas near Wagner and Geddes which appeared to offer possibilities. Here there is strong local interest in irrigation, and also in the possibility of restoring Lake Andes as a fishing and recreation center. We are making more detailed studies of the Wagner unit and should it or a larger unit prove physically and economically feasible it might be a good pilot development to demonstrate the value of irrigation in the subhumid area of South Dakota.

The impact of power development is also being and will be increasingly felt as the revenues from power sales assist in paying the construction cost of irrigation features.

This is one of the basic features of the Missouri River Basin project.

OAHE UNIT STUDIED

The greatest benefit in the State can be realized if the Oahe unit is constructed. This is one of the largest potential irrigation projects remaining to be built in the United States. Since work began on firming up the Pick-Sloan plan we have been studying this unit. Investigations have been expensive and there have been many setbacks.

We have learned a great deal about the glacial till and the lakebed soils east of the river. In 1956 we issued an interim information report which indicated about 550,000 acres of land were suitable for irrigation in the James River Valley, and which showed a favorable benefit-cost ratio for the Oahe unit. The current studies are for the purpose of firming up the earlier figures, both as to the amount of land suitable for irrigation and as to the cost and benefits.

The investigation will culminate in a report, scheduled for completion in the summer of 1960, which will have a firm economic and financial analysis and will definitely establish whether the entire Oahe unit is feasible. It will also give the farmers a firm plan for irrigation, and tell them within reasonably close limits what the operation and maintenance and construction charges will be. At that time the extent to which power revenues will assist in repayment will become apparent.

NEED LOCAL SUPPORT

This is the situation on Oahe unit as far as the bureau's work is concerned. The other principal facet is that of local interest and support. No reclamation project, however, small, has any chance of authorization by Congress without local support, the larger the project, the stronger and more widespread is the support needed. The construction and development of the Oahe unit is an undertaking which would require the constructive effort and foresight of many individuals and organizations in South Dakota.

The magnitude of the project will require that it be constructed in several stages over a considerable period of time. Some works would be built to full capacity initially. Construction of water supply works larger than needed to serve the first irrigation districts that may be organized poses an operation and maintenance financing problem that must be faced before construction work can be started.

Irrigation districts, organized in the usual fashion, can underwrite the reimbursable cost of distribution works in their districts. This would not meet the financial requirements of a project of this magnitude, particularly in the early years.

We can foresee that an organization such as a conservancy district will be necessary to coordinate the promotion and development of the entire project. Additional moneys will be needed to pay a portion of the operation and maintenance costs, particularly of water supply works, and a portion of the construction costs. Because of the widespread benefits a conservancy district is the logical answer.

Such a district must have the power of assessment and must be broadly based to provide the financial assistance necessary until irrigation districts covering the entire irrigable area attain their ultimate development.

NORTH DAKOTA EXAMPLE

You are fortunate in having the model and experience of your neighboring State of North Dakota in considering a conservancy district type of organization. The Garrison Diversion Conservancy District in that State covers 25 counties in entirety. Its authorized

1-mill assessment enables, on present valuation, the financing of a budget of more than \$300,000 per year, if necessary. This financing authority of the conservancy district has been very useful in its educational activities and in hiring technical and legal counsel.

The existence of the conservancy district has also warranted organizing irrigation districts where there was not unanimous acceptance of irrigation at this time, on the assumption that the objectors would ultimately come into the irrigation district. Without the conservancy district it would have been necessary to include in the irrigation districts nearly everyone within their exterior boundaries, and strong opposition to district formation might have developed.

Along with the six irrigation districts now organized in that State, the conservancy district will be a key entity for purposes of contracting with the United States for the financing of a portion of operation and maintenance cost during the early stages and repayment of a portion of the construction cost of the irrigation facilities.

The benefits of reclamation development to industrial development, wholesale and retail business, and professional services have long been recognized. Diversified irrigated farming brings greater wealth and opportunity.

The businessman and the farmer need to know what irrigation can mean to the area and the State. Getting the facts across to them will require a full measure of foresight, understanding, and hard work. I commend your leaders who have been active in this field of endeavor.

In considering the need and importance of further irrigation development in South Dakota, you should look to the experiences in other States. Take a trip through the North Platte project in western Nebraska and Wyoming, for example, and see the results of long-time irrigation development there and how it has released that area from a one-crop economy.

A recent economic survey showed that the irrigated area and towns therein support 27 times as many people and provide 40 times the income of adjacent prairie areas. What's more, the irrigated area provided 40 times the income. It is worth remembering that during the drought of the 1930's, the dryland areas lost 12 percent of their population and the irrigated areas gained 18 percent.

POPULATION NEEDS

Remember, too, that the United States is experiencing a population growth that will put us over the 200 million mark by 1970 and 220 million by 1975. At the same time, we are losing more than a million acres of farmland per year to urban and industrial expansion and associated needs. These two facts mean a constantly increasing demand for food and fiber from existing farmlands and also sharply increased water needs for all purposes.

Recent population estimates show South Dakota gaining only 12.9 percent by 1975 compared to a national increase of 35 percent. That means many of your young people—your sons and daughters—probably will leave the State for better economic opportunity unless new industry and diversified agricultural opportunities are created here.

You have one of the Nation's most valuable resources flowing through your State. For centuries it has been a liability, alternately flooding many sections of the State and then drying up to the point where it would hardly justify the nickname, "The Big Muddy." River control has been accomplished. The Missouri has been mastered. Potential irrigation, power, and recreation are possible sources of great economic expansion in South Dakota. Future use, as a resource of your State, lies in your hands.

The Challenge of Metropolitan Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 16, 1959, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] delivered a most interesting and educational address before the Citizens Conference on Metropolitan Area Problems, which was held at American University.

In order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the address and benefit from the experienced analysis of our great chairman of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS, TO THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN AREA PROBLEMS, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, JANUARY 16, 1959

Commissioner McLaughlin, President Anderson, and ladies and gentlemen of the Citizens Conference on Washington Area Metropolitan Problems, you are meeting today to consider not only the problems of the National Capital region, but problems typical of our modern America, where some 60 percent of the people live in the 168 standard metropolitan areas. Of this metropolitan population, more than half live in 14 of the 168 areas. Washington is one of them. Of our city dwellers, nearly 9 out of every 10 live in a metropolitan area. The outlook for the future growth of our burgeoning population is for further concentration in a handful of large cities. If we expect in the year 1975 a total population of about 220 million persons, urban areas will have to face the absorption of 50 million more people.

When we speak of metropolitan areas we are talking about large aggregations of population living in politically fragmented areas. The metropolitan trend is a suburban trend. Over the last 10 years, at the rate of 4,000 people a day, our population has moved into the suburbs. That is where 14 million of them have moved since 1948. And again there is no expectation that this trend will slacken.

But it is not with these facts of growth alone but the problems that they imply that conferences like this are concerned. What are some of these problems? The pressure of increasing urban populations against limited natural resources, such as water, is certainly one of them. In my dry section of the country it is probably the principal problem. But even here in the humid East we are concerned with it. The problem of metropolitan mobility is another one. By 1975 there may be 88 million passenger cars and a two- and a three-car family will be commonplace. The shortage of school buildings is evident to everyone who lives in suburban communities. The increase of our school population by approximately one-third or 13 million pupils is expected in all our elementary school population by 1975 and a high school enrollment of 5 million is also contemplated.

These are some of the things that our increasing population will demand if the American standard of living is not to be low-

ered and if the prospect of metropolitan growth is not to be stifled.

I repeat that these are national problems when looked at in their true perspective. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has recently called attention to the need to know more about this vital sector of American life. He has recommended the creation of a broad study commission to survey these emerging problems and how they are affecting our great metropolitan centers. The widespread congressional interest in these matters may be further described. In the last session not less than four bills proposing the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, or, as one Representative phrased it, of "urbiculture," were introduced in the House. Earlier this week Representative OSTERTAG introduced in the House the first of what may be a series of proposals for a study of national metropolitan problems. Senators KENNEDY and CLARK have already voiced their concern with these problems and the need to do something about them in the present session of Congress. Even the President has recognized this need in his message earlier this week.

I think that we can take it, without further demonstration, that the subject of this conference is not only one of national importance but one of congressional concern.

What you are going to discuss here today and tomorrow may seem, to many, a local problem. But I would like to begin by setting it in a broad frame and by reminding you that what is done in Washington will have a far-reaching significance in other metropolitan areas throughout the Nation.

The position of our city as a prototype of the ideal American city, as a pilot plant of metropolitan area government, has frequently been urged upon us, and with good reason. The government of the District of Columbia is a national problem, made such by the Constitution of the United States which confers upon Congress the exclusive legislative jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever for the government of the District of Columbia. It is the inseparable relationship between the government of the District of Columbia and its rapidly growing surrounding area that gives rise to the concern of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems. In the studies of the last year much has been learned of this relationship.

We know, for example, well over half of the area's population is now located outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia. What is more surprising, one-third of the Federal employees in the area are working in establishments located in the environs rather than in the Capital City itself. The Federal Government has tremendously increased its land holdings in the metropolitan region and is today by far the largest single economic factor in all four metropolitan counties. While the entire metropolitan area constitutes one market, of course, I think it is with some interest, in illustrating the dispersal of Federal employees throughout the area, to note that of the Federal payrolls in the fiscal year 1958 which totaled \$1,350 million, nearly 30 percent was paid to those employed in adjacent counties of Maryland and Virginia.

Let me return to the hope that has been voiced over many years that the Federal Government exercise its unique responsibilities in the National Capital region to create an ideal metropolitan area. This has been forcefully stated by Prof. Daniel Grant of Vanderbilt University in the following terms, "If the Federal Government could achieve an effective integration of the government of the District of Columbia with its suburbs by some method also available to other metropolitan areas, the result would be new hope for metropolitan integration the country over." Another scholar, Victor Jones, has urged, "The least that the Federal Govern-

ment should do is to study the problems of its own metropolitan area. Here Congress has exclusive jurisdiction over the central city. The Federal Government has an opportunity and I believe a responsibility to act as a model to the rest of the country by recognizing that the National Capital is a metropolitan community spilling over into several counties and independent cities of two States. It also has an opportunity to develop a model approach to a comprehensive and cooperative study of the problems and to the development of solutions."

My purpose in marshaling these facts and citing these quotations is to inspire and encourage your efforts at this conference by reminding you of its broader significance. Let me now turn to another aspect of this subject which I believe you will also find invigorating.

Washington has an enviable record in recognizing and dealing with the problems of metropolitan growth and expansion, and Congress has been prompt in recognizing the appearance of these problems and supporting enlightened measures for dealing with them. This record over nearly a century is one reason why the creation of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems was a logical and altogether consistent step for Congress to take, and why I believe that the recommendations of the committee in its final report (which will be handed Congress the end of this month) should receive favorable consideration.

Let me review this record. Over a century ago, Congress acted to protect the metropolitan area water supply by creating the Washington Aqueduct, one of the first large-scale regional water supply undertakings in the United States. They planned on such a large scale that with minor repairs and alterations this system has lasted until the present day, when it provides treated Potomac water not only for the District of Columbia and the whole of Arlington County, but for other local and intermittent needs as well. In 1902 the Senate Park Commission, headed by Senator McMillan, of Michigan, drew together a team of outstanding national figures who produced the great McMillan Report which retrieved the original conception of the Capital city left by our Founding Fathers from its 19th century obscurity and laid the foundations for the Capital city that we know today. The National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission, to say nothing of innumerable parks, monuments, and building projects all derive from the McMillan Commission Report. This is well known. But it is not so well recognized that the scope of the Commission's work was not limited to the National Capital but extended up the Potomac River to Great Falls and down the Potomac to embrace that great historic shrine, Mount Vernon.

Large portions of the metropolitan area also acted independently to deal with the problems of metropolitan growth in an orderly fashion. This was conspicuously true in 1918 when the Maryland Legislature established the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and a few years later the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. For the Maryland portion of the suburban area these two agencies have rendered invaluable service. Today it is apparent that they have not only helped plan the orderly development of the Maryland suburbs but by the provision of waterlines and sanitary sewers have tended to structure the development of these areas in such a way that they are inherently more economical to provide with local government services than would otherwise have been the case, and is tragically the case in so many suburban areas in American cities. A good beginning in the same direction has also been made in Virginia through the establishment of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning

Commission, which this year is being greatly strengthened. Our committee has contemplated the proposed establishment of a Northern Virginia Sanitation Authority as a natural and beneficial step.

In 1952 Washington became the second metropolitan area in the United States to establish an official regional planning agency. In 1955 Congress authorized the creation of a metropolitan area mass transportation survey which, in method and in boldness of conception, has already set the pace for similar studies in other areas.

The organization of the Washington Metropolitan Conference, under the leadership of Commissioner McLaughlin, 2 years ago, was a major step forward in developing a political organization that reflects the interests of local governments throughout the area. It has other characteristics which are unique and valuable. These include the membership in the conference of the State legislative delegations in Maryland and Virginia. (I was interested to read in last week's New York Times a proposal to strengthen the only other comparable metropolitan body in the United States, the New York Metropolitan Conference, in a report prepared by Prof. Wallace Sayre of Columbia University. His recommendations impress me as mild, indeed, compared with the role for the conference proposed by our committee's own staff consultants.)

May I claim, too, the establishment and activities of our own Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems as another milestone in metropolitan area progress. There have been, of course, other studies of a broadly similar nature in other American cities. But, I know of none that compares to what we have undertaken—in its unique combination of broad scope and the consideration of metropolitan areawide problems and solutions in an institutional sense, and considerable depth in the analysis of the specific problems selected by the committee for detailed study.

Earlier I have referred to the final report of our committee which will be given Congress the end of this month. The committee also proposes to continue its work through the summer in order to receive the report of the mass transportation survey and hold such hearings on it as may be necessary. When that remaining task has been completed, our work is done. But, however useful, the report of a temporary committee is far from all that is needed if our enduring metropolitan problems are to yield to continuous attack. We need, both in Congress and in this community, organizations that will bring continuity to our efforts to deal with area problems. In this very real sense, it is up to you, the people who have demonstrated their interest in working on these continuing problems by your attendance here. The many legislative acts and administrative decisions required by regional problems will gain unity if there is a regionwide and fully representative citizens organization at work in this field. At the least, let me voice the hope there will be further regional conferences of this sort.

This record of metropolitan progress, taken as a whole, is one, I claim, that any American metropolitan area would take pride in, and sets a high mark for our present and future efforts. In particular, it allows me to hope that we have already made substantial progress toward the goal of that municipal ideal and national example that we have been urged to create.

Now from these heights where, in the role assigned me as keynoter of your conference, I have tried to look ahead and behind and to either side, to provide a framework for your deliberations, and to inspire your efforts, let me descend briefly to the level where you

will find yourself working in the next 2 days. I would like to say a word or two about the political problems of the National Capital region. Many of the things people want to accomplish cannot be achieved through existing local governments. Many of the things that metropolitan growth and expansion require, if indeed growth is not to be frustrated altogether, are beyond the capacity of the existing instrumentalities of government. We must choose whether to take the necessary forward step and create new institutions of government that can deal with problems on a regional scale, or to submit to the consequences of inaction. These consequences are formidable but the difficulty of moving ahead seems to me to have been exaggerated in most of the solutions that have been offered.

I can concur with those who believe that a general purpose regional authority is too remote from the people to be a realistic solution to what is, in the end, a problem of local government. I also share the fears of those who object to the proliferation of a number of separate functional authorities and special districts, lacking relationship to each other or to the established local governments of cities and counties in the region.

The opportunity which is open—in theory, at least—in most American cities, of annexing the adjacent suburban development or of consolidating cities and counties, appears to me barred by the provisions of our written Constitution. The course of retrocession, ardently urged by Professor Franchino of the Georgetown University Law School, on the precedent of the retrocession of Arlington County to Virginia in 1846, also seems to me politically unlikely, to say the least.

I suspect that in this area we will have to find some new means of organizing to undertake the unique tasks of metropolitan government. I suggest that the eventual solution should be one in which local interests can find effective representation, giving them not only a voice, but some control. I am sure that, given the unique congressional responsibility for our central city in the District of Columbia, and the great and growing Federal interest in the surrounding area, the desirable structure of regional government must be one in which the Federal interest will be effectively represented.

Perhaps this does not sound like the tidy administrative conceptions that have been offered in some metropolitan areas of the United States, and chiefly by those concerned with administrative efficiency and economy. It does not pretend to respond merely to those aims. Earlier I said that, "Many of the things people want to accomplish cannot be achieved through existing local governments." The reason we have governments is to allow people to do things, some of them perhaps unreasonable things, but things which are wanted and often desperately wanted to reflect their ambitions, to support their standard of living, to enrich their life. The glowing words of our great national documents were not written to voice platitudes but the aspirations of a free people. We have now become an urban people and our destiny now must be worked out in urban terms. It will not be easy. Politics never is. The result in the end may not be neat. That is not the way of legislation. But I am supremely confident that the forces of modern life, as we see them written here typically in the Washington metropolitan area, cannot be denied, and in finding expression for them I am equally confident that even in this unfortunately disfranchised central city, the dominant interests of our people will seek and find appropriate recognition.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, the Pathfinder of the Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one of the most erudite Members of the Senate and one of its greatest students of history is the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

On last Monday, January 19, the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the Senator from Virginia delivered a beautiful and most informative address on Matthew Fontaine Maury, "The Pathfinder of the Seas," to the Albemarle Chapter, No. 1, United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Charlottesville, Va. In his address the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] not only gave us a picture of Maury and of his monumental work, but he also spoke words of appreciation of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

The Senator's paternal grandfather was a captain of infantry in the Stonewall Brigade and was killed at the bloody Battle of Cold Harbor. His maternal grandfather and nine of his grandfather's brothers served in the Army of Northern Virginia under General Lee, and five of them were killed.

In 1922 the junior Senator from Virginia, as a member of the State Senate of Virginia, sponsored a bill to provide for the erection of a monument to Matthew Fontaine Maury in his beloved Goshen Pass. The legislature passed the bill and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] was named chairman of the commission to select the monument and to arrange the exercises for its dedication. The dedication took place in 1923 and was a historic occasion.

The Senator from Virginia is himself a veteran of World War I, in which he served with honor and distinction.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Senator's eloquent address on Matthew Fontaine Maury printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON BEFORE THE ALBEMARLE CHAPTER, No. 1, UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., JANUARY 19, 1959

My life, as most of you well know, has been lived within the shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains. By inheritance, environment, and training, I am devoted to the memory of Confederate leaders and the principles of government for which they made sacrifices, never surpassed in the history of our Nation.

No one in the South could be more grateful than I for the wonderful work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in preserving the memory of southern leaders. In doing so, they have not only helped to perpetuate in the hearts of all sons and daughters of the Confederacy the principles of States rights for which men like Lee, Jackson,

and Maury made great personal sacrifices, but the Daughters of the Confederacy, through high idealism, and in refusing to admit that it was a lost cause, have set a standard of true greatness which both our Nation and the world have finally been willing to accept.

In all of recorded history, there never was a nobler man than Robert E. Lee and none who has left a greater imprint upon succeeding generations. Yet, shortly before his death, Lee, in his great humility, indicated he felt he had done nothing worthwhile saying. "Life is gliding away and I have nothing to show for mine. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God." There is at least one historian who still lists Lee as a failure simply because he was the commander in chief of an army that suffered total defeat and the leader of a cause which that historian listed as a lost cause. But most historians, including the great Virginian, Douglas Southall Freeman, and the people generally of the entire Nation endorse the opinion of Lee expressed by Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, when he said: "He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without vices, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guilt. He was Caesar without his ambition, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant and royal in authority as a king. He was as gentle as a woman in life, pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestal, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

Military experts throughout the world now rank Lee as one of the greatest military leaders of the English speaking peoples and second only to him, Thomas J. Stonewall Jackson, the great lieutenant on whom Lee so heavily relied. In the quiet and reserved VMI professor, in the consecrated Presbyterian deacon, who each Sunday morning taught a class of Negro slaves, no one in Lexington could visualize the military genius later to be displayed by Jackson in his famous valley campaign. Even his own soldiers at first misunderstood him. They thought him harsh, even cruel; but as their experience increased they recognized the wisdom of his severity and when they looked upon that kindly face, grave and determined as it was, they realized how closely his firmness was allied to tenderness. No one could, like him, unless it was Napoleon, establish and maintain discipline worthy of the best in the Anglo-Saxon nature, which had honor for its principle and glory for its reward. From him his soldiers and the people of his Southland learned the self-denial, which is the root of all religion, the self-control which is the root of all manliness. It was this discipline which enabled the first brigade to turn the tide of battle at Bull Run, or first Manassas. McDowell's men were carrying all before them and by an impetuous rush had carried Henry Hill which was a commanding point in the very center of the Confederate lines and the key of the battle-ground. Bee, Bartow, Evans, and Hampton were driven in and Jackson alone stood fast. General Bee, with his hat off, his sword in hand, covered with dust and his horse foaming, dashed up to Jackson and said: "General, they are beating us back." "Then, sir, we will give them the bayonet," said Jackson, as his thin lips closed like a vise. Bee, inspired by Jackson's confidence, galloped back to his broken lines and shouted: "Look, there is Jackson, standing like a stone wall. Rally behind the Virginians."

Notwithstanding military achievements of Confederate leaders which in themselves are proof of greatness, the United Daughters of

the Confederacy have taught the South and the Nation the fundamental truth that true greatness is not based upon physical strength, political power, mental brilliancy, or accumulated wealth, but rather upon the type of sacrificial service that a man renders to his day and generation. Their test of unselfish love and devotion to duty as applied to our Confederate leaders goes beyond the political idealism of Pericles' tribute to the young men of Athens when he said: "So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives." * * *

Jackson gave his life for the cause and as a professional soldier who had suffered a major defeat it would have been easier for Lee to have done likewise because it will be recalled that he said shortly before he surrendered at Appomattox: "How easily I could be rid of this and be at rest. I have only to ride along the line and all will be over. But it is our duty to live. What will become of the women and children of the South if we are not here to protect them?" It was in that devotion to duty, to protect the women and children of the South and to train the youth of the South to repair the ravages of a fraternal war that Lee made his greatest contribution not only to his day and generation but to all succeeding generations.

We are now in a period when the heritage of constitutional liberty in which both North and South believed, although they were divided on how it should be preserved, is threatened anew by so-called liberals at home, who wittingly or not would take us down the road to socialism, and by Communists abroad who threaten to impose their will by force upon a free world. Therefore, for the preservation at home of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers we have never had a greater need to be reminded of the example set us by Confederate leaders like Lee, Jackson, and Maury.

We also live in a time when men are challenging the statement of the Roman philosopher, Seneca: "There is no easy road from the earth to the stars." Rockets are shot into outer space and brought back with data which scientists assure us will chart a pathway through the skies. Manmade missiles have penetrated beyond the moon and our Government is appropriating millions of dollars to continue these studies and experiments. Hence, the appropriateness of the request of your program committee that I speak primarily tonight concerning the greatest scientist of the Confederacy, Matthew Fontaine Maury. While these annual celebrations normally are held on January 19, the well-known birthday of the immortal Lee, it perhaps is not so well known that the birthday of Maury was January 14 and that of Jackson, January 21. Like Lee and Jackson, Maury's claim to immortality rests more securely upon his qualities of Christian character and his unselfish and constructive contributions to humanity than upon public recognition of his scientific achievements.

Maury was born in Spottsylvania County, Va., January 14, 1806. He entered the Navy as a midshipman in 1825 but 14 years later, when he was 33, he was thrown from the top of a stagecoach, having yielded his seat in the coach to a lady, and suffered a permanent lameness, which disqualified him for

further active service at sea. In 1841 he was placed in charge of the Depot of Charts and Instruments, out of which grew the U.S. Naval Observatory and the Hydrographic Office. The weekly reports published by the Hydrographic Office in Washington are headed with this statement: "Founded upon the research made and the data collected by Lt. M. F. Maury, U.S. Navy." This is a recognition paid to no other naval officer.

When he was only 25 years old, Maury became convinced that the waves, the winds, the storms, the currents, the depths and temperatures of the sea constituted a system so mathematically interrelated that the mind of man could understand its phenomena and forecast its processes. The Prophet Job had written an explanation of God's power "Which alone spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea." Then David had written Maury's favorite passage, in the 107th Psalm:

"For He commandeth, and raiseth the stormy wind, which lifteth up the waves thereof. They mount up to the heaven, they go down again to the depths; their soul is melted because of trouble. They reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and are at their wit's end. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, and He bringeth them out of their distresses. He maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still."

The young Maury was firmly convinced that the same God who had made nature's laws for the dry land which man was beginning to understand also made them for the waters of the earth which likewise, through patient study and observance, could be understood. And so it was that Maury was able to discover the tradewinds and the ocean currents which reduced weeks of sailing time in Atlantic waters, and around the Cape of Good Hope to the Pacific, resulting in savings of millions of dollars to American shippers. Because of that monumental work, Maury was given the sobriquet "The Pathfinder of the Seas."

Maury's pinnacle moment was yet to come. His system of sea lanes had been utilized chiefly by American ships, his coworkers being chiefly Americans, but Maury wanted all nations to cooperate with the U.S. observatory for the benefit of the maritime interests of the whole world. So, he called an international conference to meet in Brussels in August 1853. That might properly be termed the first League of Nations. It included Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, France, Portugal, Great Britain, and the United States—representing 95 percent of the shipping of the world. The conference lasted 16 days. Maury's charts were unanimously adopted, and for the next 50 years those nations cooperated in exchanging maritime information along the lines proposed by Maury. But typical of Maury's modesty in declining to accept the presidency of the league was the reply he made to the praise that was given to the value of his scientific research: "I am extremely grateful for the sympathy you have expressed and the praise you have been pleased to bestow on my humble efforts. On my part I beg to thank you for the kind assistance that you have afforded me. Allow me to add that we are taking part in a proceeding to which we should vainly seek for a parallel in history. Heretofore, when naval officers of different nations met in such numbers, it was to deliberate at the cannons' mouths upon the most efficacious means of destroying the human species. Today, on the contrary, we see assembled the delegates of almost every maritime nation for the noble purpose of serving humanity by seeking to render navigation more and more secure. I think, gentlemen, we may congratulate ourselves with pride upon the opening of this new era."

Time will not permit me to enumerate the details of Maury's remarkable career but

they can be summarized by saying that in addition to founding the Naval Observatory, his magazine articles resulted in the founding of the U.S. Naval Academy, he furnished the data necessary for the laying of the first transatlantic cable and he was the real father of the Weather Bureau which grew out of his recommendations to the Government when he was a professor of physics at the Virginia Military Institute.

Maury had formulated the plan for the weather bureau for the benefit of farmers as well as mariners when he was head of the naval observatory but war came before he could perfect his plans. We find this significant statement, however, in one of his sailing directions to accompany the wind and current charts published in 1858: "As much as we have accomplished at sea, more yet can be accomplished through the magnetic telegraph on land. With a properly devised system of meteorological observations to be made at certain stations wherever the telegraph spreads its meshes, and to be reported daily by telegrams to a properly organized office, the shipping in the harbors of our seaport towns, the husbandman in the field, and the traveler on the road may all be warned of every extensive storm that visits our shores and while yet it is a great way off."

When Virginia seceded from the Union in 1861, Maury, like Lee, threw in his lot with the South and became head of coasts, harbors, and river defenses. He invented the electric torpedo for harbor defenses and because of his international fame as a scientist, President Jefferson Davis sent him to England in 1862 to procure torpedo materials. Maury remained in England until 1868 where he received signal honors, including an honorary degree from Cambridge. Both Russia and France offered him the directorship of their imperial observatories. But Maury loved his native Virginia, and like Lee, he felt he owed a duty to the youth of the South. So, turning down offers that would have meant international fame as a scientist, a life of wealth and ease, Maury returned to a professorship at VMI where he labored for the rest of his life seeking to solve the riddles of nature, particularly for the benefit of the farmer in connection with weather reports and passing on to younger men his thirst for scientific knowledge.

In utilizing his chair of physics as a sounding board for a national program in behalf of a weather bureau, Maury overtaxed his strength. Returning from a lecture in St. Louis, he knew that his career was near its close. He knew that the task of interpreting nature in terms of help rather than of hindrance for mankind had been permanently advanced by his efforts. The end came quietly on February 1, 1873. "Do I drag my anchors?" he asked with a smile. "Yes," said his son. "All is well," he replied.

Maury loved the beauty of Goshen Pass and his last wish was that he be carried through the pass when the Rhododendron and Laurel were in bloom. It was the flowers that blossom in Goshen Pass in the spring that he wished placed upon his coffin body as the last and only tribute of affection:

"Wait till the Laurel bursts its buds,
And creeping ivy flings its graces
About the lichen'd rocks, and floods
Of sunshine fill the shady places.

"Then, when the sky, the air, the grass,
Sweet nature all, is glad and tender,
Then bear me through the Goshen Pass
Amid its flush of May-day splendor."

Careless of monument by the grave he built it in the world—a monument by which man might be taught to remember not where he died but where he lived.

Maury was truly, as Dr. C. Alphonso Smith said at the dedication of the Goshen Pass monument, "founder of a new science, pilot

of every ship that sails and herald of a new era of international cooperation."

If we of the present generation join with the Daughters of the Confederacy in Charlottesville and throughout our beloved Commonwealth in being true to the principles of Lee, Jackson, and Maury, there will undoubtedly be heard again the Bull Run battle cry, "Rally behind the Virginians."

The Food Crisis of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Floyd E. Dominy, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, stated on January 20, 1959, before the Kansas Conservation Contractors Association in Hutchinson, Kans., that "Kansas is confronted with an obligation to the Nation and to the world." In his excellent address before this organization he stressed the growth of population, both in the Nation and in the world, together with increased demands for food that must be met within the next few decades.

Kansas will play an important part in this program, but in my opinion our part in the program will be largely determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes.

We have made great progress, but there is much more work to be done in controlling the water runoff of our State. With increased water supplies both for agriculture and industry, Kansas will be in a position to maintain its place among the States of the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Dominy's address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FOOD CRISIS OF HUMANITY

(Address by Associate Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, Bureau of Reclamation, before the Kansas Conservation Contractors Association in Hutchinson, Kans., Jan. 20, 1959)

I was a little astonished, on receiving the invitation of your association to address this meeting tonight, to read that a suggested topic was "The Food Crisis of Humanity."

Here in the center of the Wheat Belt where, every year, we grow more grain to put in more warehouses with more subsidy from Uncle Sam to finance the growing of more wheat, in a seemingly endless circle, it may seem strange to be talking about a food crisis. Nevertheless, there is a continuing crisis which sends a good share of the world's population to bed hungry every night. You people are to be congratulated on your interest and foresight in discussing this problem even though it seemingly has no immediate relationship to your situation here.

A century and a half ago, the Reverend Thomas Robert Malthus forecast a catastrophe for the human race. He contended that, in time, the rise of population would ultimately overtake and pass the food supply.

His prophecy brought consternation to the world of his day. Then the industrial and agricultural revolution so stimulated food

production that the Malthusian theory fell into disrepute, and its author with it.

Today, some economists, sociologists, and demographers—the people who forecast population trends—are finding many reasons for believing that the theory might yet come true. These people figure old Malthus was a pretty smart fellow, just a few centuries ahead of his day.

The world is divided between optimists and pessimists. When the pessimists examine the present world crisis in food, they become prophets of doom, subscribers to the Malthus theory. I prefer to be an optimist—I prefer to believe that man will continue to find ways to solve his problems.

But an optimist would be foolish to be little or run away from reality. The reality is potentially ominous and spells out the gravity of the problem. A genuine crisis in food supply does confront the world. It is here—now—not in the future. It is real. The United States, the land of plenty has no immediate shortages but we must share world responsibility. And we must also keep an eye on that future time when our population growth outstrips our farm productive capacity and we become a potential land of want. As an optimist, I prefer to think that day will never come. As a realist, I prefer to take steps to insure that it does not come.

I think you will be interested in some figures that will indicate where present trends are carrying us.

In 1650, the world population was somewhere around 600 million. During the next 300 years, this population more than quadrupled to 2,700 million. The current trends are still upward—and from a constantly broadening base. Some demographers foresee another quadrupling within the next 100 years. There may well be 9 billion people in the world by the year 2050.

Put the problem in different and current terms. Population growth is the difference between births and deaths. Since this hour last night, the world population has increased by 123,000 hungry mouths. Since this hour last night the net increase in U.S. population is 8,000, or roughly one-fourth the population of Hutchinson, Kans.

Simple multiplication, at such rates, produces frightening totals. Within just 4 years the world population will increase by about 175 million people, the equivalent of the present United States population. The present world population of 2,700 million would nearly double in about 40 years, and the United States in the year 2000 would have more than 300 million citizens.

Now, all of this multiplication needs to be put into frames of reference to our topic tonight. The figures are meaningful if related to ability to produce food, fiber, and fuel, to standards of living, and to levels of subsistence.

Without assuming the role of pessimist, it can be stated simply that some 60 percent of the present inhabitants of the world are undernourished—certainly one-third of them seriously so. Peter Drucker, the economist, has pointed out that three-fourths of the world population have only one-tenth of the world's goods and income. Conversely, the North American Continent, with less than one-tenth of the population, enjoys up to three-fourths of the world's income and goods.

This gap between the underdeveloped portions of the globe and the more favored areas is not narrowing; rather it is widening—even in the last 10 years. The have-nots are getting less food and income and the haves are getting more. The effect must be that the 60 percent of people who are existing on less than 2,200 calories a day are those who day by day are being forced to drop further below the subsistence level.

Decline in death rates, rather than increase in births, is making the big difference in present population growth in the under-

developed lands. Each time these countries take a step forward in public health measures their population soars. In Ceylon, after the jungles were sprayed with DDT to reduce the incidence of malaria and other diseases of the tropics, the death rate dropped nearly 35 percent in 2 years. Food production remained constant. So in a few years famine struck. Once again population growth had outstripped food supply.

However, we should not limit ourselves to the underdeveloped areas in considering future food and population balance. The United States, for example, requires sustenance for 3 million additional people every year. Yet every year the United States is experiencing the loss of more than 1 million acres annually that hitherto had been devoted to agricultural production. Despite this annual loss in productive acres, our total area in farms has been relatively the same for the last 40 years, thanks to diligent efforts by private and public enterprise to bring new lands into production. Parenthetically, I might remark that the lands brought under irrigation or given supplemental water supplies by the Bureau of Reclamation have been averaging about 175,000 acres a year.

In spite of the annual land loss to new roads, industries, and community expansions, the United States continues to be a Nation having surpluses of certain foods. This paradox is caused partly because of technological advances in plant breeding, in mechanization, and in uses of insecticides, pesticides, and fertilizers. As an outstanding "have" Nation insofar as food supply is concerned, we Americans owe a real debt of gratitude to our soil scientists and to our free agriculture and its related businesses and producer cooperatives.

I am sure that most of you in this group are aware that the United States' production per acre has increased sharply during the last 2 decades. But it is also a matter of record that the rate of increase of production was greater during the earlier decade than in the second; in fact, the rate of increase during the last 10 years has been only about two-thirds that of the preceding period.

The Agricultural Research Service, the source of this comparison, adds that the rate of increase of crop production per acre per year must be more than twice the increase experienced during the last 10 years. If we are to meet our requirements by 1975. In the face of our glutted warehouses of basic agricultural commodities, this observation is generally unknown or unappreciated.

Commenting on these statistics, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the 1958 National Rivers and Harbors Congress, declared:

"Even if we are able to increase our total farm land 30 million acres by 1975, the rate of increase in crop production until then must be 50 percent greater than the rate of increase in the last 10 years. Furthermore, this projection of 30 million additional acres of farm land by 1975 is predicated upon the assumption that 5 million of these new acres will be irrigated.

"That is more new land than the Bureau of Reclamation has brought under irrigation during its 56 years of existence. Therefore, it is plain to see that if we are to meet 1975 and subsequent conditions we must have more land under cultivation, or the rate of increase in production per acre per year will have to be far greater than it has been in recent years."

We get concurrence from a Department of Agriculture source. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, has said:

"In our time we shall see the rising population and the dwindling amounts of farm land meet. From that day on, you and your

children can no longer be assured of the healthy balanced diet to which we have become accustomed."

This is the situation that portends here in food-rich America. Robert C. Cook, Director of the Population Reference Bureau, emphatically summarizes what it means. Said Dr. Cook: "The population bomb is as great a threat to mankind as the nuclear bomb. Fortunately, its fuse is longer."

Now, what are the implications that would particularly concern and interest this gathering? One long-range effect is extremely significant in this area, dominated as it is by production of grain and livestock. That is, that production of domestic animals for work purposes is a luxury that the world ultimately will not be able to afford. In the future—and I hope it is in the far, far distant future—production of domestic animals for meat consumption purposes may follow the same course to oblivion. Even today, in industrialized and rich western Europe, beefsteak from a prime steer is almost a rarity.

Dr. J. Murray Luck, Stanford University biochemist, points out that cattle, sheep, poultry, and swine consume about three times the amount of food calories that are consumed by man. Only a small part of this is food refuse, unfit for human consumption. In a world of 9 billion people, it seems certain that the number of domestic animals raised for meat will be reduced. Mankind may have to go more largely to a cereal diet with the amino acids of the animal proteins being substituted by laboratory synthesis. Again I emphasize the hope that any such substitute for a good beefsteak is a long way off.

Dr. Luck also reminds us that less than one-tenth of the earth's land area of 36 billion acres is under cultivation, and one-sixth of the earth's land surface is now used as pasture. Some of the pastureland and another billion acres of marginal land in the north and in the tropics could conceivably be brought into cultivation in the coming world struggle against hunger. Through such recourse to lands not now cultivated, existing techniques would permit possibly a doubling of world food production. But even this increase will hardly keep up with exploding population increases.

Says Dr. Luck:

"To feed 9 billion people in the year 2050, even at minimum levels, it is reasonably certain that vast sums will have to be expended in land reclamation, in the prevention of further erosion, in the manufacture of fertilizers, in the husbanding of nitrogenous and phosphorus-containing wastes, and in irrigation and water conservation.

"Domestic animals, whether used for food or for work will be displaced—the former by the synthetic products of the food industry, and the latter by the machine. The harvesting and cropping of food from the oceans and from the fresh waters of the earth will be carried out much more efficiently, and the cultivation of bacteria, yeasts, and photosynthetic algae for human food will be further developed where regional conditions are appropriate."

Aldous Huxley observes that "world output of mineral fertilizers could easily be doubled, with immense benefit especially to backward countries," and that the average wheat yield per acre is less than one-fifth of that of the best farms in the best countries. The world average of milk yield per cow probably could be trebled.

Irrigation, multiplication of the effective yield of grasslands, reduction of loss because of weeds, pests and animal disease, genetics and chemical production of synthetic foodstuffs all are waiting to be exploited, Huxley points out.

He concludes:

"Thus, if we really set our minds, our muscles, and our machines to it, it would clearly be possible, one way or another, to

increase the world's food supply very appreciably in the space of a few decades, and probably to multiply twofold or threefold in the space of a few generations."

Certain measures that can be considered immediate are equally obvious. Foremost among these is irrigation but this, in turn depends upon conservation and wise development and use of our water resources. The United States wastes water flagrantly, and at a time when the water consumption per individual is skyrocketing.

Today's national demand for water—250 billion gallons a day—will be double that amount in 20 years. A possible remedy close to you conservation contractors is the urgent requirement for reducing water loss attributable to seepage, weeds, and phreatophytes. We, as a Nation, cannot afford this deplorable waste; neither can we go on wasting the substance of our lands by letting erosion continue at its present rates.

Current experiments toward enlarging our available water supply are encouraging. In this field are studies to retard evaporation on bodies of stored water; conversion of sea water and brackish water; and means of encouraging greater precipitation from the atmosphere.

Not only in the 17 western reclamation States, of which Kansas is one, but elsewhere in the Nation, there are numerous opportunities for private and public sources to develop both surface and ground waters. Such enterprises takes much time, planning, and money and the year 2000 is really much closer to us than it seems. When we refer to the year 2000, we are expressing concern for the welfare of our own children and grandchildren—and you parents all know how amazingly fast those youngsters grow to adulthood.

The Colorado River storage project, which includes both mainstem storage and participating projects, will require between 30 and 50 years to complete. The Missouri River basin project, from which Kansas benefits, was authorized 15 years ago and only now are we beginning to realize some of the positive benefits by irrigation. Any large scale irrigation on this project is still some years away.

Although requiring fewer years for completion, other smaller reclamation projects also emphasize that the 41 years until the year 2000 is a short span of time because many of those proposed, surveyed, and needed soon, haven't even been authorized.

I am one who believes that the principles on which the Reclamation structure has rooted and grown strong should be perpetuated. I believe in the continuation of the family-size farm as a means of individual agricultural enterprise. I believe in the principle of reimbursability, a credo of Reclamation since its inception in 1902. I believe in the worth to the Nation of reclamation enterprise. I believe—yes, I know—that reclamation projects stabilize, develop, and enhance not only the economy of the local area in which each exists, but also yield important benefits to the respective States and the Nation.

These being my convictions, I remain firmly of the belief that all water resource development groups—private, local, State, and Federal—should cooperate to develop surface waters for agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes at a rate equal to or, if possible, even beyond that of recent experience. The population pressures of our times—to say nothing of the population pressures of the immediate future—should be recognized for the inexorable force that they are.

Meanwhile, urgent water requirements conflicting with the development of irrigated agriculture are with us at this moment. An example is found along the Kansas-Oklahoma border. The city of Wichita has an urgent need for domestic water supply. Co-operatively, the city and the Federal Gov-

ernment are proposing the construction of the Wichita project on the Neenah River. If authorized by the Congress, the Bureau would build the dam and multiple-purpose reservoir, and the city would, in addition to amortizing the cost of the dam, construct the pipelines to deliver water to the urban users.

Other projects along the Kansas-Oklahoma border contain prospects for agricultural developments. These developments will come, just as surely as hopes of a quarter century ago have become realities near the Kansas-Nebraska border. The Kirwin and Webster Units of the Missouri River Basin project on the Solomon River, and the Bostwick Division on the Republican River in Kansas, are new irrigation developments which will diversify dryland agriculture and aid the struggle for adequate diets the world over.

Collectively, these same projects will have facilities by the next crop year to deliver water to about 23,500 acres. Actually, on the Bostwick division in Kansas and the Kirwin unit, about 19,500 acres received irrigation water during 1958.

These Federal projects represent a rather small proportion of the total of irrigated acreage within your State. Kansas State College calculated that the irrigated acreage of the State of Kansas in 1957 was 844,000 acres. This is a total acreage, including lands receiving water from both surface and underground sources, from both gravity and sprinkler applications. It is a rather dramatic threefold increase from the total irrigated acreage in 1949 of only 248,000 acres.

There are prospects for important expansion of irrigation and of food production in Kansas and in others of the semiarid reclamation States. To deal with the problems of the imminent future, however, we should not confine our thinking to the irrigation States. In all of these United States, water for irrigation must compete with demands for water for domestic and industrial purposes, and indeed with water for navigation and for carrying off the wastes of our urban and industrial civilization.

Wise men of the immediate and the more distant future must concern themselves with the problems of competition for the available water supplies. Where water exists as surplus today, these wise men should devote their abilities to the end that the water is put to use, and at least part of it to enhance the productivity of the land.

It is such an approach that is involved in the development of irrigated agriculture outside the semiarid areas of the West. Arkansas' irrigation totaled nearly 900,000 acres in 1956. Florida irrigated 600,000 acres in 1957. Even Iowa has risen to 40,000 irrigated acres, Michigan to 68,000, Missouri to 32,000, South Carolina to 62,000, and Virginia to 37,000 acres. As you know, these are all States of relatively high annual rainfall.

In those areas of the populous East and South in which water can be devoted to agricultural production, some striking production results have been achieved. Gov. George D. Clyde, of Utah, told the recent convention of the National Reclamation Association about some net increases in crop yields in experiments with irrigation. After taking all irrigation costs into account, he said, sweetpotato production in Georgia increased in value about \$400 an acre; tobacco in Virginia increased \$282 per acre; cotton in Missouri \$242 an acre, and even pasture land in Tennessee gained in value by \$122 an acre.

Kansas is confronted by an obligation to the Nation and the world. It is blessed by having productive land, precipitation which is adequate for agriculture during most years, and water supplies which are greater than are needed in some places for current municipal, industrial, and irrigation demands.

You contractors, whose purpose is to assist residents of this State to conserve their water and land resources, should be among the first to accept Kansas' obligations for leadership in this coming battle against worldwide hunger.

Kansas is likely to be spared some of the greater problems inherent in population growth—the concomitant urbanization and industrial pressures that now confound smaller States and those with less productive soil and water. This really is a most fortuitous position. You Kansans have the opportunity and the responsibility to use your most abundant resources to help others who have and will have more complex and greater population pressures.

You might be distracted by the shibboleth—yes, shibboleth—of grain surpluses. Such surpluses, today and more so in the future, are transitory, even so far as United States needs are concerned. Right now, your grain production seems to be a problem to yourselves and to the National Government.

In the light of world needs, take pride in your 1958 production, overwhelming as it was. Take pride, and hope that future years will be as productive: In your winter wheat yield of 291 million bushels, 54 percent above the average; your record grain sorghum yield of 129 million bushels; your record soybean crop of 9.3 million bushels; your corn and your alfalfa hay crops, one-third and two-thirds greater respectively than the 10-year average for Kansas.

In the interests of conservation—of husbanding of Kansas' soil and water—each of you bears his individual obligation to mankind. The conservation work you perform now will help assure bountiful harvests for future generations.

Thank you for your courtesy in extending to me this invitation, and my very best wishes to you in your present and future efforts to develop the abundant soil and water resources of the great State of Kansas.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two speeches which I recently delivered before groups interested in highway construction. The first one was given December 1, 1958, at San Francisco before the American Association of State Highway Officials and the second one, January 19, 1959, before the American Road Builders Association in Dallas, Tex.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS AHEAD

(Remarks of U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, ranking Republican member, Senate Subcommittee on Roads, at 44th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, San Francisco, Calif.)

Roadbuilding in the United States is the outstanding example of a working partnership between the several States and the Federal Government. You are the people who carry out the program of that partnership. We Members of Congress may write

the charter of the partnership—but if the program is to be successful, the terms and the modifications must be based upon an understanding of the conditions which you encounter at the grassroots of action.

That is why, Mr. President, your representatives are so welcome at congressional hearings. It is also why we welcome these opportunities to rub shoulders and exchange views with you at these annual meetings of your association. All of us have our responsibilities in the partnership.

To illustrate the responsibilities of partnership or teamwork in a negative way, I like the story told me by an old prospector friend in the Black Hills. His search for the elusive El Dorado took him, some years ago, into the northern part of Canada. There he employed as guide a native who was part Indian, part French in blood.

The guide told him one night that they were near the place where the British Hudson Bay Company had lost a fur trader some years before. The trader had died during a hard winter and those with him buried his body in the frozen earth. Next summer, the Hudson Bay Company sent a party into the northlands in an effort to find the grave and recover the body. They employed some of the natives to assist them. The guide of my prospector friend, however, was employed that time not as a guide, but as a cook.

The party searched for several weeks in vain. They did not recover the body of the lost fur trader. My prospector friend from the Black Hills said to his half-breed guide, "That was sure too bad. I wonder where he could have been buried."

"Oh," the guide said to him, "You want to see the grave? I show you."

"What," my prospector friend said, "Do you know where it is?"

"Sure do," the guide replied, "I show you."

"But," my friend said, "Why didn't you lead the Hudson Bay party to it?"

"Oh," his guide came back, "On that trip I not hired to guide. My job to cook, so I cook, not guide."

DIFFERENT APPROACH NEEDED

Needless to say, such an approach to a Federal-State partnership in roadbuilding would leave many problems unsolved. Unless there be an understanding at the Federal legislative level of your problems in the field at the roadbuilding level, and at your end an understanding of our legislative problems, and at both levels a spirit of, and freedom in, teamwork, we would not get the job done. That there has been good progress, outstanding progress in the past year on all Federal-aid systems is evidence of excellent understanding and teamwork.

During the last session of Congress, three bills were passed which were the result of outstanding teamwork, teamwork within our congressional committees, teamwork with the Bureau of Public Roads, and teamwork with the highway officials of the several States. The three were:

1. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.
2. The General Highway Act of 1958, which codifies and brings together all of the Federal highway legislation in one compact statute.
3. The act to amend the Federal Aid Act of 1958 by extending for an additional year, 1960, the estimate of costs on the Interstate System so that apportionments could be made for the customary biennium.

This last act would not have been passed without the help given by your association officers in bringing out the inconvenience and delay that would have been created in the several States had the many legislatures which meet in January not known the Federal aid apportionment for the second year of the biennium for which they customarily provide.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT AID ACT NOTABLE

In addition to the usual features of the regular biennial Federal aid act, the first bill that I cited, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 was notable, I think, for these things:

1. Acceptance of the new cost estimates as the basis for making apportionments of funds for the Interstate System. That was a definite break from the old area-mileage-population basis.
2. Establishment of a modified form of bill-board regulation on the new right-of-way portions of the Interstate System.
3. Creation of the emergency fund of \$400 million for auxiliary construction of roads not on the Interstate System, the so-called "D" fund of the Bureau which States might use on the other Federal aid systems in the way best calculated to meet their emergency needs with matching "L" funds advanced, if needed, on an automatic repayment or deduction basis.
4. Provision for hearings for rural people on highway locations, giving them the same right previously accorded bypassed towns and cities.

Those were all notable legislative accomplishments, I think, and they reflected teamwork in the field of roadbuilding for the United States.

NEW PROBLEMS AHEAD

The coming session of Congress opening in January will bring some very definite problems. On them we will need your counsel and help. Of many that might be mentioned, I shall discuss briefly three:

1. Adequate financing for the trust fund.
2. A demand for greater highway safety.
3. Requests by States for recognition of money they have put into free roads and toll roads that are on the Interstate System.

I will take them up in reverse order.

First, then, as to the requests by States for recognition of the money they have put into both free roads and toll roads that have become a part of the Interstate System.

I must frankly admit that I did not realize the importance of this matter to some States until I drove to New York, up the Thruway, and into Connecticut and into Massachusetts and saw what splendid and expensive modern highways were being or had been built on the initiative of those States without getting apportionments on a 90-to-10 basis of Federal aid, yet which would be parts of the Interstate System.

In New York, for example, I was told that 540 miles of the 1,210 miles of Interstate in that State, are on that toll road—a project with a construction cost of \$800 million absorbed into the Federal system without earning as of this time any credit in the apportionments to that State. Also, that an additional \$100 million would be put into bridges and traffic separations as a part of the Interstate System but financed by tolls and getting no recognition in apportionments.

In Kansas, I am told, one-half of her toll road system is similarly incorporated into the Interstate System without reimbursement. And a similar point could be made for toll roads in New Jersey, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana.

INTEGRATION OF STATE ROADS

But if this point can be made for States with toll roads that are incorporated into the Interstate System without reimbursement, what about the same States and other States which see many miles of roads that have been paid for on a regular 50-50 matching basis and are put into the system without either tolls or apportionment to reimburse the States? Obviously, they are entitled to consideration, too.

During a hearing on this matter, last spring, we were told by the Bureau of Public Roads that \$4.83 billion would be required

to reimburse the several States if they were to be reimbursed at this time for the depreciated value of all the roads, toll and free, that are being made a part of the Interstate System.

That figure illustrates the difficulty of doing anything with the problem at this time. It would take the funds equal to 2 years of past apportionments to fully reimburse the States on that basis. I am sure that no one wants to suspend the construction program for 2 years in order to do that.

The Bureau of Public Roads, however, is under a congressional directive to report to the next Congress on possible formulas for reimbursement. While recognizing there is merit in the principle of reimbursement, I for one believe we cannot accept any formula which would interrupt or delay the construction program now underway. I hope your association will feel the same way about it.

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPORTANT

A second problem which I predict will receive increasing attention in Congress is that of highway safety. Public opinion will not forever tolerate the casualty lists that papers carry today of fatalities and injuries due to highway accidents.

In the last Congress, no less than 30 bills were introduced which proposed to deal with highway safety in one way or another. Five of them proposed studies and investigations—notwithstanding the parts of existing law which place upon the Bureau of Public Roads the responsibility for a continuing study of accidents and efforts to reduce them by methods of design and construction.

The Bureau of Public Roads has studied and analyzed and is installing electronic equipment better to catalog types and causes of accidents—but no mere classifying of accidents is going to correct the situation unless we have the courage to enact necessary legislation at State and Federal levels.

Three separate bills proposed requiring safety belts to be installed on automobiles sold in interstate commerce. Three others proposed speed limitations with speedometer control or other devices.

One bill would sanction interstate compacts to promote highway safety while another would encourage the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the several States. Another would require luminous buttons or strips on freight cars in an effort to prevent broadside crashes into trains stopped at or passing highway crossings. Another would reward acts of heroism by drivers of motor vehicles under carrier regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This review does not exhaust the list or the approaches to the problem but should suffice to indicate a growing consciousness on the part of Members of Congress that something should be done to reduce the accidents that, in round figures, are killing 40,000 people a year in the United States and injuring three to four times that number, with a terrible cost in pain, suffering, lost time, broken families, maimed and crippled people—to say nothing of high insurance rates.

STUDIES UNDERWAY

Executive agencies are making studies of accidents. In addition to the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads under section 117 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 in attempting to classify accidents by types, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has completed 1 year of fieldwork in an effort to evaluate national well-being in terms of highway accidents.

I am told that these studies bring out a lack of uniformity in definition and reporting of accidents and their causes. The Bureau of Public Roads is trying to get statistics on a fairly uniform basis from 11

States. This data will be put through an electronic high-speed computer in an attempt to determine accident rates by speed, type of vehicle and kind of driver. An intensive accident investigation project is underway at Northwestern University. The President's Committee for Traffic Safety plans to present legislative needs to the several State legislatures.

These steps are all to the good—but it is becoming increasingly clear, I believe, that mechanical devices in the cars and safety designs in highway construction will not of themselves prevent many of the most tragic accidents which are catalogued under the head of reckless driving.

I was impressed some months ago to see an article in the Saturday Evening Post with this title: "We Jail Drunken Drivers." The article was by Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California—so in the State which is host to this convention, I offer my commendation for his frank statement of a policy which other States might well adopt.

DRUNKEN DRIVING

Somehow since the repeal of the Prohibition amendment it has seemed to be regarded as politically unethical to propose legislation to deal with excessive use of liquor and dangerous to report that an accident in early morning hours was due to careless driving by a drunken driver. That, of course, is not always the cause but many an innocent life has been snuffed out in an accident labeled as reckless driving where the circumstances clearly indicate a more precise cause could be given.

We can design and build roads and intersections for greater safety but all this will be for naught unless the man or woman, the boy or girl at the wheel has the competence and the sense of responsibility necessary to drive safely for those they meet on the road as well as those who ride with them.

Police powers under the Constitution rest with the States—but I do not hesitate to say that if the States fail to enact adequate and effective legislation on car inspection, driver tests and driver performance, the Federal Government will find a way to do so. An aroused public opinion will demand that it do so.

ADEQUATE HIGHWAY FINANCING

I come now to the first problem that I listed—perhaps the one that is first in priority as a mechanical matter of highway legislation—namely, that of adequate financing for the highway trust fund.

We are told that revenues accruing to the trust fund during the fiscal year 1957 and 1958 totaled \$3,526 million, or \$41 million more than the original estimates. During the first 4 months of this fiscal year, the revenues have been slightly below estimates.

Last spring and summer Congress passed, and the President approved, legislation directing that the full amount for the several Federal aid systems should be apportioned to the States notwithstanding the provisions of the so-called Byrd amendment which is found in section 209(g) of the 1956 Highway Act. That is the portion of law which says that apportionments for Interstate System aid for any fiscal year may not exceed the amounts expected to be available in the trust fund to liquidate obligations resulting from such apportionments.

As a result of that waiver of the Byrd amendment, full apportionments were made for 1959 and 1960. Under present law, money will have to be borrowed from the general funds of the Treasury to meet the obligations that will accrue under the apportionments. But also, under existing law, amounts so borrowed must be repaid and those repayments must be provided for before apportionments can be made for 1961 and subsequent years.

I am advised by the Bureau of Public Roads, then, that on the basis of present

estimates, there will be no funds available to make apportionments for the Interstate System for the fiscal year 1961. And that the interstate apportionment for fiscal 1962 could not exceed \$600 million and that thereafter the interstate apportionment would range from \$1.3 to \$1.5 billion per year in accordance with amounts estimated to be available in the highway trust fund for the interstate program, instead of the \$2.5 billion authorized in the basic legislation if available. Congressman FALLON told us this morning that the prospective shortage in the fund may even reduce the apportionment for ABC roads by \$200 million for 1 year if the fund is not rehabilitated.

FIVE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

This creates a situation which must engage the attention of the public works committees and roads subcommittees in the next Congress. One does not have to be a prophet to predict that there will be a variety of opinions on what to do about it. At least five possible solutions suggest themselves:

1. Place the burden of rehabilitating the trust fund on the general funds of the Treasury.
2. Increase the present tax levies which go into the trust fund, meaning most likely an increase in the Federal gasoline tax.
3. Adopt some new or additional levies and dedicate the revenue to the highway trust fund.
4. Authorize a special bond issue to cover the anticipated shortage in the trust fund and extend the period of time for which the special levies are now authorized from a total of 16 years to 17 or 18 years, or whatever may be needed to retire the bonds.
5. Modify the scope of or standards required in the Interstate System; in other words, a stretchout.

I shall give only a sentence or two of comment upon each of these possibilities. I have no doubt each one present has some idea about them.

Resolution No. 1

On solution No. 1, the taking of funds from the Treasury, we can expect vigorous opposition, not only from the Treasury Department but from powerful Members of Congress in both parties who resist any move to increase the national debt. Many of these people are members of the House Ways and Means Committee or of the Senate Committee on Finance who would pass upon any legislation dealing with the subject.

To propose the assigning to the trust fund of any revenues from levies or excise taxes not now dedicated to that fund would be regarded as equivalent to taking the deficit money from the general funds of the Treasury and would meet the same opposition.

Such a solution, in my judgment, could not be enacted into law. If it should pass Congress, which is doubtful, I would expect a Presidential veto that could not be overridden in the face of the present high national debt and the prospect of \$10 or \$12 billion deficit in the current fiscal year.

Resolution No. 2

With regard to solution No. 2, an increase of the Federal gas tax, there will be some support, possibly administration support. For myself, I cannot be enthusiastic about such a solution. Many States either raised their gasoline tax in the last legislature or faced that possibility for next year. Public opinion would react badly to another Federal gasoline-tax increase—at least, until the new highway building, and particularly the Interstate System, has had more of a chance to show the economies and benefits that can flow from this development.

In passing I would make this observation: people who travel toll roads and pay 1½ cents per mile for the privilege are paying the equivalent of a 22-cent gas tax, assuming that the average car makes 15 miles per gallon.

In time, if the Interstate System achieves the acceptability that toll roads have won, an increase in the gas tax may be popular as a means of expediting conclusion of the system. That time is not yet.

It must be kept in mind that a great many people do not travel and will not be near to any part of the Interstate System. An increase in the gas tax will be paid by them as well as by Interstate Highway users. True the ABC roads come out of the trust fund but the Interstate apportionments take more than twice as much money as do the ABC roads. It is also to be kept in mind that an increase in gas taxes also makes a levy on those who use and pay for the toll roads.

Thus a solution based upon increasing the Federal gas tax will have its problems even though the method is appealing from the standpoint of easy administration and costs of collection.

Resolution No. 3

As for solution No. 3: New levies or sources of revenue. Only one comes to my mind, the possibility of employing a windshield sticker as a highway use fee to be collected by selling a stamp at the postoffices as was done during the war.

Publicity on the fact that the proceeds from the windshield stamp were to be used to pay for the road program would help but could hardly make this plan popular. A \$5 stamp for passenger cars and a graduated stamp for pickups, trucks and buses could raise from \$400 million to \$900 million per year, depending, of course, upon the size of the stamps required for trucks and buses.

Even at the lower figure, with an even \$5 stamp for all motor vehicles on the highways, the receipts if continued for the remaining period of the original 16-year levy period would probably retire or liquidate any shortage in the trust fund. This approach to the problem should be explored along with other possible solutions.

Resolution No. 4

Solution No. 4: The authorization of a special bond issue with the bonds to be retired by extension of the period of time for existing levels dedicated to the trust fund is the one for which I have heard most congressional support.

It has the defect, of course, of adding to the national debt, either directly or indirectly. However, it would have the virtue of carrying a specific plan for retirement of that debt increase which cannot be said for most other increases of the debt. Certainly this proposal deserves serious consideration.

Resolution No. 5

As for No. 5—modification of the scope or standards now required for the Interstate System, you may expect this answer to be pushed by some influential people.

An example came to my attention on my way to this gathering. The Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram for November 29, 1958, devoted its major editorial to the subject and closed with these questions:

"Why can we not slow down the construction program, in other words, to fit the receipts rolling in? Those receipts amount to staggering totals—\$8 billion by 1960, for example, which is just eight times the largest yearly amount ever spent by the Federal Government for highways before this highway program was adopted. Are expenditures of that magnitude really so inadequate?"

With a Federal budget facing a \$12 billion deficit and new taxes unpopular, this attitude will develop support in many places.

So—we who are engaged in the building of a modern highway system for the people of the United States face some problems as we approach the year 1959 and a new session of Congress.

It would be possible for members of your association to say, "O, well, it is the business of Congress to find answers to these problems."

Similarly, members of the Committees of Public Works could say, "O, well, it is the business of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees to find the revenue to pay the bills. We are only supposed to map programs that will develop the country."

To such attitudes, however, I respectfully recall the story of the guide my prospector friend found up north. If he was hired to cook, he felt no obligation to be a guide, he had no feeling about teamwork. None of us desires a stretchout in the interstate program but if that is to be avoided, there must be an answer to the question: where do we get the money for the trust funds? We cannot dispose of it by saying that we were only hired to cook. Someone must guide.

I said at the first of my remarks that road building in the United States has been the outstanding example of a working partnership between the several States and the Federal Government.

Under the inspiration of the message of President Eisenhower to the Governors' conference in 1955, the greatest road-building program for this or any other nation in the history of the world was authorized and begun.

Each year, the dollar volume for that program is 10 times greater than the original cost of the Panama Canal. Everyone who has a part in this program, every-day worker, contractor, engineer, highway official, legislator or Congressman has a right to take pride in the program.

It is a constructive program not a destructive one. While valuable for national defense, its primary benefits are from day to day in adding to the pleasures, conveniences and welfare of the people in peacetime.

It is a partnership job—and I am confident that the Congress will have in the future, as it has had in the past, the counsel and the support of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

HIGHWAY FINANCING

(Remarks of Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, before the American Road Builders Association, Dallas, Tex., January 19, 1959)

The big road program is rolling. In 1958 \$6.2 billion went to work on roads in the United States, an all-time high.

Congress passed its regular biennial highway act with approval of the revised cost estimates and authorized using them for making apportionments for the Interstate System for 1960 and 1961, at a rate of \$2.5 billion for each year, started an annual increased increment of \$25 million per year on the ABC roads, provided a new D program with \$400 million for emergency or problem areas within the States, and wound up with a single act codifying all highway acts and their amendments into one compact document.

It was a notable year for roadbuilders in Congress, at the Bureau of Public Roads, in the several State highway departments and out on the highways and byways where the people want—and now are getting—better roads.

WHERE TO GET THE MONEY

But, as Federal Highway Administrator Bert Tallamy said to the American Association of State Highway Officials at San Francisco a month ago, "It would be near the truth to say that all our problems are practically solved except the big one."

That big one, of course, is that old pocket-book problem—where are you going to get the money? The highway trust fund will, prospectively, be out of cash when the ABC apportionments are made in June this year for fiscal year 1961 and there will be nothing on which to make the 1961 apportionments for the Interstate System.

That will be due to the operation of section 209(b) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, known as the Byrd amendment.

Similarly, only \$600 million will be available for the authorized \$2.5 billion for 1962. Thereafter the interstate apportionment would range from \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion per year, roughly three-fourths of the authorizations.

BILLIONS SHORT

Put another way, over the span of the remaining years of the interstate program, the highway trust fund will be short a gross total of \$13.3 billion, under present estimates. It adds up this way:

Billions

Increased cost estimates on Interstate System (including the added 1,000 miles to 41,000).....	\$10.4
Increase AEC apportionments by \$25 million per year up to an annual \$1 billion per year.....	1.5
Allowance for the Federal or public land road items.....	1.0
New D program for problem areas.....	0.4
Total.....	13.3

Or, if we allow for contingencies, we could add \$200 million and round off the problem at \$13.5 billion for the 10 years.

To meet the immediate problem of apportionments for fiscal 1961 and 1962, I understand that the President's budget message being sent to the Congress today will probably recommend an additional gas tax levy of 1½ cents per gallon. That, it is estimated, will yield \$1.7 billion per year, and supply the three-fourths deficiency indicated for those years.

The Bureau of Public Roads, by congressional directive, is presently engaged in making comprehensive studies from coast to coast to get a better idea of the distribution of benefits from improved highways. We in Congress directed the study in the belief that it would give guides which would be useful in future legislation, particularly in any reshifting of taxes or increase of levies.

ALTERNATIVE FINANCING METHODS

An increase in the gas tax is not the only method of meeting the problem which has been suggested. Other approaches mentioned include:

1. Taking funds from the general Treasury, which, of course would add to the Treasury's current deficit prospects.
2. Allocating to the trust fund the proceeds of certain excise taxes already levied, which, of course, would have the same effect on the Federal deficits and debt.
3. Giving special borrowing authority to the trust fund to go into the market and sell short- or long-term obligations to meet actual cash requirements and extending existing levies beyond 1972 to meet them.
4. Extension or readjustment of the authorized building program.

There is one other complication which I think has not been faced but which I foresee; namely, that Alaska at once, and Hawaii in the near future, will be asking for an allocation of some funds on a 90-percent Federal basis for the construction of some part of their highways, with controlled access design to connect principal points, even though a strictly interstate connection may not be possible. The new States will be paying the same Federal gas tax that other States do.

So, there is the big problem. I could discuss it further, but I anticipate that the question and answer plan for the panel will bring out the particular phases of the problem and possible solutions that are of most interest to you.

I assure you, President Steelman and delegates, that it is always a pleasure to meet with you and to get the benefit of your counsel as well as to share your enthusiasms in the great job of building better roads for a better America.

Grass as a National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I believe that all of my colleagues are aware of the wide interest currently prevailing for the Congress to designate an appropriate flower as the national floral emblem of the United States. Just this past Wednesday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] introduced a joint resolution which would make the golden corn tassel our national floral emblem.

That same day I received correspondence from two organizations in Kentucky supporting the selection of grass for the honor spot on the floral design. The Kentucky Bankers Association has approved, by resolution, a grass floral emblem, and Mr. William C. Johnstone, agricultural representative of the association, has responded to the corn tassel proposal with a highly interesting rebuttal and counterproposal which I should like to commend to your attention.

He says that he might go along with an ear of corn but not the tassel. As a matter of fact he even rates an ear of corn behind cotton. It is proposed that grass—all grass—should be considered for the floral tribute. Kentucky is noted for its grasses, its lush rich bluegrass from which stems the State's nickname as the "Bluegrass State," and its Kentucky 31 Fescue, a hardy grass popular for pasturage and conservation. We also have plenty of crabgrass in Kentucky, but I prefer to have some other State take the credit for it.

In order that my colleagues may further familiarize themselves with the merits of the grass proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Kentucky Bankers Association, a statement by the association, the conservationist's response by Mr. Johnstone, and a letter dated January 15, 1959, from Mr. L. W. Murdock, chairman, Graves County Soil Conservation District.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF GRASS AS A NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Whereas it has been suggested that the Kentucky Bankers Association, along with all other State bankers associations, endorse the adoption by the U.S. Congress of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem; and

Whereas joint resolutions have been introduced in Congress to make the corn tassel the national floral emblem; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Kentucky Bankers Association that the corn tassel is not a perfect flower but is only the staminate, or male flower, and in itself is of little value; and that the pistillate, or female flower—the ear of corn—

is the part that produces the valuable grains; and

Whereas the Kentucky Bankers Association recognizes the value of corn to the economy of our country, both in the past and present; but at the same time it is cognizant of the destruction of land and the terrible losses in fertility brought about by leaching and erosion due to the improper culture of corn on hilly, rolling, and unadapted land; and

Whereas the Kentucky Bankers Association has considered the merits of other plants as the national floral emblem and has found that grass, with its beautiful blooms and artistic seed heads, more nearly represents, than any other plant, the ideals and aspirations of the American people. (It is grass that was mentioned first, of all living things, in the story of creation; it was grass with its deep, penetrating roots that gave fertility and protection to the great plains and prairie soils of America; it was grass that sustained the buffalo whence came our forefather's food. It is grass that feeds the lowing cattle, the gentle sheep, the patient horse; it is to grass that we turn to heal our fields after they have been eroded and ravished by the plow and the cultivator. Grass is truly the hope of the conservationist and the dream of the naturalist): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kentucky Bankers Association through action of its executive committee, meeting on December 17, 1958, and after much consideration, endorse the adoption of grass as the floral emblem of the United States and urge its adoption by the United States Congress and request the President of the United States to declare such fact by proclamation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions and supporting documents be entered in the minutes of this meeting and copies be sent to the U.S. Senators and Congressmen from Kentucky, State bankers associations, State and National farm organizations, conservation associations, and the farm press and other individuals, groups, and organizations interested in the conservation and welfare of our country's greatest natural resource—its soil.

MAURICE KIRBY,
President.
RALPH FONTAINE,
Executive Secretary.

KENTUCKY BANKERS SEE GRASS AS BEST NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

The Kentucky Bankers Association, always vigilant of the welfare of the State and solicitous of the conservation of its natural resources, has endorsed grass as the national floral emblem, urged its adoption by Congress and requested President Eisenhower to proclaim it, according to Ralph Fontaine, executive secretary of the association.

The action of the bankers' association was taken at a recent meeting of its executive committee as a result of a campaign originating in another State to make the corn tassel the national floral emblem. "The Kentucky Bankers Association is opposed to this," Mr. Fontaine said, "because, in the first place, the corn tassel is not a perfect flower. The corn flower is borne in two parts: The male part is the tassel and the female part is the ear." "Furthermore," continued Mr. Fontaine, "the culture of corn on unadapted land has caused serious erosion and untold damage to millions of acres of land in the United States."

"The adoption of the male corn flower is in direct opposition to the goal of conservationists and lovers of nature," according to Mr. Fontaine. The Kentucky Bankers Association has for years cooperated with agricultural leaders and organizations in promoting a grass-type agriculture in this State, putting emphasis on pastures and pasture-

using livestock. Only this month did the bankers association adopt the phrase "Conservation Is Everybody's Business" as their theme of the year and approved conservation as the major agricultural activity for 1959.

"Bankers believe in conservation," said Mr. Fontaine, "and grass is the hope of the conservationist. For over 10 years the Kentucky Bankers Association has been using scenes of livestock grazing on beautiful pastures with the phrase, 'Kentucky, the Center of the Pasture Belt,' as a part of its agricultural letterhead, and they are not ready to change at this time. There is nothing more beautiful and satisfying than lush, green pastures with occasional seed heads of bluegrass, orchard grass and fescue waving in the breeze. The adoption of grass as our national floral emblem would pay tribute to a worthy family and encourage its wider usage."

Copies of the bankers' resolutions have been sent to Kentucky's Senators and Congressmen, other State bankers' associations, and to State and National farm and conservation organizations. Many other groups are expected to join with the bankers in behalf of grass.

A CONSERVATIONIST'S RESPONSE TO AN APPEAL TO MAKE THE CORN TASSEL OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Why the corn tassel? The American floral emblem should be a perfect and complete flower, representing all that is best in both men and women, a united family—a united country. The corn tassel is not a perfect flower. It is only the male organ of the corn plant. It blooms, it sheds pollen, it dries up and leaves nothing to show for its existence.

The male corn flower? No. It towers over the female, it waves in the wind and dominates the field. For only a few days it is virile and then, in its last wild rampage, it scatters its pollen to the wide ranges of the compass—then fades and dies and is gone forever.

The female corn flower? Yes. Well, maybe yes. Although not so showy as the tassel, it represents stability—food (and drink), clothing, warmth, beauty, fertility, and motherhood.

The corn tassel? No. They are in surplus production. Even though nine-tenths of the tassels were lost, the harvest would not be diminished. The tassels serve one purpose only—to bear, for a few hours, the pollen to fertilize the ovaries of the ear. They leave nothing to posterity.

But the female flower, the ear? Yes, well, maybe yes. The female flower and its three component parts; the cob, the grain and the husk, has intrinsic and historic values. The cob, from which emerges the golden, silver, and ruby silks, is the symbol of peace. From it is fashioned the oldtime corncob pipes; the pipes of peace, so to speak. And how we need them today. The grain—each one a veritable package of atomic energy which no human can produce without the help of the Almighty, might well be the symbol of immortality. They are the links between the past and the future. In them are those sparks of God-given life which, even though buried for thousands of years will grow again and reproduce themselves a thousandfold. And the shucks that wrap the cob and precious grain—even they might well symbolize protection and care. They protect those intricate parts, the tiny embryos and fragile silks until from them the kernels have developed. From these shucks our forefathers wove their chair bottoms, braided their welcome doormats and fashioned their mattresses. Even the silks that wither and dry so soon after fulfilling their purpose have a nostalgic remembrance for those country boys who used them, wrapped in the thin tissues of shuck, to enjoy their first venture into youthful freedom—the pleasure of smoking a cornsilk cigarette.

And what is more beautiful than an ear of corn? Fresh buttered sweetcorn; golden rich, yellow dent corn; rich, silvery, white corn. What child does not enjoy the mysteries of the exploding popcorn, and who does not admire the beauties of the colorful squaw corn?

The tassel? Never. The ear—yes—maybe, yes.

But why the rush? Why not consider other flowers? The cotton flower, for example, is a perfect combination of the male and the female blossom, the product of which represents food and fiber. Cotton has, from our early days, been the bulwark of trade and commerce. It has paid more foreign debts and brought over more foreign money than any other single American product.

But above all, why not consider grass as a national floral emblem? Not just one grass—any grass—all grass.

No more fitting tribute could be paid to any plant than that composed by the beloved late Senator from Kansas, John James Ingalls, who, in 1872, under the title "Bluegrass," wrote these immortal words:

"Next in importance to the divine profusion of water, light and air, * * * may be reckoned the universal beneficence of grass. * * * Grass is the most widely distributed of all vegetable beings, and is at once the type of our life and the emblem of our mortality. * * * Our earliest recollections are of grass; and when the fitful fever is ended, and the foolish wrangle of the market and forum is closed, grass heals over the scar which our descent into the bosom of the earth has made, and the carpet of the infant becomes the blanket of the dead.

"Grass is the forgiveness of nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. * * * Its tenacious fibers hold the earth in its place, and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and forbidding pinnacles of mountains, modifies climates, and determines the history, character, and destiny of nations. Unobtrusive and patient, it has immortal vigor and aggression. Banished from the thoroughfare and the field, it bides its time to return and when vigilance is relaxed, or the dynasty has perished, it silently resumes the throne from which it has been expelled, but which it never abdicates. It bears no blazonry of bloom to charm the sense with fragrance or splendor, but its homely hue is more enchanting than the lily or the rose; it yields no fruit in earth or air, and yet would its harvest fail for a single year, famine would depopulate the earth."

What more can we add? And what could be more beautiful than a colorful floret of grass waving gently in the breeze above a carpet of emerald green?

As for us—we cast our vote, first for grass, next for cotton, third for the ear of corn—but as for the corn tassel—we vote "No."

WM. C. JOHNSTONE,
Agricultural Representative, Kentucky
Bankers Association.

GRAVES COUNTY SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Mayfield, Ky., January 15, 1958.

Senator THURSTON MORTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: The Graves County Soil Conservation District Supervisors would like to urge you to do everything possible to get grass adopted as the national floral emblem.

We know that grass is one of the most important tools we have in Kentucky for conservation of all natural resources. We

feel that nationwide, it is the most important crop of all plants that are being grown in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. MURDOCK,
Chairman, Graves County Soil Conservation District.

Senator Alan Bible—A Good Man To Have Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent editorials praising the distinguished Senator from Nevada [MR. BIBLE], for his work on the Senate District of Columbia Committee and expressing relief that he has decided to remain on the committee.

The first entitled, "A Good Man to Have Around," was the lead editorial in the January 22 issue of the Washington Daily News.

The second, entitled, "D.C.'s Aldermen," appeared in the January 16 Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 22, 1959]

A GOOD MAN TO HAVE AROUND

District citizens can feel considerably relieved that Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat of Nevada, has agreed to stay on the Senate District Committee.

Many politicians consider this a relatively thankless job. Senator BIBLE has served most conscientiously. His insight into District problems and his realization of the Federal Government's responsibilities to the city which it inhabits have made him particularly valuable to all those who share his concern for our town.

The fact that he now is serving on the Senate Appropriations Committee, too, should strengthen his hand in District affairs.

The Senate District Committee has had its membership cut from nine to seven. It has suffered from quorum troubles and this should enable it to get more business done. All seven are able men. They should accomplish much for the District in the months ahead. We need their best efforts and we wish them well.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 16, 1959]

D.C.'S ALDERMEN

It is good news indeed that Senator ALAN BIBLE will continue as chairman of the Senate District Committee. He led it energetically and capably in the last Congress. His recommendation, which was adopted, that the Committee be reduced from nine to seven members to make it more manageable, seems to bespeak a determination to get some business done in this Congress, too. The appointment of Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, a former mayor of Evansville, as the only new Democratic member of the Committee is also welcome. In happy contrast to the attitude of some new Members of Congress, he seems to recognize the crying need for sincere congressional attention to

the affairs of the Nation's Capital. Senators MORSE and FREAR, each with long experience in District affairs, will also be back, and the prospect is for the appointment of well-qualified Republican members. While we'd rather be congratulating a Washington city council, these men have our sincere good wishes as they undertake their aldermanic chores.

Splendid Junior Achievement Program in Southeastern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to invite attention to the splendid program which is helping to train our young people in knowledge and skills of our free enterprise system—that is, the junior achievement program. During the week of January 25 through 31 special recognition will be given to this outstanding program designed to educate our young people on the working principles of our economic system.

Last week I was delighted that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to declare a week in January as National Junior Achievement Week. Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee, before which this is pending, has not as yet had an organizational meeting. Consequently it has not been possible to act on the resolution.

I hope that the committee and the Congress will find it possible to take early and favorable action on this resolution, and encouraging our young folks to learn more about our free enterprise system and thus be better able to cope with the problems of the future.

The program itself is a constructive learn-by-doing system of planned activities in which our youth, guided by advisers, become familiar with the many problems and challenges in setting up a business. Among others, these include acquiring a charter, deciding upon a product, planning production schedules, figuring production costs and operating expenses, paying wages, keeping accounts and other aspects of business operations. In addition, the junior achievers are required to plan for purchasing raw materials, leasing machinery, advertising, marketing, and other decisions necessary in conducting private enterprise.

Recently, I received from Mr. Ken Weidt, program director of the Junior Achievement of Southeastern Wisconsin, Inc., a résumé of their fine work in junior achievement. In recognition of the sound principles upon which this program is based, I invite their work to the attention of my colleagues and request unanimous consent to have the résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK, JANUARY 25-31

One thousand six hundred and seventy-five teen-agers known as achievers and 350 volunteer business leaders known as advisers will be celebrating Junior Achievement Week January 25-31.

The junior achievement program constitutes the one movement in America, among our youth 15-19, that is really doing something to stem the tide of thinking that "the Government owes us a living" and that is realistically educating the coming generation to the false concepts in the philosophies of socialism and communism.

It is a practical business education program, a laboratory for developing business know-how in our teen-agers of today who will be the business men and women of tomorrow. It's better understanding and appreciating American free enterprise economic system.

During an 8-month period these teen-agers experience every facet of a corporate business. This includes acquiring a charter, deciding on a product, planning production schedules, figuring production costs, operating expenses, pay wages, selling costs, mark-up, profits, and account to their stockholders.

These achievers are also called upon to plan for purchasing raw materials, leasing machinery, inventory control, promotion, advertising, marketing the product, deciding on policy at board meetings and any and all of the other thousands of decisions, activities and worries that go with conducting a business private enterprise system.

The program in southeastern Wisconsin ranks nationally seventh in 152 areas operating in more than 235 cities.

Junior Achievement operates in Milwaukee, 3900 West Wisconsin Avenue, with 53 companies; West Allis, 1964 South 86th Street, with 13 companies; South Milwaukee, 914 Rear Madison Avenue, with 4 companies; Wauwatosa, 8830 West Bluemound Road (House of Good Shepherd), with 5 companies; Fort Atkinson, Wis., 1 company; and Lake Geneva, Wis., 1 company.

Products range from children's toys, clothes trees, auto accessories, household articles, outdoor tools, chemical products, and transistor radios.

A typical Junior Achievement company has 4 advisers and 20 achievers. Average capitalization, \$105; average income, \$342.31; average wages, \$101.74; average sales income, \$339.67.

The Plight of Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I recently received a most compelling letter from one of our senior citizens. I was so impressed with the depth and sensitivity of the letter that I felt it should be read by the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER TO SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE

I am one of those so-called senior citizens, nearly 70 years of age and about ready to retire from active practice of law, due to my

inability to compete with the younger lawyers before the bar, as my memory along with rest of my body has "balanced wear."

Since the will to survive continues, even in spite of these handicaps which the senior citizens have, I am naturally interested in some things that when I was younger I did not let my mind dwell on. When we are young, life seems endless, and the ability to compete and make a good living seems sure. It is then that we feel that only the poor are deserving of poverty, and if they are poor it is all their own fault and their own planning. If they fail to use good judgment, due to a poorer and weaker mentality, that also is their own fault, and we are our brother's keeper, so what?

Now I am about down to what I want to say to you. We have some laws that are neither fish nor fowl, and no one can understand that kind of law enactment by our great Government. For instance, the Social Security Act administered through the Social Security Administration. Does this act provide charity or insurance? If it is insurance why do we have to actually retire first after we reach the handicapped age and cannot compete anyway for a living? If it is charity, why do we call it insurance and pay the full value for the protection? Is it half charity and half insurance? If it is insurance, why does it provide about one-fourth the amount required for a person to live? If it is charity, why do we have to retire from all our labors to get one-fourth the amount required on which to live? We are our brother's keeper, at least to the extent of being consistent and rational, even if we have no charitable inclinations, or emotions. Everyone gets old and helpless at the extreme end of life, both the rich and the poor share the same fate. All our mothers and fathers reach this position in life, if they live long enough. It doesn't matter what their personal opinions are when they are young and vigorous. They change them when the hour of disability and death draws near, and the bell in the graveyard tolls.

Financing of the Interstate Highway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Somebody Must Pay for Those Highways," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of January 22, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEBODY MUST PAY FOR THOSE HIGHWAYS

Already the Connecticut motorist pays a 9-cent gasoline tax—6 cents to the State and 3 to the Federal Government. That means that if you can find a pump to sell you gas for 27 cents, one-third of it goes for taxes. Though some goods, like cigarettes, are taxed even more outrageously, this is still pretty steep.

In view of all this, who is there who will not join the protest against President Eisenhower's budget recommendation that the Federal gas tax be raised by one-half, from 3 to 4½ cents? Certainly we do not lack for protests. Local newspapers and radio, for example, yesterday got a shower of six of them. They came from the Connecticut Petroleum Council, the Connecticut Motor

Stage Association, the Connecticut Conference of Farm Organizations, the New England Bus Association, the Connecticut State Grange, and the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut. Nor does the fact that all came in the same envelope, on the same paper, and presumably from the same mimeograph machine, necessarily mean that these pleas are not valid. They are part of the modern American way of mobilizing various conflicting pressures, out of which we shape our legislation.

At the same time it is questionable whether it is wise to protest the Eisenhower tax proposal. The budget balance is, as the President himself noted, precarious at best. What if this tax is rejected? What will that do to the dollar, and to our whole economy?

It is curious, too, that the same people who protest that Uncle Sam is reducing them to wearing a barrel ride their oversized, overcostly, 300-horsepower automobiles with much pleasure over such sections of the new Interstate Highway System as have been built. The 13-year program for criss-crossing the country with a network of modern highways is going to be barely enough to bring our roads up to our own motoring habits. If these roads are good enough for us to want, then they are good enough for us to pay for. There isn't any Santa Claus beside the taxpayer, whether you call him the Federal Government or not. And who is a better one to pay for the new roads than the man who uses them?

The same philosophy applies to other budgetary fields. The other day the first district's new Congressman [Mr. DADDARIO] was lamenting that the Eisenhower budget omitted a new Federal office building for Hartford. This is indeed regrettable. And no doubt the omission is a popular issue on which to make votes. But again, if this building is good, doesn't somebody have to pay for it? And if we don't want to pay for it to the tune of unbalancing the budget, as we shouldn't, maybe we can get along for awhile without.

After all, we are in a cold war. And as the \$42 billion defense item in a \$77 billion budget makes clear, a cold war is the most expensive thing you can have short of a hot war. Here we are, trying to compete with totalitarian peoples who work a 60- to 70-hour week, and like it because they have a sense that they and their country are going places. We want a 4½-day week, and we want even more good things from our Government. But we scream when it comes to paying for them. It doesn't make sense.

Most Young Citizens Are Better Than We Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although numerous newspaper headlines recently have dealt with juvenile delinquency, investigation reveals that most American young people are not included in this category. By far the number of young people today are working seriously at being good citizens and becoming better ones. This is evidenced not only in their studying to prepare themselves for the future, but in what they are doing now.

Young people today are doing volunteer work in hospitals and nurseries, helping to collect funds for charities, working for better government by supporting for public office persons in whom they believe, joining church and civic work projects to better their own community or to assist someone else, and participating in a number of other worthwhile activities to make this a better world.

They do this work earnestly and quietly and are seldom recognized for their service.

Mr. President, in recognition of the vast majority of the fine young people in our Nation today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Young Citizens," which was published in the Corpus Christi Caller of January 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG CITIZENS

Not all schoolchildren are little monsters, according to the National Education Association, despite the impression that may have been created by the publicity given to juvenile delinquency. The NEA finds a higher percentage of those in school lead exemplary lives than do members of the older generations.

In a handbook for parents and teachers entitled "Juvenile Delinquency—Research, Theory, and Comment," the education association goes into some detail in analyzing the age groups of the most susceptible and the influence of schools on the problem. It even categorizes delinquency into two parts: Cultural and emotional delinquencies.

Less than 5 percent of school-age children were found to be other than normal, reasonably healthy and law-abiding citizens, and of this 5 percent a remarkably large number were found to be not in school. Of delinquents, 95 percent of those 17 years old, 85 percent of those 16 years old, and 50 percent of those aged 15 do not attend schools, according to the NEA's survey.

"The big stumbling block—for the general public as well as for teachers—is the scarcity of reliable information on the subject compared to the abundance of medicine-man prescriptions," complains the NEA. Despite the lack of material and proper guidance, the schools seem to have done a commendable job in promoting citizenship among their students.

In dividing juvenile delinquency into two parts, the educators have eliminated from the hard core of hoodlums the passively antisocial cultural delinquent. He is described as the otherwise normal child who shows antisocial tendencies only so far as is necessary to conform to the code of his gang.

The emotional delinquent is the bully, the sadist or the violent hoodum who is motivated by inner urges. He is the true delinquent, the menace to society, and the one responsible for the shadow of guilt cast wrongly on many of his youthful contemporaries. He is also the one in need of psychiatric or psychological help.

It is both gratifying and revealing to note the small percentage of youths who have earned themselves the label of juvenile delinquent. Even this small group, however, is responsible for some of the most heinous crimes and it is to the eradication of this element, and not the blackening of youthful reputations, that the fight against juvenile delinquency must be waged.

Civil Rights Legislation in the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Post's lead editorial, entitled "Coups on Civil Rights," opened the substantive discussion of civil rights legislation in the 86th Congress.

I do not believe that the scope of the civil rights bill of 1957 has the immutability of the laws of the Medes and the Persians. S. 499 presents some new ideas, which I intend to study thoroughly, and I commend to the Senate the Post editorial in the thought that consideration of civil rights legislation should never be approached from fixed, or doctrinaire positions.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

We should ever strive not for civil rights issues, but for the enactment of feasible civil rights legislation, marking progress in this field.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON has prepared a coup of potentially great significance in the introduction of a moderate and thoughtful civil rights bill. Senator JOHNSON has taken the lead away from the administration with a bill which, as the President indicated on Wednesday, may be similar in several particulars to what the Department of Justice is expected to recommend.

It is significant also that Mr. JOHNSON intends to use the bill as a test of the revision of rule XXII which he sponsored. Having persuaded the Senate to adopt his compromise plan for curbing filibusters, he wants to demonstrate that a civil rights bill can be passed without prolonged paralysis in the Senate. This strongly indicates that the bill is offered as a practical piece of legislation rather than as political window dressing.

Major discussion no doubt will be focused on the section of the bill establishing a Community Relations Service "to provide conciliation assistance" in communities in which peaceful relations among citizens might be threatened by disagreements over interstate commerce or "disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution of the United States." In plain language, this means conciliation in such situations as the Montgomery bus boycott.

Whether such efforts by an independent Federal agency actually would be helpful in reestablishing communication between disputants on civil rights issues still must be proved. The idea is an appealing one borrowed from the work of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in labor disputes. But there is a basic difference between the adjustment of wage disputes and the enforcement of law.

Basic human and legal rights of course cannot be compromised or bargained away. Obviously it would require a very special type of conciliation to find means of bridging such community gaps in conformity with the Constitution, and a prerequisite

probably would be a basic anxiety on both sides actually to reach a settlement.

The least controversial sections of the bill are likely to be those extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to January 31, 1961, and giving the Department of Justice subpoena powers in voting rights cases. The CRC of course will have to be continued if it is to carry out the mandate Congress gave it. And the effective protection of voting rights is in many ways the key to respect for other civil rights.

The new subpoena power would enable the Department of Justice to examine registration books and other documents without going through the cumbersome process of impaneling a grand jury. That power would not be used when documents could be voluntarily obtained, but it would assure the Department ample data on which to make cases when voting rights are denied. With the facts thus at hand, the Attorney General could go into court and seek an injunction against further denial of voting rights.

Some question may be raised about the possibility that another section of the bill might weaken local law enforcement in bombing cases. This section consists basically of a prohibition against transportation of explosives across State and National lines with intent to destroy property. It will need close examination to avoid collision between Federal and local authority and duplication of the present law under which the FBI cooperates generally with local police in such cases.

Irrespective of any controversy over particular emphasis in the bill, Mr. JOHNSON not only has advanced a novel idea on community conciliation but also has sought to keep all his proposals within the realm of the possible. His invitation to wide debate with the objective of passing an effective civil rights bill is a challenge that merits constructive response.

An Early Skirmish in the Global War Against Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the continuing world struggle against the ravages of chronic disease is a subject which I am sure will be considered in this session of Congress. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is sponsoring legislation to develop greater world cooperation in this never-ending struggle. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] reports that Mr. Khrushchev is disposed toward cooperation in this area that knows no politics or power blocs. An address by John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., of Rahway, N.J., provides a vivid illustration of the kind of effort that is beginning in this field and should be expanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Mr. Connor be printed in the Appendix of the Record. There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN EARLY SKIRMISH

(Address by John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J.)

It may be helpful to you who are interested in the economic offensive of the Communist bloc if I explore the ramifications of a lively skirmish between the Russians and a single American company that took place recently about 9,000 miles east of New York.

I do not contend that this skirmish was typical, or even that it was inherently significant. But as we explore it, we will pick up the footprints of Soviet aggressors probing the defenses of freedom among the hungry, the sick, and the hopeful in the underdeveloped parts of the globe.

Our story starts on a plane high above the Bay of Bengal, at 11 a.m., Calcutta time, January 26, 1957. Two officials of an American pharmaceutical company, bound for New Delhi, were reading the latest report from India, handed them early that morning at the Bangkok Airport. The report contained two surprises. One was an opportunity; the other, a threat.

The opportunity was a list of drugs, just announced, that the Indian Government wanted produced locally under its second 5-year plan, in order to provide employment, build up native skills, and save precious foreign exchange. From the point of view of these two men, the timing could not have been better. Anticipating this development, their company had sent them to India to try to negotiate an agreement to establish manufacturing facilities there. The officials ran quickly down the list, checking off the drugs their company could make and putting them in rough order of priority. By the time their plane reached New Delhi, they had worked out their strategy.

Their sense of urgency sprang from the threat in the report. A team of Soviet experts, having surveyed India's pharmaceutical needs, was on the spot, ready with a proposal to replace Western imports with a state-owned and managed drug manufacturing industry. As most of you in this room will instinctively understand, few situations could quicken the competitive pulse of an American businessman more rapidly than a team of Russians in possession of the ball with first down and goal to go.

SOVIET PROGRESS IN MEDICINE

Now, before I tell you the outcome of this early skirmish in what is fast becoming a global war against disease, let me sketch in the background of the Soviet skirmishers. We have to start almost 40 years ago. The civil war that followed in the wake of the Russian Revolution let loose a series of epidemics that killed several million persons, demoralized the country, and threatened the hold of the new Communist government. The devastation of these epidemics taught Lenin the importance of human capital in the development of a backward country.

Taking stock of the human capital at his disposal, Lenin discovered that Russia's death rate was nearly twice that of the West and that the average citizen had a life expectancy of only 40 years. Though there is no record that he was distressed from a humanitarian point of view, it is clear that the Soviet leader could translate these figures into national output. Financial capital for development of Russia, he knew, could come only from the production of the workers and peasants. First, they had to be educated and trained. If, after that investment, they were weakened by disease and doomed to a short life, the rate of capital accumulation would be so slow that the Communists would never build a modern industrial state short of a hundred years.

When Lenin acted on these conclusions, health became, along with education, the

outstanding exceptions to the rule of human exploitation that has marked the Soviet Union since the beginning. For the past 40 years the Russians have been campaigning for better sanitation, public health, and preventive medicine. They have been diverting scarce materials for hospitals, clinics, and medical schools. And they have been turning out enormous numbers of new doctors; their current annual rate of 16,000 is more than twice that of the United States.

What have been the results? They startled me, when I first learned them. I shall not go into the reasons for being skeptical of official Soviet statistics. I shall merely report them with two comments: first, that the ones I am about to use seem to be within the realm of probability, and, second, that we have gone further astray when we ignored Russian claims than when we took them seriously. The number of hospital beds per thousand population, according to these statistics, multiplied four and a half times between 1913 and 1956. The per capita number of doctors jumped 10 times—from about 17 for each 100,000 Russians before World War I to about 164 in 1956. The comparable figure for the United States that year was only 130. This means that, in proportion to the population, which in their case is just over 200 million, the Soviet Union now has 25 percent more doctors than we. Though their quality is still well below ours, we cannot feel smug about the future.

This mammoth Soviet health establishment now boasts 2,750,000 employees and is one of the Communist Party's proudest achievements. What has it been able to accomplish? The best single measures of a nation's physical well-being can be found in the mortality and longevity rates. The Kremlin recently broke its long silence on this subject and announced the figures. Let's take a look at them.

The Soviet Union, the announcement said, had raised the health of its people up to the level of the West. It had slashed the crude mortality rate about 75 percent since before the revolution and by 1956, at 7.7 per 1,000 population, it was comparable to ours. At the same time, it had lengthened average life expectancy from about 40 years at the beginning of World War I to a claimed 67 years in 1956. This was within reaching distance of longevity in the United States, which in the same year stood at 69.5.

This is an extraordinary achievement. What does it mean? Some persons will say that it is a natural consequence of industrialization. The Soviets have already told us, as you might expect, that it is a natural consequence of communism—a claim, incidentally, that is effectively destroyed by the even more spectacular health progress of our own capitalist neighbor, Puerto Rico, which added 50 percent to the average length of life in only 15 years.

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN CAPITAL

What it means to me is something else. It means that the Bolshevik planners were right when they decided to pour enormous effort into their human capital on the theory that better health as well as better education would have to precede better output. This is a point that we often overlook in our own plans for the underdeveloped countries. We tend to think too much, I believe, in terms of dams and roads, farm machinery and steel mills, money and credit—and not enough in terms of the people who will build them and for whom they are to be built.

Because of our concentration on physical and financial capital, we are inclined to forget the importance of human capital, which is both the means and the end of industrialization. This concept of the relation between human capital and economic growth could turn out to be decisive as the Soviet sets forth to meet the rising expectations of

Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and even Latin America with a program of health, development, and communism.

This brings me back to the skirmish in New Delhi with which I opened this talk. The two gentlemen, as you doubtless had surmised, were officials of Merck Sharp & Dohme International, a division of my own company, Merck. In common with most of the pharmaceutical industry, Merck Sharp & Dohme is no stranger to international business. It is selling today in 80 foreign countries, in 11 of which it has manufacturing plants. Out of total company sales of nearly \$200 million last year, 27 percent were outside the United States.

Merck, however, had never been up against quite the situation that confronted these two men when they arrived, after proper introductions from Ambassador Bunker's helpful staff, at the ministry of commerce and industry. They were immediately confronted with two problems: first, Russian competition, and second, a danger that the Indian Government would build its new pharmaceutical industry in what is called the public sector, which means that it would be state-owned and controlled.

INDIA'S PROBLEM

After the formal atmosphere had been thawed by some frank conversation it turned out that the Indians were glad to see these Americans. Near the top of their list were facilities for the production of streptomycin and its important derivative, dihydrostreptomycin, both of which Merck had pioneered.

The streptomycins were vital to India because they are leading drugs in the treatment of tuberculosis. TB is one of the great scourges of Asia. It kills more than half a million Indians a year. More than five times that many are currently suffering from it. The director of the Central Drug Research Institute in Lucknow recently estimated that this disease cost his nation almost a billion man-days of lost work per year.

Here is a typical problem of an underdeveloped country, desperately trying to raise the standard of living of its people against considerable odds. A disease like TB not only kills enormous numbers, but it saps the will and the ability to work, forcing countless human beings to live off the production of others.

The root of the debilitating disease of tuberculosis, therefore, ranks high among the objectives of India's second 5-year plan. To reach their goal, the Indians need, among other things, the modern drugs with which we in this country have cut our TB death rate down to about a fifth of what it was before World War II. India has been importing these drugs from the West at a cost of millions of dollars annually in precious foreign exchange.

Just before the two men from Merck arrived on the scene, the team of Russian experts had recommended that India build a state-owned basic chemical-pharmaceutical manufacturing industry to free itself from dependence on the West. It would—though this had not yet been made explicit—be designed by Soviet engineers, financed by Communist bloc loans, and, of course, politically motivated. Every round that goes through the Iron Curtain is bound on a political mission. In this case, the mission would be to build a showcase to display communism as the friend of the sick and disabled.

THE INDIAN NEGOTIATIONS

Within this context, the meeting between Merck and the Indian Government representatives quickly produced a proposal. The Indians suggested we go into partnership with a government-owned corporation to produce a long list of needed drugs. In view of the realities of the situation, we agreed to consider this proposal, even though it meant indirect partnership with socialism. Our refusal to be rigid and our willingness

to look at India's problems from the Indian point of view have, I believe, been major contributing factors in stalling the Russian offensive for almost 2 years.

The Indians have not been rigid, either. Though they are extremely good at bargaining, they have always been willing to take our problems into account, and we have found integrity, frankness, and fairness in all our contacts with the Indian Government.

The Indian proposal, in the end, proved impractical from our point of view, mainly because we thought there would be too many basic conflicts of interest in a partnership with a government agency in such a broad enterprise. But we were able to offer them a creative alternative. We split the problem into two parts. The first is an agreement that was signed last April. Under it, we are now helping the Indians build what will probably be the most modern streptomycin plant in the world.

The plant will be owned by Hindustan Antibiotics, a government corporation already producing penicillin by the fermentation process. It will be built with our plans and the help of our engineers, and it will be operated by Merck-trained Indian technicians using our know-how. The needed machinery and equipment will be financed by means of a loan from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. This new plant will supply all the country's requirements for the drug at an initial saving of nearly \$2.5 million annually in foreign exchange. For our help, we are receiving a modest fee to be paid out of sales over a period of 10 years.

Under the second agreement, which was just announced 3 days ago, Merck and a partner, the well-known Indian firm, Tata Sons Private Limited, have set up a new corporation to manufacture several Merck specialties, such as vitamin B₁₂, certain steroid hormones, our new drug, "Diuril," and other discoveries as they come from our own laboratories and are needed in India. We will build a basic medicinal chemical plant, and, as far as possible, use indigenous materials. Our part of the capital investment will be about \$3,500,000, and we expect to earn a reasonable profit from the operations.

We will be criticized—perhaps by some persons in this room—because we are helping build a streptomycin plant in the public sector. If it succeeds—and we are doing our best to make it a success—won't this encourage the Indians to produce more medicines and other products in the public sector?

We took a long, hard look at this question before we made our decision. It is not easy for a believer in private enterprise to swallow a Socialist deal. There are several reasons why we did it.

First, this is the way the Indians wanted it. They made this perfectly clear to us after we had done our best to dissuade them. We finally concluded that, if we really meant to help the Indians, we would have to help them in the way they wanted to be helped. To have insisted that we do it our way or not at all would have been transparently arrogant, a quality the Asians find less than endearing, as is so dramatically illustrated in the revealing new novel, "The Ugly American."

Second, by devising our plan, we forestalled the Russians, who, in the midst of our negotiations, offered the Indians a \$20 million, 40-year loan at the incredibly low interest rate of 2 percent to finance several basic units for a pharmaceutical-chemical industry, including a streptomycin plant. I used the word "forestalled" because the Soviets have not given up. They are making new proposals to India and may still build some plants in this industry.

Third, our willingness to be flexible enough to adapt our resources to their needs undoubtedly helped make Merck seem a reasonable company with which to do business

in the private sector. The fact is, we now will build a private sector pharmaceutical and medicinal chemical plant. Other Western producers in our industry are doing the same. There is therefore a possibility that what started out to be a government-owned industry may end up being mostly in the private sector. This will probably hinge on whether we and the other producers do a good job for India.

Let us remember that some people in this world have a hard time believing that the American corporation deserves a major share of the credit for the social benefits and the high standard of living that we enjoy in the United States. They have known businessmen mainly as traders and exploiters, which is perhaps part of the explanation why so many countries have turned to socialism. If we can perform as well in the underdeveloped countries as we have at home, and do it with humility and understanding, perhaps we can persuade them that we have found a way of improving the welfare of their citizens, that makes socialism obsolete.

In reality, what we have done in India is only a small beginning. I have told the story about it, not because I think it is significant but in the hope that it might suggest a few useful ideas that you could adapt to fit the problems and opportunities your own company and industry are facing in the underdeveloped countries.

MEDICINE AND FREEDOM

Our big job, however, is not just to sell understanding of private enterprise; our big job is to sell freedom. We are in the midst of a war that stretches eastward almost all the way around the globe. It is not a cold war; that adjective describes nothing but the absence of shooting. It is a war against poverty and disease. In the past few years, the rising expectations of the peoples of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America for a better and a longer life have become the most dynamic human force at work in the world today. Four years ago it lured the Soviet Union out of its lair and the West now finds itself pitted against the Communist bloc in a struggle to see which system can do a better job of economic and social development.

The Soviet economic offensive is being more than adequately described by the other participants in this conference, so I shall confine myself to the coming Russian drive on the other front—the war against disease—an opening skirmish of which we have seen in India.

The Soviet is at least as well equipped medically as it is economically to match us in the underdeveloped countries. It already has 25 percent more doctors in relation to the population than we have and its medical schools are still producing new ones at the rate of 16,000 a year compared with our 7,000. All its physicians and other health personnel work for the State and can be sent where the Kremlin thinks they should go, in or outside the country. The Russian doctor's training in foreign languages and his familiarity with relatively crude living and working conditions put him in a better position than his American counterpart to adapt to service in most parts of Asia or Africa.

And when this well-staffed army sallies forth from its borders—as it will—carrying the nostrums of communism in its medical kit, it will have a proposal to make that could be quite appealing. Reorganize your state along our lines, the proposal would go, and you, too, can do what we did—make the fastest progress in health achieved by any large nation in modern times.

This may not seem appealing to many in this room. But what about someone who was born with a life expectancy of only 35 years and who can never forget that death may visit him or his family at any time, and does, without even bothering to knock

on the door? Most of mankind is surrounded by sickness and is helpless against disease. Whoever provides the tools to fight it will earn the gratitude and might win the allegiance of the multitude.

The Soviets, at no cost to their ideals, can set out to buy the allegiance of people with the promise of good health, because they believe that the end justifies the means. But we cannot. We cannot deflect our great system of medicine from its historic mission—service to humanity—and use its fruits to buy the allegiance of anybody to anything—even to the United States or to the noble idea of freedom.

The population of a large area of Burma feels friendly toward the United States today because of the activities of a single American—Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famed Burma surgeon. He won this friendship for his country not so much by the healing he dispensed as by the way he did it, and most important, the concern for the individual that was so transparently his motivation.

It might be argued by some that we should not concern ourselves with what might appear to be only the fine points of philosophy when we are in the midst of a long tough fight for survival against a ruthless enemy. But in the long run we can win only if we concentrate more on what we are fighting for—which is the rights of man—than on what we are fighting against.

We can win if we can learn how to export the spirit of the West, not just the material creations of the society that was built with that spirit. Charles Malik, the Lebanese philosopher who is now President of the U.N. General Assembly, put it this way in a magnificent address at the Harvard Business School in September:

"Freedom, independence, respect, equality, fellowship—these spring from the inmost soul of the western tradition; and the question is how much the West can be existentially true to them. And there is in the faithful observance of these things all that is needed, and more, to meet the challenge of communism."

The faithful observance of the things that Dr. Malik mentions requires, it seems to me, that we export American medicine to the underdeveloped countries and that we do it in the form that it is wanted by them, in a modest desire to share our good fortune and with no strings attached.

As we all know, we have been doing precisely this for several generations now. Medical missionaries established clinics in these areas before the turn of the century. They were followed by the foundations, notably Rockefeller, and by scores of individuals, such as Dr. Thomas Dooley. The Russians have only just begun, and, as I have pointed out, they are there for a different reason.

A FOREIGN MEDICAL AID PROGRAM

The haphazard system we have used in the past has been made obsolete by the speed of events—the advent of the Soviets and the rapid rise in the expectations of the peoples in this area. The logic of survival requires that we now make a concerted effort on a broad front. As a beginning, I should like to suggest the following:

1. Alert the public to the challenge of Soviet medicine in the underdeveloped countries: Intelligence and sustained action will have to be based on public understanding. The facts about Soviet progress in medicine and about Russian moves in the underdeveloped countries should be more widely known. One way to do this would be through a commission of leading experts who would find the facts and report them.

2. Develop a bold new foreign medical aid program of our own: This can be built

around the excellent bill that Senator LISTER HILL and Congressman JOHN FOGARTY introduced at the end of the last session of Congress to set up an international medical research program. Their bill might be enlarged to provide for scholarships and fellowships in the United States to train students from the underdeveloped countries who would then return home to practice and teach as well as do research on the indigenous diseases that plague their native lands.

Several agencies of the Federal Government are developing a program for the next session of Congress. Part of it should be, I think, continued and expanded support of World Health Organization activities in the underdeveloped countries.

We need at the same time to enlarge our own facilities for medical education so that we can take care of added foreign students and also train American doctors for service abroad.

3. Support private organizations that are working in the foreign medical field: In many ways nongovernmental agencies, such as Medico, the people-to-people program, Dr. Howard Rusk's World Rehabilitation Fund, the World Medical Association, Columbia University's newly formed Institute of Nutrition Sciences, and several of the foundations, with help from our medical profession and our medical schools, are or can be more effective as emissaries of our way of life than official bodies. Though the job to be done is too enormous to be carried out through private support alone, these agencies, which can be more imaginative and flexible than Government, will serve the additional purpose of pioneering promising new projects.

4. Encourage participation by our pharmaceutical industry: It is in the interests of firms such as ours as well as of the Government for the two to work together on a program that would make more drugs available in these countries. In many countries the commercial incentives are strong enough for pharmaceutical firms to take the financial risks themselves. In such cases, support such as the State Department gave Merck throughout its negotiations in India would be helpful. But in some countries, where private incentives are inadequate, the alternative to Russian plants in the public sector is some form of U.S. Government help to make the know-how of American corporations available.

In this connection, we should explore the merits of the imaginative plan proposed by Dean Donald David at the 50th anniversary of the Harvard Business School. He suggested that Federal funds be used to retain corporations, rather than just individual technicians, to build foreign facilities or even develop whole industries in areas where the risk is too great or the reward too small to justify the use of private capital. As Dean David pointed out, this is the way we tooled up to win World War II.

A global war against disease is a vast undertaking. At this stage of public awareness and with the resources presently at our command, we can make only a small beginning, which is why the program outlined above is a modest one. But the urgency of the problem in the underdeveloped countries requires that we make an immediate start.

When we do, we should do it, not because we are worried about what the Soviet Union will do, but because we cannot abandon these people to a mortality rate that is twice our own and a life expectancy of only 35 years.

We should do it because the day has passed when either a man or a country can live with either moral comfort or physical safety on an island of plenty and good health surrounded by a sea of poverty and sickness.

We should do it in the hope that loosening the bonds that bind most of mankind to hunger and disease will be a major step in helping to liberate the human spirit.

The President's Budget—The Inside-Out Straitjacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article, entitled "The Inside-Out Straitjacket," published in the Wall Street Journal of January 22, 1959, dealing with the President's new budget.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE INSIDE-OUT STRAITJACKET

The President's new budget, in one view, rests on "the assumption that there is some magic figure into which the budget should be forced, like putting a man in a straitjacket."

The words are LYNDON JOHNSON's, the so-called moderate Senate majority leader, but they reflect the attitude of many liberals in and out of Congress. For instance, the Democratic Advisory Council, which includes former President Truman and Adlai Stevenson and other important Democrats, declares that the budget puts "pocketbook before people" and proceeds to contend that "what is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public."

Now what all these people are really saying is that a budget should not be a budget at all. For a budget is meaningless if it is not in fact a straitjacket of sorts. A real budget, whether it is yours or ours or the Government's, is a financial discipline based on the ancient and certain knowledge that people and governments that consistently live beyond their means are headed for real trouble.

Rejecting this accumulated knowledge, the statists of today who unjustifiably call themselves liberals propound a reverse theory. In one version it goes like this: Closing the "deficit of needs" is far more important than closing any fiscal deficit; indeed, they speak of balanced budgets with ill-concealed contempt. Their idea is to decree the things they think Government should do and ignore the problem of paying for those things.

And they have been applying their theory with a vengeance—abetted, unhappily, at times by the Republican administration. During the fiscal years 1932 through 1959—28 years—the Federal budget has been in the red 23 years. To be sure, there was World War II, in which the deficits were extremely heavy, but that war comprised only 5 of those 23 years of red ink.

As a result of these almost uninterrupted deficits the public debt has risen from less than \$20 billion in 1932 to an estimated \$285 billion at the end of the current 1959 fiscal period. And the debt is rapidly soaring out of control. President Eisenhower felt impelled to request, in his budget message, still another increase in the permanent debt ceiling—that most impermanent of ceilings.

Since the deficits have been largely financed, in effect, by the printing presses, in them lies the chief explanation of the inflation which has destroyed more than half the value of the dollar in that same generation. And in their continuation lies the menace of the future inflation which could destroy all value. This menace the inflationists even now blandly propose to study; they intend to search assiduously for its

causes almost everywhere except in the Federal Government.

But inflation, monstrous though its mien can be, is not the only outcome of the theory that a budget should not be a budget. The rejection of financial discipline must also mean Government by chaos.

This can be seen even in expenditures for defense, which hardly anyone dares say might be cut. If the military were permitted to have all they want, the existing waste and duplication would be multiplied a hundred-fold. Not only that; without discipline, innovation and development would be retarded, for a certain amount of stringency is a goad to invention. Without financial discipline the defense effort would be impaired and finally wrecked.

For the Government as a whole, one result of the denial of discipline is to destroy selectivity. The question becomes not whether this program is better than that; instead, any program anybody thinks of is embraced. Thus, Government becomes a levathan, speeding the inflation and in the whole process suppressing the individual.

So what kind of nonsense is this about putting the pocketbook before people? The inflationists, the spoiled children who resent discipline, are the ones who are antipeople. For what they propose would ruin the people.

Fortunately there are still some who reject the inside-out budgeting theory and realize that a budget must be a firm control. It would also be well if reason could put a straitjacket on folly.

Ham Operators' Service Is Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in our modern world, the field of communications is especially valuable and important. This is particularly brought to our attention in times of emergency.

And there is one group of people who are always on hand to help in any way possible in this field. They are the amateur radio operators of this Nation.

The services this group provides are innumerable and invaluable. They have assisted law enforcement officers both in the apprehension of criminals and finding persons who are lost. Amateur radio operators have received distress messages from ships at sea and downed aircraft and have notified authorities so help can be sent. During times of serious fire and flood, these people—often endangering their lives and valuable equipment which they purchased with their own funds—have stood by authorities, relaying emergency messages for help and supplies and assuring anxious relatives that their loved ones are safe. They have also crossed many miles with their radio beams to bring messages from home to our servicemen and scientists in remote outposts.

As an example of the type of service these "hams" render, it was an amateur radio operator who first got out word of the disaster which had befallen Cameron, La., and parts of my own State when struck by Hurricane Audrey in

1957. As a result, aid was quickly dispatched to the scene.

Wherever these amateur radio operators are needed, they are on hand, helping in any way possible. They specifically prepare themselves to be able to give highly mobile assistance in any emergency.

Mr. President, in recognition of the outstanding services performed by these people, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Woody Montgomery which appeared in the Temple, Tex., Daily Telegram for Sunday, January 11, 1959, under the heading "Central Texas Hams Set for Emergency Work."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL TEXAS HAMS SET FOR EMERGENCY WORK

(By Woody Montgomery)

In some circles when a fellow is called a big ham he's liable to resent the implications, but in amateur radio circles being called a big ham is a compliment.

Temple has about 25 active hams, the radio variety, as members of the Temple Amateur Radio Club and they're ready for any emergency.

Central Texas has not called for their services to a great extent since the Waco tornado a few years back, but the Temple club hasn't relented in preparing for any emergency.

And the rigs, a term the amateurs fondly call their transmitters and receivers, range from a small mobile job to the near-maximum 1-kilowatt jobs.

The Temple club is equipped to move on short notice to any location and is ready to set up to aid in flood, fire and any disaster.

The local club at one time had a fully equipped mobile unit for use in emergencies but the van truck had its limitations and was abandoned.

Now, according to Club President Paul Gardner, the club has a portable generator mounted on a small trailer that can be towed behind any car.

On another trailer, furnished by the Red Cross, can be mounted at a moment's notice a fully-equipped transmitter and receiver.

"With the separate units they can be moved by any member when needed and as a number of the hams have mobile units in their cars it makes the operation doubly effective," Vernon Starnes, a club member said.

"Right now things are running smoothly but no one knows just when the amateurs may be pressed into emergency service," Gardner said.

Amateurs never seem to be satisfied with their equipment and are always either working on it or building something new to add to their present rig.

And the hams are the "tradingest" bunch of people in the Nation. They never buy a part if they can trade someone out of what they need.

The Temple club meets the first and third Tuesday of each month; the members engage in a swap session, swapping either information or radio parts.

The Temple club, boasting members from the radio, photography, medical, electrical and just about every field, is getting ready for their annual nationwide field day.

It isn't until June, but then the members of central Texas clubs will journey to the Ed Brod farm near Cameron and set up camp.

During the field day, operated only on emergency power, the clubs across the Nation vie for the honors in contacting the most other stations over the world.

It's a fascinating hobby and pastime, but as one ham put it, "It takes up a lot of time."

Educational TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles which describe an educational television series which is being conducted in my hometown of Fayetteville, Ark.

Fayetteville does not have a television broadcasting company; but through the cooperation of Radio Station KHOG, The Trans Video Corp., which operates a local community antenna system, the Fayetteville Public Schools, and the University of Arkansas, it has been possible to establish Arkansas' only closed circuit educational television program. I believe that the series may be the forerunner to a wider and more effective use of television in schools throughout the Nation.

The articles which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD are "TV Goes to Public School," which appears in the January issue of Arkansas Alumnus. The second article appears in the November 1958 issue of the Journal of Arkansas Education and is entitled "A Look at Educational TV."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Alumnus, January 1959]
TV GOES TO PUBLIC SCHOOL—ART, MUSIC, AND SCIENCE PROGRAMS ARE VIEWED BY ELEMENTARY CLASSES

Now that everybody agrees television is here to stay, educators are searching for ways to use it to the best advantage.

On the University of Arkansas campus that search is headed by Norman DeMarco, associate professor of speech, who spent 9 months of last year studying and observing in the New York network studios and at educational station WGBH-TV in Boston. The study was made possible by a Leadership Training Award from the Fund for Adult Education.

Bringing back to the campus both know-how and a belief in the value of TV as a teaching aid, Professor DeMarco this fall initiated TV Classroom, a series of educational programs for elementary school-children.

Countless persons of both the town and gown communities have cooperated to bring these art, music, and science programs into the public school classroom once a week. Each Wednesday at 2:15 the second-grade children all over the city view the music program for 30 minutes; on Thursday the sixth-graders watch art; on Friday the fifth-graders see the science program.

Those in the community who have helped include Superintendent Wayne White (BSE '40, MS '45); the school principals, and the teachers who make the classroom arrangements, prepare the children, and offer constructive criticism. The school board and the PTA's have provided two television sets for each of the five elementary schools; Trans-Video Corp., installed cable service in

each school without charge (cable users normally pay for installation and a monthly service charge); and radio-TV station KHOG gives time and studio space. Although the university owns one TV camera and accessories, it has no studio space. Fred Stevenson, manager of the station, offered the studio, and KHOG and the university combined equipment.

The university has contributed the planning and production. The teachers are faculty members; the members of Professor DeMarco's TV production class do everything from operating the cameras to announcing the programs. In addition to his roles as director and producer, DeMarco himself usually operates the control board. Faculty members receive no credit or extra pay for the time given to TV—and that time involves preparing a 30-minute lecture on a special subject, attending at least two rehearsals (one called a "dry rehearsal," which is outside the studio, and another a before-camera rehearsal), as well as the actual TV airing.

In advance of each program the classroom teachers whose children will be observing receive an outline so that they can discuss it together before and after. They also receive an evaluation sheet on which they assess the quality of each program: Whether the children were interested, whether the aural and visual qualities were good, whether they have suggestions for improvement. Through such evaluations the producers discovered, for example, that their first art programs were too difficult for the third-graders who were viewing them; they switched to the sixth-graders, who were fascinated.

The art presentations are under the supervision of David Durst, head of the art department. He has also done most of the on-camera teaching. He has discussed the art of cartography and the art of costume in the time of Columbus, both as prefaces to Columbus Day. Aided by Charles McGimsey, assistant curator of the museum, who brought art examples from the university museum displays, he has discussed art work of various American Indian tribes. At Christmas, with Lothar Krueger and Ed Albin, also of the art department, he demonstrated how to make Christmas decorations out of common objects.

Miss Catherine McHugh, associate professor of music, is in charge of the music programs. Usually she has in the studio second grade guests from different schools; occasionally she talks alone about music, demonstrating on the piano and with blackboard.

In setting up a whole year's schedule of the science TV Classroom, Dr. R. F. Kruh of the chemistry department has called upon scientists in a number of departments. Topics have included Insects and Their Work, Controlling Fires, Streams at Work, and Warm Weather Indoors.

Since TV cable service is used by so many adults, Professor DeMarco would like to start a language program, preferably a class in Russian. He also hopes to produce a series for adults on the creative process, which would be viewed in the evenings.

He, along with other faculty members, would also like to experiment with TV in the university classroom, but that will have to wait upon the provision of a campus studio and more equipment.

In the budget request for the next biennial President Caldwell commented that "television will be used more and more in higher education, for both on-campus and off-campus instruction. The university has been able to qualify at least three splendid members of its faculty for developing institutional use of this medium—but we have not had the space nor the 'seed-money' to begin experimental use of TV."

[From the Journal of Arkansas Education, November 1958]

A LOOK AT EDUCATIONAL TV (By Don Murphy, Jr.)

The big news in the fall roundup of television is neither the newest adult western, nor the old comedian making a comeback, nor the singer with the most cleavage in her gown, nor the most extravagant spectacular with a galaxy of talent and peacock color. The big news this fall is television for the classroom.

While autumn leaves litter Arkansas lawns, video waves are beamed into homes and classrooms bringing shows that are designed to teach. In eastern Arkansas many high schools are participating in a program of TV physics broadcast from a Memphis station. In Fayetteville viewers are offered three regular weekly educational television shows, one designed for public information, the other two for classroom work. And every commercial channel in the State is giving time to educational television which is aimed either at classroom enrichment for students or at informing the public about what goes on in schools.

Let's take a look at the various programs throughout the State to see what they are doing and how they came about.

EASTERN ARKANSAS PHYSICS PROGRAM

Thirteen high schools in six cities in eastern Arkansas are taking part in the physics program offered by Memphis station WKNO-TV, channel 10. In films being shown by WKNO-TV, Dr. Harvey E. White, professor and vice chairman of the department of physics at the University of California at Berkeley, teaches physics. The 30-minute film series was prepared especially for high school level work by Dr. White. The schedule each week allows for three lecture and two laboratory periods. For the convenience of all the schools in making their class schedules, the films are televised four times a day; at 9, 10:30, and 11:30 a.m., and at 1 p.m. By having a choice of telecast times, each school can schedule its physics to suit its school day.

High schools offering the course in television physics include those at West Memphis, Parkin, Wynne, Marianna, Osceola, Leachville, West Ridge, Lepanto, Weiner, Trumann, and Forrest City. In both Parkin and Forrest City there are two schools bringing the televised lessons into their classrooms.

The series, inaugurated September 8, 1958, includes not only the Arkansas schools listed above, but also schools in Mississippi and Tennessee. The series will continue throughout the school year.

PRELIMINARY PLANNING

Considerable preparation was poured into the program long before it went into operation. Station WKNO-TV questioned high schools within its broadcasting range concerning their interest in the plan. After contacting those schools interested, the station telecast test patterns to determine the quality of reception in each area.

In practice, the size of the classes averages 26 pupils. A crew of engineers determined the best television screen size for classroom viewing to be 21 to 24 inches.

Reports from teachers concerning the success of the program are most gratifying. With few exceptions the teachers are pleased with the classes by television. Many praise the program, pointing out that their students have made more progress in the study of physics than in previous years. They report that the films on laboratory work are especially useful because no time is wasted in having to set up the materials, and students can actually see the experiments better on the screen than in a laboratory.

Station WKNO-TV has scheduled preview showings of the films at night a week prior to the time they are to be used in the classroom in order that teachers may familiarize themselves with the material to be covered and plan their classroom procedure. The 30-minute showings leave sufficient class time for teachers to answer questions about the filmed lesson for that day and to emphasize important points.

Dr. White's series on high school physics is no stranger to Arkansas schools. Last year the same films were put on 16-millimeter projectors and shown in many high schools within the State. In some instances specific films in the series were used; in others several of the units were used.

COLLEGE SERIES

A similar physics film series, made by Dr. White for use on the college level is also being televised in the State. Several colleges, including Little Rock University, Henderson State Teachers College, Arkansas State Teachers College, Arkansas A. and M., and Arkansas A. M. and N. are currently offering credit for successful completion of the course.

The films are telecast over KARK-TV, Little Rock, at 6:30 every morning, Monday through Friday. The series covers 32 weeks or the equivalent of 2 college semesters, and is good for 4 hours' credit.

Using the program of Little Rock University as an example, here is how one college conducts its physics-by-television course. At the beginning of the school year the students enrolling in the course were given a syllabus containing daily textbook assignments plus problems to be solved. With the syllabus as a guide, class members view the filmed lecture-demonstration in their own homes. They meet for class at 7:30 each Wednesday evening during the semester, at which time the regular professor answers questions arising from the filmed lectures. At these weekly class periods, students turn in their homework and take periodic tests. When a student has successfully passed his examinations, his grade for the course is placed on his transcript.

JOINT PROJECT IN FAYETTEVILLE

In Fayetteville, where the State's only closed-circuit educational channel is located, the television teaching is being tried out on the elementary level. While attending past national administrative conferences and meetings, Superintendent Wayne White had heard the subject of television discussed at great length in connection with schools. When Fayetteville got its station last year and free time became available to the local schools, Mr. White was anxious to accept.

Gaining the support of the school board, the staff of station KHOG-TV, and faculty members of the University of Arkansas, he referred to a committee the matter of setting up a schedule of local educational television shows. The committee, consisting of educators, professional television men, and the lay public started its work by drafting plans for two 30-minute shows each week.

One of these shows is an informational program about the Fayetteville schools planned and conducted by Mr. White every Tuesday morning at 10:30. It may feature students and teachers in a discussion of classroom activities, or parents and PTA members discussing supervised play periods or the school lunchroom. Any issue of importance to the public school system is a must for airing on his program.

The second program drafted by the committee was a weekly 30-minute instructional program directed to third-grade art. A team of two third-grade teachers and members of the University of Arkansas art department decided on a program schedule and selected the material to be covered. This weekly show is viewed by the third-grade art classes under the supervision of their regular

teacher and is a supplement to their daily instruction.

These informational and instructional programs were begun in late September. Since that time the program has been expanded by adding, in mid-October, a 30-minute show on elementary music similar to the existing one on art. The committee hopes to expand the television series further to include additional instructional programs before the end of the school year. On the agenda for next year is a plan to include the junior high school level in the television series.

A great deal of community cooperation and spirit was displayed in putting the television shows on the air in Fayetteville. Faculty members from the university volunteered their time as television teachers. Norman De Marco, cochairman of the planning committee and the university's representative on the committee, supervised his undergraduate students in the university's television classes in producing and directing the shows and operating the cameras. Anxious to do its part, station KHOG-TV saved the school system the expense of hooking onto the coaxial cable by installing the connections at the schools without charge.

The school board and PTA combined forces in procuring television sets for the six schools. Both 21- and 24-inch console and table models were purchased and installed in the auditorium and lunchroom at each elementary school. Each set was placed in an elevated position to facilitate maximum viewing by the classes.

STATE LEVEL ALSO

On the State level, also, experimentation in the use of educational television is being encouraged by the State department of education. It began last spring, when the State department of education was approached by the representatives of the seven commercial television stations in the State about the possibility of endorsing a project in educational television. The State department of education acted favorably on the offer, and work commenced.

Under the plan the State department of education is sponsoring a weekly 30-minute program over each of the seven participating stations for a period of 6 months. To expedite the plan and put it into working order a local committee has been selected for each station. Membership on these program planning committees includes school administrators, school board members, employees of the TV stations, business and civic leaders, and interested laymen. A State department coordinator, selected by the State commissioner of education, is working with each of the local committees.

The primary duty of each local committee is to plan the programs to be presented over its station for the 6-month period. Each station's programming includes some adult information and some enrichment shows.

Four of the stations had their programs on the air by the middle of October, and by the first of November two others had joined them.

Telecast times for the State department of education sponsored programs are as follows: KARK-TV, Little Rock, Sunday at 1:30 p.m.; KTHV, Little Rock, Saturday at 11 a.m.; KNAC-TV, Fort Smith, Sunday at 11 a.m.; KRBB-TV, El Dorado, Tuesday at 4 p.m.; and KCMC-TV, Texarkana, Tuesday at 5 p.m.

The new activity in educational television in Arkansas is quite pronounced and is an indication of the recognition of its potential as a teaching device. The future of its use in the classroom is very much wrapped up in the pilot projects that are now underway in many parts of the State. Whether it will ultimately become a mature

influence and an effective teacher for Arkansas youth as well as an effective interpreter of the schools to their patrons, depends to a great extent upon the experimentation now taking place.

Soviet Barriers to Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on December 2, 1958, the Hon. George McGreggor Harrison, U.S. representative to the United Nations General Assembly, spoke before the Special Political Committee. The subject of his address was "Peaceful and Neighborly Relations Among States."

The address is an excellent one, but I feel that it is too long for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do, however, ask unanimous consent that part V entitled "Soviet Barriers to Friendship" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks of mine.

For the benefit of any of my colleagues who might be interested in reading the entire address it can be obtained from the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations and is listed as "Press Release No. 3099."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. SOVIET BARRIERS TO FRIENDSHIP

To avoid bitterness in this debate, I prefer not to burden the record with examples of the ceaseless flow of official propaganda within the Soviet Union, consistently portraying my country and other non-Communist countries in false and hostile terms. Nor shall I go into details here about the elaborate system of control which prevents anything from being published within the Soviet Union that disagrees with the official line.

But I do wish to describe briefly how the Soviet leaders, having created this artificial and fearful climate of opinion within their country, then attempt to seal it off from contamination by any different facts or opinions from the outside world.

This is done chiefly by two techniques. The first is exclusion of foreign radio broadcasts by jamming. The second is censorship and control of the printed word, both incoming and outgoing. I shall discuss both.

A. RADIO JAMMING

It may be well for us to remember just what jamming is, because very few countries represented here engage in this practice.

Jamming is deliberate interference with a radio broadcast, to prevent it from being listened to, by drowning it out with noise from another transmitter using the same frequency.

Soviet jamming of Russian language news broadcasts on the Voice of America began in 1948. Since then the Soviet jamming operation has grown by leaps and bounds. The number of radio transmitters operated by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Soviet bloc for jamming foreign broadcasts has risen as follows: Spring of 1948, about a dozen jamming transmitters; April 1949, about 150; December 1950, over 1,000; 1952,

over 1,500; 1956, about 2,000; 1958, about 2,500.

This army of jammers is one of the largest radio systems in the world. It represents a capital investment of some \$250 million, and an annual operating cost of about \$100 million.

It is 5 or 6 times more expensive than all the broadcasting of the Voice of America, in all languages, to all parts of the world. Yet it broadcasts nothing but meaningless noise.

Its purpose, which it partly accomplishes, is to shut off the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist bloc from outside broadcasts in all their native languages. This includes broadcasts not only by the United States but by other countries too—and even by the United Nations itself.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has opposed radio jamming from the beginning. In April 1949 the United States made a written protest against Soviet jamming to the Secretary General of the International Telecommunications Union, a special agency of the United Nations. We pointed out that this practice was a violation of articles 11, 13, 19, and 44 of the Atlantic City Telecommunications Convention, to which the United States and the Soviet Union are both parties. Our protest was duly forwarded to the Soviet Government, which never even replied to it.

The United Nations General Assembly has taken a position against jamming. On December 14, 1950, after a full debate in the third committee, the assembly adopted Resolution 424 (V). This resolution declared jamming to be "a violation of the accepted principles of freedom of information" and condemned it as "a denial of the right of all peoples to be fully informed concerning news, opinions, and ideas regardless of frontiers." It invited member states "to refrain from such interference with the right of their peoples to freedom of information." It further invited member states "to give every possible facility so that their peoples may know objectively the activities of the United Nations in promoting peace and, in particular, to facilitate the reception and transmission of the United Nations official broadcasts."

The vote on this resolution was 49 to 5, the Soviet bloc alone in opposition. Since it was adopted, the Soviet Union has increased its jamming network from about 1,000 stations to 2,500.

It is not just United States programs that are jammed by the Soviets. The British Broadcasting Corporation and the Vatican radio, among others, get the same treatment. In fact, all radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union, in any of the languages of that country, are jammed.

Even the Russian language radio transmissions of the United Nations Secretariat have been jammed. They are beamed to the Soviet Union every day for 25 minutes on a transmitter in Geneva. They consist of summaries of developments at the United Nations, with special attention to the statements of the Soviet representatives here. They are edited by officials of the impartial U.N. Secretariat. And yet it seems that even these broadcasts must be prevented from reaching the ears of the Russian people.

Last August the United Nations General Assembly held an emergency session on the situation in the Middle East. Its proceedings were broadcast—the full proceedings, word for word, not just summaries—in all five of the official languages of the United Nations: English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese. The U.S. Government made available its own powerful transmitters for this purpose. The voice which was broadcast in each language was the actual voice either of the original speaker or of the United Nations simultaneous translator.

Those historic debates were clearly heard by radio in English, French, Spanish, and

Chinese, in the countries where those languages are spoken. But the Russian language version was jammed by the jammers of the Soviet Union.

Not only did the Soviets jam the speech of the President of the United States in the General Assembly, they jammed all the speeches. They jammed the speeches of the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic and of the delegates of all the other Arab States. They jammed the speeches of the delegates from the countries of Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe.

And they even jammed the speech of their own Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko.

In 1955, when a Soviet agricultural delegation and a delegation of Russian churchmen visited the United Kingdom, their remarks were broadcast by the B.B.C. to the Soviet Union—where they were jammed. And in the same year, when the heads of government met at Geneva, messages by Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin were broadcast in the original Russian to the Soviet Union—where they were jammed.

Can it be that the Soviet Government sometimes does not even want the Soviet people to know what their own representatives abroad are saying to the rest of the world?

The newspapers recently printed a report by a leading American, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, on his trip to the Soviet Union last summer. In his report Mr. Stevenson said this:

"We kept a careful log on foreign broadcasts with a shortwave radio. Never once were we able to hear more than the first few seconds of Russian-language broadcast from the Voice of America, the B.B.C. or even the United Nations before the jamming drowned them out. They go to great trouble and expense to see to it that the people hear only one side of a story and to keep them in ignorance of the United States and its motives."

One last comment before I leave the subject of jamming. The Soviet Union, in the first half of 1958, transmitted an average of 938 broadcast hours every week to foreign countries. That means five or six radio programs going at the same time at any hour of the day or night.

Of those broadcasts, 112 hours a week, or 16 hours a day, are English language broadcasts originating in Moscow and beamed at North America.

No Soviet broadcasts to other countries are jammed as far as we know, Mr. Chairman. Certainly none of those aimed at the United States are jammed. Anybody in the United States is free to listen to them—no matter how much they falsify U.S. policy. We believe in the old principle of Thomas Jefferson: "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Now I turn to the matter of censorship.

B. CENSORSHIP AND CONTROL OF THE PRINTED WORD

The Soviet Union has the same "closed door" policy with regard to the printed word.

In the Soviet Government there is an organization almost unknown to the outside world, called Glavlit. Its full title is "Main Administration for Safeguarding Military and State Secrets." Its duties are broader than its name implies. It exercises censorship over all publications, motion pictures, etc.—not only those which originate in the Soviet Union, but also those which enter from the outside.

Glavlit, among other functions, controls both the importing and exporting of publications and films. It may confiscate any publication which it considers unsuitable for distribution. Every book, pamphlet, newspaper or periodical, whether it originated in the Soviet Union or outside, must have the Glavlit imprint before it is allowed to be published in the Soviet Union.

The only exception to this rule is the monthly illustrated magazine *Amerika*, which I mentioned a moment ago.

Censorship applies also to dispatches of foreign news correspondents in the Soviet Union. Every dispatch must be submitted to the central telegraph agency for scrutiny by the Glavlit censors. Their decisions are final. They refuse even to discuss them with correspondents.

Here are a few examples of how that power of censorship is used:

In Moscow last August 1, the Japanese delegate to the Assembly of the International Geophysical Year made a speech in which he reported that most of the radioactive fallout over Japan had been caused by Soviet atomic explosions. There was nothing secret about his speech. But foreign correspondents' reports about it were stopped by the Glavlit censors.

Recently a correspondent in Moscow was forbidden by the censors to send out of the country the text of a biography of Charles de Gaulle, now the Premier of France, taken word for word from the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia."

The censors also stopped dispatches reporting that the birthday of former Premier Bulganin went by this year without any official observance.

When an American delegation of physicians, visiting the Soviet Union, gave a news conference in Moscow, foreign correspondents were allowed to report everything favorable that the doctors said about Soviet medicine—but everything they said which was unfavorable was cut out by the censors.

A Ukrainian Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

There is an irony of history here. The Ukrainian people have not known liberty since they were mercilessly incorporated into the Russian Empire in 1920. Their long-sought freedom from the yoke of Russian domination lasted but 2 years, from 1918 to 1920.

Today it is only fitting that we salute this brave and valiant nation that ceaselessly retains the desire to be free. The Ukrainian people are proud, individualistic, and have a tremendous amount of resilience to the present fates of history. Even though they are once again under the hated heel of historic domination, and have been under Soviet domination longer than any other nation now under Kremlin control, there is no shadow of doubt but that the interlude of a 2-year span of freedom immediately after World War I was enough to make the reality of freedom the ultimate national goal.

Since 1920 the Ukraine has been one of the bloodiest battlefields of modern history. The people of this rich agricultural land have died by the hundreds of thousands. Neither the dead nor the living can celebrate the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence. The Iron Curtain, so obvious to the rest of the

world, is also within the segments of the Russian Empire.

Thus it is up to us who live in freedom not to let this day pass without recognizing its significance to those brave men and women who make such an event meaningful. I, for one, am happy to be able to give this recognition. To the peoples of the Ukraine and those of Ukrainian descent in this country, I give my respect and my admiration.

The Importance of Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the importance of foreign trade to the economy and prosperity of our country generally is recognized much more fully by residents of ocean port areas than by citizens of other sections. However, the benefits of this trade are spread widely throughout the inland industrial and agricultural areas, to such an extent that it may well be said that every single person in the United States participates in some way or other in the fruits of foreign commerce.

An editorial in the January 17 issue of the *Marine Digest* points this out most effectively. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS ARE YOUR PARTNER

How important is foreign trade to this country?

An individual and an organization have recently provided answers. President Eisenhower says: "World trade makes jobs for at least 4.5 million American workers." The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce reports: "Foreign trade provides more direct employment in the United States than the textile, auto, chemical and steel industries combined."

Moreover, the employment thus created is spread throughout the whole country; it isn't concentrated in the seaports or along the oceans. As an example, an official of the Committee of American Steamship Lines recently described what foreign trade means in terms of income and employment to two States which are far from any sea—Kansas and Missouri. In a late year, their share of the U.S. exports of six industries alone amounted to \$330 million. And their share of farm exports in the same year added another \$270 million.

Putting it another way, the Kansas-Missouri work force totals 2.1 million persons. Some 750,000 of them are affected directly or indirectly by foreign trade. And imports, it should be noted, are as important as exports. We must go overseas for all manner of raw materials used in our factories—iron ore, long staple cotton, animal skins, and so on.

All but a small fraction of foreign trade moves by ship. That makes the U.S. merchant marine the active partner of industry and agriculture.

BENEFITS FOR EVERY COMMUNITY

"Every community in America benefits from American shipbuilding."

That statement comes from the head of one of the leading American steamship lines, and is based on a study of purchases made for the construction of two luxury passenger cargo ships. Five hundred job classifications were involved in filling those orders. All manner of raw materials, parts and services were required.

These two ships cost more than \$50 million. And they are only part of this particular company's \$400 million shipbuilding program. That program, in turn, is only part of the \$3.5 billion rebuilding program now underway for the American merchant marine as a whole.

The point is that the economic benefits of shipbuilding aren't confined to the seacoasts and the port communities. The money flows out to every section of the country. It's a fact that many a man who has never seen an ocean-going vessel owes a part of his livelihood to its existence.

The building of ships is only the beginning. The jobs of close to five million of us depend on import and export trade.

The Dollar and the Next Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the largest problem the U.S. Senate faces as we meet to begin the 1st session of the 86th Congress is the problem of inflation. Our great need is to determine what fiscal policies will insure a strong and stable economy. A balanced budget will be a strong force in maintaining a sound fiscal structure in our Nation. It is not the final answer; but it is one which will determine, in a large measure, whether we keep a sound dollar, an expanding economy, or whether we panic and take the road to runaway inflation.

In the December 8, 1958, edition of *Life* there is a reasonable and convincing editorial on the importance of working out a budget which will reduce spending and keep inflation under control. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE DOLLAR AND THE NEXT BUDGET

For the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget, these are the busiest days of a critical year. Preparing the budget that goes to Congress in January, they are vetting the multitudinous Federal claims on the taxpayer's dollar—that 1959-60 dollar which he has yet to earn. Heroically and against a tide of political cynicism—but with Eisenhower's support—they are striving to balance that budget. What difference does it make?

The current deficit (fiscal 1959) is some \$10 to \$12 billion, the recession having knocked last January's budget into a cocked hat. Expected tax revenues fell by \$7 billion, while spending rose \$5 billion. The Pentagon budget, which Eisenhower and McElroy were wrestling over in August last week, takes about half of the whole Federal

expenditure, but it is not responsible for the current deficit; the biggest increases in spending have gone to farmers, the unemployed, housing and other welfare items. And on such items the new Democratic Congress is widely expected to be even more openhanded with our money than the last.

"The time for a showdown with inflation is now," declared Anderson before setting to work. But would another deficit (even of \$5 billion or so) mean inflation? Not necessarily. The Federal budget is only one of the factors that influence prices. There are at least four other major factors to watch:

The cost-price push, chiefly the force of steadily rising wage rates. But this is not an urgent problem at the moment, since a recent spurt in productivity has offset (temporarily anyway) its inflationary effect.

The policies of the Federal Reserve. It has delicately but firmly been restricting credit since last August and, if necessary, could create anything from a mild deflation to a full depression overnight.

The way the Treasury manages our huge Federal debt—now a record \$283 billion. If he wanted to raise interest rates high enough, Secretary Anderson could stop the housing boom in its tracks and sequester the lion's share of our savings.

The tax structure, which influences how people spend their money. The present structure is probably inflationary; but it could be reformed in the direction already suggested by Vice President Nixon and others, from emphasis on income taxes to excise taxes, thus increasing Federal revenues and production.

In addition the Government has many other unused weapons against price increases, as a speech by Arthur Burns recently pointed out. It could reduce or even jettison price supports, import duties, import quotas, wage regulations, stockpiles, and subsidies. In short, the Government has enough power to drive prices through the floor.

Nobody expects it to drive prices through the floor. But the surprising thing is the number of people who expect the Government to do nothing at all.

The idea that inflation is inevitable is fomented by many sophisticated people, including Harvard economists, the Kiplinger letter, and half the professionals on Wall Street. The cynical syllogism goes like this: big labor controls Congress; big labor means higher wages, more Federal spending, cheaper credit, soak-the-rich taxes, and every other cause of inflation, which is therefore bound to come. A good example is the remark in Kiplinger's last letter: "Eisenhower won't stop this trend toward more spending. Truth is he probably couldn't even if he wanted to." Wall Street market letters echo this wise-guy certitude; the active market in stocks probably reflects as many bets on inflation as bets on prosperity.

Yet the plain fact is that most prices (other than stock prices) are not rising; businessmen, unlike Wall Streeters, are not buying as though they expected prices to rise; and indeed the whole fear of inflation, as a Federal Reserve man has put it, is "a state of mind rather than a state of facts." The state of mind assumes that U.S. democracy is incapable of self-discipline and that you can fool most of the people most of the time. This assumption has been disproved so often that it is odd to find smart men betting on it. Our advice is: don't.

A balanced budget for fiscal 1960 will not in itself determine whether we have more inflation or not. But it will make a big difference—and it could do a lot to wake up the wise guys about the real strength of our economy and our democracy. Most people are smart enough to want a sound dollar. The Government has plenty of ways to give it to them. In trying to keep the 1960 budget within bounds, Ike, Anderson and company

are using one of the most important of these ways. They are fighting one of the worst sources of inflation—what an earlier Budget Director called the "peculiar tendency in Government to add but never to subtract." They deserve all the support they can get.

The Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the *Record* an editorial, entitled "The Talmadge Plan," from the Sunday, January 18, 1959, issue of the Winston-Salem, N.C., *Journal and Sunday Sentinel*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE TALMADGE PLAN

With the Department of Agriculture's budget standing at \$6.9 billion for the current fiscal year and with nearly \$9 billion in Government funds already tied up in surplus commodities, the farm program has become a matter of increasing concern in Washington.

In his State of the Union message President Eisenhower said that Government outlays for the support of prices on a very few farm products for the current fiscal year will exceed \$5 billion—a sum equal to two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the United States. He said annual Government expenditures just for storage, interest, and handling of the surplus will reach a rate of \$1 billion by July 1.

These mounting costs and our obvious failure to control production, and thereby stabilize the market, challenge Congress to seek more realistic approaches to the whole problem. Legislation proposed last week by Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, could be a step in this direction.

Senator TALMADGE would abolish the present farm program and substitute direct Government payments to farmers for part of their output. This is a Brannan plan type of subsidy which the Government now provides for woolgrowers.

Under the TALMADGE program all Government planting controls and price supports would be wiped out. In their place farmers would be given quotas covering their individual shares of the U.S. domestic market. The farmers would grow as much as they wanted to and sell their products in the open market for whatever consumers would pay. The difference between the open market prices and 100 percent of the "fair earning power" parity price—on domestic quota sales only—would be paid to the growers by the Government. But no individual farmer would be allowed to collect more than \$25,000 a year in such parity payments. According to TALMADGE, his plan would cost between \$1.5 billion and \$2.5 billion a year, as compared with \$5 billion for the current fiscal year under the present farm program.

Theoretically, both the farmer and the consumer would benefit. In the absence of a created scarcity economy or artificial price supports, the old law of supply and demand would come back into the marketplace. Supplies would be more plentiful and prices to the consumer would be lower. This in turn should result in more purchases and greater public consumption. In time the

expanding domestic market might eliminate the necessity of any Government subsidy to the growers. But in the meantime, the payment of the subsidy on part of the growers' crop would assure them of a fair earning power income.

In actual practice the Talmadge program might not work as well as theory makes it appear. Congress may not even give it a chance to prove itself. It embraces the main features of the never used (except for wool) but long abused Brannan plan which has become a bogeyman of welfare statism to some politicians. The fact that it is offered by a southern Senator, who can hardly be termed a radical, may gain for it serious congressional study.

Certainly, as both Senator Talmadge and the President have emphasized, the time has come to deal realistically and effectively with the farm problem. It is clear now that neither the costly Benson policies nor the old rigid parity price support and acreage control program afford adequate relief from mounting Government costs and increasing surpluses. Courageous experimentation with the Talmadge plan (call it the Brannan plan, if you will) might be worth an early try. At least it deserves earnest study, if only to get congressional thinking out of the mental straightjacket which has bound it to rigid parity and control concepts for so long.

Visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking article entitled "We Are Deeply Disturbed," written by Milton Berliner and published in the Washington Daily News of January 17, 1959. The article deals with the visit to the United States of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan. What the writer has to say in this article is most important. I thoroughly and completely concur in what he has to say.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE DEEPLY DISTURBED

(By Milton Berliner)

In the poorly lighted corridor outside the Capitol's old Supreme Court chamber were four former members of the last Free Hungarian government.

Not far away, in the committee's handsome hearing room, waiters were prepping up the table for Chairman Theodore F. GREEN's luncheon in honor of one of Free Hungary's mortal enemies—Anastas I. Mikoyan.

The four Free Hungarians waited patiently for the meeting to end. They had what they called an "aide memoire" on the Mikoyan visit, and they wanted the Foreign Relations Committee members to read it before they joined the Red envoy at lunch.

"We are deeply disturbed by the exaggerated hospitality being accorded to Mr. Mikoyan in some American circles," the statement said. "Knowing the part played by Mr. Mikoyan during the Hungarian revolution of 1956 we can fully understand those who have been expressing their passions against him. . . . For us East Central Eu-

ropeans, Mikoyan is a trader of raw materials and slave labor."

The statement begged the U.S. Government to let the Soviet Union know that without freeing of the subjugated nations no peace could be maintained.

One of the four who waited was Ferenc Nagy, Free Hungary's last Prime Minister who was vacationing in Switzerland when the Reds took over. In exchange for his resignation, they promised to send him his little son who was still in Budapest. The trade was made on the Swiss-Austrian border.

"I know Mikoyan from the Kremlin," Mr. Nagy said, keeping an eye on the old Supreme Court chamber door. "In 1946 I visited the Soviet Government. The occupying Red Army had presented the Hungarian Government with a bill for \$15 million for repairing railroad lines.

"At the end of my official discussion with Stalin, I mentioned this bill. First of all we didn't ask the Red Army to repair our railroads. Secondly, the railroads enumerated were almost all in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, not Hungary. Stalin said, 'Don't pay it.' The next morning I talked with Mikoyan. He said, 'If Stalin said 'Don't pay it,' don't pay it.' And we didn't."

Mr. Nagy said he believed that Mr. Mikoyan was more a politician than an economic man.

"That's why I feel his coming to the United States is first of all not for trade but for political arrangements," he said. "Probably he would like to prepare for a summit conference."

Mr. Nagy thought Soviet leadership was much more firm under Stalin; that now it wavers between liberalization and aggressiveness.

The Senators began to emerge and each was handed a copy of the Hungarian committee statement. Then they walked down the hall to the Mikoyan luncheon which consisted of fresh fruit cocktail, steak and mushrooms, baked potato, broiled tomato stuffed with peas, tossed salad, an oversized rum tart, and coffee.

The New Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the provisions of the President's budget for fiscal 1960 affecting the various phases of Government operations will be a main topic of discussion this week and for many weeks to come, we may be sure. And few of these provisions, I am certain, have been awaited with more interest and trepidation than those which have to do with Government's participation in the upbuilding and the operation of the American merchant marine.

As is so well pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the January 16 issue of the Journal of Commerce, the American merchant marine is one of the real and rare bargains the Government has come by in the years since it became official Government policy to foster and develop a merchant marine adequate to the needs of peace and war. The net costs of assistance to our shipping, as cited by the Maritime Administrator in his recent report, have been more than balanced, in my belief, by the savings to

the Government and to our export industries in the lower freight rates made possible by the fact that we were not at the mercy of foreign shipping as we had been too often in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Journal of Commerce be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW BUDGET

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The American-flag steamship industry is awaiting with more than usual interest the budget message of the President for the coming fiscal year, which is due next week.

On the basis of grapevine reports, there seems to be considerable fear that the sums to be suggested for operating and construction subsidies for the merchant marine may either be short of actual needs or, at the very least, leave so little margin for reduction by congressional committees as to imperil the assistance program.

It is quite apparent that the battleground from the start at this session is to be the budget. The Democratic majority is not seeing eye to eye with the White House on balancing accounts, but is insisting on expanded defense expenditures even though another deficit results.

Industry feeling was expressed by Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, this week when he declared "too many times in the past the merchant marine has been treated as the most expendable item from the standpoint of governmental financial support."

As a matter of fact, the shipping industry is going to need more money this year to maintain its position than was the case in the 1958-59 fiscal period when \$160 million was allowed for construction subsidies and \$120 million for operating aid.

Many of the presently subsidized lines are well along in their fleet replacement programs, all of which hinge on the grant of construction aid. In addition, the Federal Maritime Board has on its docket several applications from American flag lines for operating subsidy contracts. In two instances, the applications cover several essential trade routes and would require substantial aid.

Assistance to shipping has not proved to be much of a financial burden to the Government since instituted in its present form back in 1937.

Figures just released by the Federal Maritime Board show that total cost for operating aid through June 30, 1958, was \$808 million. Eliminating the five war years, when no Government subsidies were paid, this brings the average annual bill to the taxpayers to about \$47 million.

The final figures covering this period, actually may be reduced, for, as FMB pointed out, they are subject to recapture where earnings have exceeded the statutory limit.

As for construction subsidies, the picture is complicated by the fact that some ships were requisitioned by the Government during the war and others sold to operators later under the Ship Sales Act.

Thus, while the Government's account shows a total amount paid out of \$477 million, these offset credits bring the residual cost down to \$183 million for the period, or about \$10.7 million annually for the same 17-year period. This is just about the cost of one good cargo ship today.

Considering the fact that we now have a good competitive merchant fleet of some 300 ships operated in foreign trade by the subsidized lines, the investment can truthfully be said to have paid off handsomely.

This is not the time for Congress or the administration to take a pinchpenny stand

on shipping. The industry has proved its ability to competently handle aid funds, competition today is keener than ever and our merchant fleet under present high costs cannot operate without Government aid.

The International Significance of Alaskan Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished Senator from our newest State, Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], has recently written a most interesting article entitled "The International Significance of Alaskan Statehood," which appears in the winter 1958 edition of *World Affairs*. This article very ably illustrates the striking contrast that statehood for Alaska presents to the eyes of the world in comparison with the Soviet Union's treatment of its satellites. I commend to the reading of all Senators this splendid article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by the distinguished Senator from Alaska be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF ALASKAN STATEHOOD

(By ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from Alaska)

The admission of Alaska to the Union as a State has substantial significance in international affairs.

It demonstrates that the United States practices what it preaches. It proves that the United States, true to its professions and to its best traditions, does not practice colonialism. It augurs a corresponding treatment for the Nation's only other incorporated Territory, Hawaii, and for the maximum of self-government of all other of the remaining dependent areas, Puerto Rico having already been granted the status its people desired. It shows that the United States is willing to break other precedents in order to extend to a noncontiguous area—for the first time in history—the full equality and sovereignty previously conferred on 35 States subsequent to the formation of the Nation.

Statehood for Alaska advances the frontiers of democracy to the continent's farthest North and West. It extends these frontiers of freedom for the first time into the Arctic and into the Eastern Hemisphere—for the Alaskan terrain reaches into both these parts of the globe.

What is particularly striking about this liberating action is that Alaska was once Russian-America. But for the vision and wisdom of William H. Seward, Alaska might still be groaning under the tyranny of Moscow.

Historically, not only was Alaska once part of what now has become the most brutal totalitarian regime in modern times, but, geographically, Alaska lies within naked-eye view of the Soviet police state. Only 54 miles separate Alaska and Siberia across Bering Strait. The Siberian headlands which rise to 11,000 feet are clearly seen from the

Alaskan mainland. They are visible also from St. Lawrence Island, an Alaskan island in the Bering Sea.

Two other islands, Little Diomed and Big Diomed, the former American, the latter Russian, lie within $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of each other. Thus Alaska is the nearest free country to the Soviet State and the contrast between these two adjacent systems of government and the two ways of life is revealed for the whole world to see.

This contrast and this difference may be specifically illustrated by what has happened on the two Diomedes. Both islands were formerly inhabited by Eskimos, there being a small village on each, both extant before the coming of the white man. The American Eskimos continue to live there, following their peaceable pursuits, enjoying the blessings of liberty, as loyal and patriotic a group of Americans as can be found under the flag. I was happy to enlist those who were not in the Armed Forces in our Alaska Territorial Guard in the early days of World War II; and they are now active members of the Alaska National Guard, enrolled in its scout battalions.

In contrast, Russia's Eskimos on Big Diomed have been uprooted from their ancestral homes and forcibly deported to the mainland of Siberia. With that deportation, the friendly visiting that had taken place between the inhabitants of the two islands for generations, ceased abruptly.

Thus we have in those far northern latitudes a striking illustration of contrasting freedom and serfdom. It is to be hoped that our Voice of America will make clear to the world the profound difference between Uncle Sam's treatment of its dependencies—for Alaska was such a dependency prior to statehood—and Russia's treatment of its satellites.

Alaska versus Hungary. Gaze on this picture and on that.

In the one case there is the grant of full equality. There is application by due process of law of that most basic of American principles, the principle of government by consent of the governed. In the other case we have, by a dictatorial exercise of power, forcible deportation and the suppression of freedom which in varying degree all Russian subjects suffer.

In the continuing struggle for the understanding and sympathy of the wavering and uncommitted peoples of the earth, Alaskan statehood should be of great value as a shining example.

"By their deeds ye shall know them." The deed of making Alaska the 49th State in the American Union speaks far more loudly than words could.

That the 49th State was once Russian-American, that it is, geographically, Russia's nearest neighbor belonging to the free world—for all Russia's other neighbors have been subverted to the Kremlin's rule—sounds a clarion call to all mankind.

Alaskan statehood exceeds the propaganda value of a dozen sputniks. It is a missile—an intercontinental missile suggests itself—which cannot be intercepted and carries its message to the ends of the earth for all time.

VHF Translator Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am re-introducing with minor amendments a bill, designated as H.R. 1913 in the 85th

Congress, which directs and requires the Federal Communications Commission to authorize VHF translator facilities under proper rules and regulations to be established by the Commission. The amendments in the bill I am introducing, which differs from H.R. 1913, are that I have incorporated the language of the Senate report providing that, in denying a VHF translator application, interference with other facilities is not to be assumed but must be proven and must be shown to be so significant that it cannot be permitted a license or cannot be permitted to continue.

Action was not taken on H.R. 1913 in the last session because of the fact that the FCC was in the process of holding hearings on the entire problem of translators, boosters, repeater stations, etc. About 3 weeks ago the FCC handed down their decision, a decision which is devastating to the western half of the United States. It declares VHF television boosters and translators to be illegal and gives communities 90 days from the time of the order in which to make application for a license under UHF.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it makes illegal receiving television programs in 50 percent of the Congressional district which I represent. It makes law violators out of peaceful people because, since the distance is so great and the population so sparse, it is not possible for a large percentage of the peoples in towns and communities on the prairies of western South Dakota to receive television reception except by some kind of booster facilities. The FCC has failed to take jurisdiction of VHF boosters and at the same time, through lack of enforcement, have permitted, although not authorized, almost every community on the prairies of the West to spend several thousand dollars in installing VHF boosters. Under the new order these facilities would be completely voided and these communities would be required to spend three or four times the amount they have invested in VHF boosters in a UHF booster.

Another problem that apparently is of no concern to the FCC is the fact that UHF is a line-of-sight reception. A large portion of the West, including the Black Hills area of western South Dakota, is mountainous. The primary reason those communities need boosters is because of the fact that most of the population live in the valleys where line-of-sight television is not possible. They must have translators or boosters on a frequency which will permit reception on other than line of sight.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the UHF boosters are, by far, the least expensive means of bringing television reception to these remote areas. They ordinarily consist of an antenna located on a windmill tower or sometimes on a grain elevator through which a normally weak signal from a distant station is picked up. It is then amplified and re-broadcast at low power on the same or another channel from an antenna many times located on the city water tower. In most towns and communities where such facilities have been installed, contributions are solicited in the community or memberships are sold in a television

club in order to finance maintenance and operation of this simple system. Because it is cheap and yet because it brings television to that community in this simple manner, thousands and thousands of communities throughout the West have availed themselves of television through this system. The signal goes out only a very few miles, but farmers living near the town get the benefit of television thereby.

Two or 3 years ago the Commission wrote to many individuals and mayors of small cities and towns, advising them that this type of booster was unauthorized and must cease. Although their action was proper under their authority, their inaction to authorize some other service or to authorize any VHF facilities, whether they interfere with any other facility or not, was unrealistic and stopped nothing. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Commission failed and refused to step in and provide a sound scheme of regulation whereby communities so situated that VHF might interfere would be required to install UHF, and authorizing communities where there was no possible chance to interfere with anything, that those communities be authorized under VHF. In other words, they sought simply to stamp out the whole operation without providing any means for people of the West to have television service. Law-abiding residents felt that the good resulting from the booster systems was so evident and the alleged dangers so theoretical that they continued their operation.

It should be pointed out that the Commission is not unanimous in its thinking. After a thorough investigation of the problem in the West, Commissioner T. A. M. Craven dissented from the majority opinion, calling it unduly rigorous and unrealistic and based upon a narrow interpretation of the Communications Act. His statement is in part as follows:

Because the Commission failed to recognize promptly the overwhelming public interest factor involved in providing practicable procedures for establishing television service to small communities in the mountainous areas of the West, it is my opinion that this agency has failed thus far to discharge its statutory obligation to make available, insofar as possible, to all the people in the United States, a rapid, efficient, nationwide radio system. Apparently, the Commission did not recognize soon enough that these low-powered boosters are the only practicable way in which the people residing in those isolated areas can secure any television service whatsoever. We have been shortsighted in this connection, as remedial steps could have been and should have been taken long ago. If necessary, changes in legislation should be requested.

No hearings were held in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this subject because of the heavy schedule of this committee, but the Senate committee did hold hearings making four very specific recommendations:

First. The Commission has a statutory duty to provide television service for as many of the people in this country as it possibly can.

Second. If VHF boosters are technically feasible, as seems demonstrated by their operations to date, the Commission

should accept them as one available tool for achieving this end—which means authorizing such facilities under proper rules.

Third. The enunciating rules to regulate boosters, the Commission should go as far as is practicable in modifying its general rules to permit unattended installations incorporating the simplest possible equipment so that the service can continue to be an extremely inexpensive one within the reach of even very small communities.

Fourth. The Commission is not only entitled to insist that boosters not create objectionable interference, but is charged by statute to do so. However, it should operate on the principle that interference is not to be assumed, but must be proved—and must be shown to be so significant that it cannot be permitted to continue.

To me the decision of the FCC is unauthorized and unwarranted. The law makes it the duty of the FCC to authorize services which will provide television reception to the people of America. In many instances the only means of providing that service is through VHF translators. In many more instances the only practical means of providing service to thousands of communities is through VHF translators. Where VHF translators provide the service and cannot cause any disruption in other television or radio or commercial or radar or defense services, it seems to me to be not only a neglect of duty and of the law for the Commission to refuse to recognize and legalize through licensing these VHF facilities.

The bill I am introducing does direct and does require the FCC to authorize these small community translator facilities where they do not interfere, and provides further that the burden of proof shall be upon the FCC to show interference where application for such facilities is under consideration.

I Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues a sermon delivered by Rabbi Leon A. Jick at the Free Synagogue of Westchester on May 16, 1958. Rabbi Jick's sermon will be of interest to all peace-loving freemen.

The sermon follows:

I PROTEST

(Sermon delivered by Rabbi Leon A. Jick at the Free Synagogue of Westchester, May 16, 1958)

Traditionally the Sabbath is and has been for our people a period of refreshment and joy. Sometimes the Sabbath which is above all a day for finding perspectives, a day for withdrawing somewhat from the immediate task and looking at the long-range objective

becomes the opportunity for confronting a disagreeable reality.

Our tradition preserves the examples of many men who have had to speak of such realities. Perhaps the one closest to the mood and the problem of our own times was Jeremiah who lived in an age of dread and destruction—a time when the threat of a war hung like a heavy and oppressive cloud over the heads of his people—indeed, of all his world. Jeremiah warned his people against a short-range viewpoint which disregarded the danger. He warned them against greed and selfishness which could only doom them to destruction. He denounced the shortsighted, the apathetic, the smug, and the indolent in high places and low.

"To whom shall I speak and give warnings that they may hear? For their ear is dull and they do not attend," he cried. "Behold the word of the Lord is become unto them a reproach. They have no delight in it. Therefore, I am full of the fury of the Lord. I am weary with holding it in." (Jeremiah 6.)

"Woe is me. My bowels, my bowels, I writhe in pain. The chambers of my heart moan within me. I cannot hold my peace because I have heard the sound of the horn—the alarm of war. Destruction followeth upon destruction. The whole land is spoiled and suddenly are my dwellings gone in a moment." (Jeremiah 4.)

And so this man, Jeremiah, writhing with pain because of the foolishness around him went about preaching the message that peace could only come from righteousness. "Beware of war—beware of evil."

In the end, the message of the prophet, Jeremiah, was not heeded and his predictions were fulfilled. The state of Judea, together with large numbers of its citizens were destroyed just as he had said they would be destroyed. But the nation was not utterly destroyed. A remnant survived and this remnant remembered Jeremiah's warning and learned a painful and frightfully expensive lesson. And, therefore Jeremiah's idea of the primacy of justice and righteousness survived and the people survived.

Not much has changed since the times of Jeremiah. The plot is still the same and so are the characters. So is, indeed, the background and the whole framework within which the play takes place. There are still shortsighted statesmen immersed in the maze of their own folly, frantically racing around the same little goalless track. There are still apathetic masses—smug, sure they are safe—not listening, not heeding, unaware of what goes on around them. There are still lying prophets of all kinds with smooth and glib tongues who say, "Peace, peace"; say what people want to hear, and are not concerned with truth.

All of this is the same. But one factor has changed. One terrible factor has changed and this makes all the difference. Weapons have become so much more powerful and the stakes have become so much higher that mankind cannot afford the luxury of another lesson like the one the generation of Jeremiah learned. Now, war and the preparation for war threaten all human life with extinction. At this very moment forces which can cripple mankind are being unleashed and are dropping upon our planet in ever increasing quantity.

There are so many conflicting reports concerning the threat that it is difficult to know what to think, or whom to believe. Before beginning any analysis or offering any suggestions or even comments, let me simply review some of the facts which I have attempted to sift from the accounts which come to us from such diverse sources and with such differing content.

I wonder how many of us are aware of the facts? The first fact is that there are enough nuclear weapons in the world today to des-

troy all life that exists on this planet. Concerning this, there is no difference of opinion. Even if not another nuclear bomb is manufactured, there are enough bombs stockpiled to destroy all life on this planet of ours with possibly the exception of a few spores that are resistant to radioactivity. This is the first fact that we must keep in mind.

The second fact is this: Atomic weapons have now been developed and controlled to a point where they vary in size from small artillerylike shells, to 10-megaton bombs. One of these 10-megaton bombs represents five times the explosive power of all of the bombs which were dropped on Germany during the 4 years of World War II and 100 times the power of those which were dropped on Japan, including the two atomic bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Is such destruction conceivable? Can the human mind possibly grasp the extent of such disaster power? Such a weapon exists. Ostensibly it has been made for the purpose of possible use. This is the second fact.

The third is this: In addition to the fantastic destructive power of such bombs, power of sheer pulverization, each of these weapons fills the atmosphere with deadly radioactive poison. Concerning this, too, there is no difference of opinion. A 10-megaton bomb produces 1,000 pounds of radioactive materials as compared with 2 pounds produced by the atomic bomb which fell on Hiroshima and which killed and maimed hundreds of thousands of people.

Three nations today possess these weapons and have been testing them. The tests conducted to date by the United States, Russia, and Britain have caused a sufficient disturbance in the balance of radioactivity in this world so that within the last 2 weeks the Times reported that radioactive mud fell on the city of Rome and that there is now a measurable quantity of strontium 90 in the milk which is being drunk in New York and in the whole of the northeastern portion of the United States. The Atomic Energy Committee admits that the United States is, and I quote, "the hottest radioactive place in the world." This, too, is a fact.

Some of this poison persists in the atmosphere for 20 years, and will, therefore, continue to fall in small quantities even if no further tests are made. Everyone agrees that there is a threat to life from the amount of radioactivity already released. The only difference of opinion is whether 2,000 or 10,000 will as a result die this year of leukemia and bone cancer. This is due to the amount of radioactivity which has already fallen. How much more will fall in the next 20 years from the bombs heretofore exploded, we can only guess since, in such matters, we have no experience.

One final fact to keep in mind. The rate of technical advance is so great that to quote one responsible scientist, "In the next quarter of a century, there will be manned satellites, television and observation satellites, radar satellites, bomb carrying satellites and, as we are driven relentlessly into space, we will also be driven relentlessly into the oceans and there will be missile carrying submarines and underwater vehicles driven by remote control that will carry several nuclear explosives to the shores of any land in the world." These are the facts. About these, there is no question. Manifestly, because of these facts, we face a situation which man has never faced before in all of human history. We are called upon to make decisions that will have vastly greater effect upon mankind and mankind's destiny than those that have been made in all of human existence. No decisions in the past—no decisions made by Alexander The Great or Caesar or even by Hitler could possibly have determined whether mankind as a whole would live or die. These men could make decisions which could determine the des-

tinies of their own cultures and their own civilizations. They could speed up progress or slow it down but they did not have the power of decision which could have excluded the possibility of the emergence of later civilizations. No decisions on their part could have resulted in the destruction of humanity.

Albert Gyorgi-Szent, Nobel Prize winner who heads the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass., has stated the problem for us. Where is the way out? Where shall we go? What is the political, economic and military structure in harmony with this reality? Nobody knows. Nobody knows, but there is a way to find out. First the question has to be asked. First we must recognize that the question is—How shall we find a way out? Then we must concentrate all of our energies and efforts and abilities to answering this question—not the question of how to build a bigger bomb. "The men to answer this question," he concludes "are the men who know more than how to be elected or how to make war." Alas, that our leaders are men who know "how to be elected—how to make war."

By contrast, the decisions made today can result in precisely this kind of cataclysm. A mistake—a rash move by some second line military commander somewhere around the Arctic Circle or in a North African base—a false reading of a radar scope, a meteorite that crosses an antenna somewhere—any of these kinds of technical errors in judgment can lead to a war—a war in which both sides possess enough to poison and contaminate the whole world and destroy all life. The capacity of both camps to achieve such destruction changes not just the stakes—it changes the entire nature of war—the entire nature of strategy. In the image which Robert Oppenheimer drew, "There are two scorpions trapped in a box—both poisonous and both capable of delivering a deadly sting."

This is the situation. Under such circumstances—war can no longer be a matter of advantage—a matter of gain and loss—a matter of winning or losing a campaign. Under such circumstances, I submit that there is one overwhelming question which confronts our Nation and mankind: Can we devise means of forestalling this terrible catastrophe which has become a real and living possibility? Can we find a way of ending the creeping contamination which defiles and despoils this earth? Can we find a way of preserving life?

The answer to such questions is infinitely difficult. I would not minimize all of the complexities—all of the social and political problems. I remember what the Russians are and what they have done in recent decades. But, in God's name, I protest that this question is not being asked. Let the question be asked. In God's name, I say, "Woe unto those who are wise in their own eyes and sure that they know the way—who are wise to devise violence but to do good they have no knowledge." Instead of considering how we can secure peace, instead of exploring how we can reduce the dread, we continue the rat race of missiles and antimissile missiles and explosives whose power is past the ability of comprehension.

Since World War II the United States and Russia have spent \$1,000 billion on safety. One thousand billion dollars on safety—with the result that we have fear and jitters and the risk of mass extermination, that we are involved in an insane round of launchings and testings—all in the name of necessity. We have to do it—we have to keep ahead—we can't fall behind in the race.

Admittedly, the problem is complicated. Albert Einstein was humble enough to understand this when he was asked, "How is it that man could invent an atom bomb and then couldn't learn how to control it?" He answered, "This is because politics is more difficult than physics." He was right.

Human affairs are more difficult than the physical conquest of nature. But there comes a time when politics and human affairs become so complex that they call for a new look—a long-range look which acknowledges that in the end the best new weapon is stupid, the best new force is dangerous. Such a new look must recognize that war is obsolete because any war means mutual annihilation and, therefore, war as a realistic vehicle or means of policy is out of the question.

In the second place, I protest that the immoral and insane process of poisoning the world continues without so much as a serious attempt to bring about a temporary halt. What enrages me is not so much what has already happened, as the callousness of the men who are responsible for it, men who are reluctant to admit that there is a danger or that contamination is serious or that it is despicable. If there is any hope of stopping this madness, man must first be filled with a sense of guilt and shame that great wrongs are being done. Only then can they find a desire to stop these wrongs. Men like Dr. Teller who, by all accounts, is very proud of being known as the father of the H-bomb, does not seem to have the sensitivity to acknowledge the problem. Would that Dr. Teller said, "Woe is me because of this radioactivity." Then I would say I am willing to entrust him with leadership. He does not say so. Instead, he acts as though he were living in the days of King Arthur and the Round Table and looks forward to a little nuclear sport.

Men like this tell us that only 2,000 will die of leukemia and bone cancer this year in the world and they sugar-coat this statistic in such a reassuring way. They say that only a few minutes will have been taken off the life of every human being. What a pleasant statistical way to conceal a horrible truth. Other scientists maintain that the toll will be 10,000. Whether it is 10,000 or 2,000, I would like to see Dr. Teller explain his complacency to Red Skelton who buried his child this week with leukemia.

Only when we think in terms of an individual can we begin to understand the magnitude of the misery which is being brought into the world. I protest this kind of callousness which disregards this misery. I protest the fact that such callous men—not elected, not chosen by us, not subject to any controls by us—wield power of life and death over us, indeed over all mankind.

We have to shake ourselves to understand what it is that is involved and what the real question is: Where can this race take us? What if we get ahead? What will we do then? Explode the bomb on Russia? Were we helped during those 5 years after World War II when we were ahead and had the atom bomb and they didn't? These were the 5 years of the biggest Communist expansion in the whole history of mankind, the years during which they consolidated their position in Eastern Europe and in Asia and in the Near East and everywhere else in the world. What then are we going to get ahead for? Where is the race to lead? What is it we are running after?

I protest the shortsightedness of leaders who do not ask, "Why?" but only run around the track which has been laid out by past error in a race to which there is no end—and no goal.

I protest too against the misinformation, the deception and the deceit which has been practiced by those who are responsible for our nuclear development program. Everyone should know that the Atomic Energy Commission deceived the American people concerning the possibilities of detecting underground explosions. Only when the facts were revealed through the congressional investigation, did the A.E.C. reluctantly admit that this underground explosion had been detected a thousand miles away.

We must be aware too of the distortion which takes facts and twists them in such a way that they say only what the people who give them want to say. This is unfair. This is indecent. The American people are being deceived and deprived of the knowledge which they need to make intelligent decisions about their own future.

And, finally, I protest against the slander which is being heaped upon those who are questioning government policies, and are raising the issues of survival in this nuclear age. Time magazine has fired the first salvo in the campaign by implying that those who signed petitions asking for a stoppage of nuclear testing are people with suspicious backgrounds, perhaps Communist sympathizers. Such tactics have been used to discredit men like Paul Tillich, Eric Fromm, Norman Cousins and Norman Thomas, men who, in Norman Cousins' words, "were fighting communism before Henry Luce opened shop." Admiral Strauss has joined in this campaign casting slurs upon the intention, the credibility and the patriotism of those who would speak out against government policy. Such slander must be protested vigorously and vehemently.

Let us now draw to a conclusion. I hope it is clear that I am not trying to underestimate the problem—not trying to underestimate the difficulties of dealing with a totalitarian government, which is, at best, not trustworthy.

And yet, if we want to preserve peace and at the same time, save freedom, we must define our goal clearly. Peace is our goal—the relaxation of tensions and not their intensification. This is the way that leads to peace. As a demonstration, to ourselves and to the world, that we are indeed a peace-loving and peace-pursuing people, let us volunteer to stop nuclear testing for a period of time while exploring means of controlling and checking the permanent stoppage of testing.

Can it be that the minds which could invent the atom bomb cannot invent means of detecting atomic tests? Can anyone really believe that if one one-hundredth of the effort going into the production of missiles and antimissile missiles went into means of perfecting a way of detecting bomb tests that such means could not be found? Let us, therefore, as a token of our belief in peace, volunteer to suspend atomic tests for a period during which means of control and means of detection would be explored and let this breathing spell be the first step toward a policy of disarmament—a policy of control—of coexistence—a policy which would lead us to explore every means to achieve settlements and to settle those scores which cannot be absolutely resolved on economic and political social fronts.

We Americans have little enough to be afraid of if we go forth with the banner of freedom and peace and democracy. There is ample evidence of weakness behind the Iron Curtain and in the Kremlin itself. There is ample reason to believe that the

Iron Curtain could not stand up under a bombardment of peace and righteousness and democracy and hope for a new life and a new world which we alone can give to mankind.

This program is not impossible. It is not utopian. Indeed, it is the only practical and the only sane answer. The time has come in this world when the so-called practical men are pursuing an insane policy. And when the so-called idealists are holding up the only policy which is sane for mankind.

We, as intelligent citizens have as our first responsibility, to be informed, reading carefully, gathering information—thinking, observing, sifting all of the evidence which comes before us. Our second is to write to our Congressmen and our Senators and our President, to write to newspapers, to make our voices heard in the organizations to which we belong, to support the newly organized National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, to seek out other human beings, other intelligent and concerned men and women in our community and to bring to them the question and the suggestion which may begin the sweep and the surge for the new understanding and a new way.

In a recent article in the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins, who is one of the co-chairmen of this National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, wrote an article in which he called for 2 billion angry men—2 billion angry men who will make it clear to their national leaders that the world does not exist for the purpose of being a stage for the total destruction of man—2 billion angry men can insist that the world's resources be utilized for human good.

Let us begin with 200—200 angry men and women, angry and zealous, zealous for life—which means for God and, incidentally, for country—200 angry men and women zealous for the fulfillment of the vision of the prophets, a vision which we have the power to fulfill in our day that "nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore but they shall dwell every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alford, Dale, Ark.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., Mont.-----911 Beverly Dr.,
Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Bailley, Cleveland M.,
W. Va.
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barr, Joseph W., Ind.-----
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Barry, Robert R., N. Y.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----
Beckworth, Lindsey, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----3718 Cardiff Rd.,
Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth,
(Mrs.), Ga.
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, Conn.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Breeding, J. Floyd, Kans.-----
Brewster, Daniel B., Md.-----
Brock, Lawrence, Nebr.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Charles H., Mo.-----3606 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Quentin, N. Dak.-----
Burke, Frank W., Ky.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., N. J.-----
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----

Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carter, Steven V., Iowa-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----
Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Christopher, George H.,
Mo.
Church, Marguerite Stitt 2122 Mass. Ave.
(Mrs.), Ill.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----3735 Gunston Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, Iowa-----
Coffin, Frank M., Maine-----
Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----
Cook, Robert E., Ohio-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N. J.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----2828 Conn. Ave.
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dooley, Edwin B., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N. Y.-----
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence F. (Mrs.),
N. J.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N. Y.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., Wis.-----
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----1133 House Office
Building
Foley, John R., Md.-----
Forand, Alme J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., Fairfax Hotel
Tenn.
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N. J.

Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
George, Newell A., Kans.-----
Gialmo, Robert N., Conn.-----
Glenn, Milton W., N. J.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E.
(Mrs.), Pa.
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, David M., N. C.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N. Y.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Hargis, Denver D., Kans.-----
Harmon, Randall S., Ind.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----1323 Barger Drive,
Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., N. Y.-----
Hebert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Hemphill, Robert W., S. C.-----
Henderson, John E., Ohio-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----100 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., Ill.-----
Hogan, Earl, Ind.-----
Hollfield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Byron L., Colo.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----
Johnson, Thomas F., Md.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kasem, George A., Calif.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.),
W. Va.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kitchin, A. Paul, N. C.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Kowalski, Frank, Conn.-----
Lafore, John A., Jr., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----

Appendix

Cecil B. De Mille

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation lost a great man last week.

Cecil B. De Mille, first citizen of Hollywood, came west from New York in 1913 to make the first feature-length motion picture. He stayed on to build an industry and a personal reputation that will survive him as long as men seek diversion from the cares of life in the motion picture theater; perhaps longer.

He was a pioneer in practically every phase of his industry, constantly developing, changing, adapting new ideas, many of them his own. But in his personal life he was a traditionalist, clinging to the morality, religion, and ethics taught at his mother's knee.

He once remarked that when he was a boy, there were no motion pictures, and that for entertainment his mother read each evening one chapter from the Old Testament and one from the New. His selection of religious themes for many of his productions reflects this early training. His "King of Kings," produced some 30 years ago, is still showing in far corners of the world. His latest of two "The Ten Commandments," it has been estimated, will play for 50 years.

Although his own success was seldom if ever in doubt, De Mille was never at ease when the industry was in trouble. He gave freely of his wise counsel and often acted as financier to companies suffering the stress of a young and sometimes erratic industry.

Young De Mille ran away from school at 15 and tried to enlist in the Army to fight in the Spanish-American War. In World War I he organized a company of the California Home Guard. During World War II he personally accounted for the sales of millions of dollars worth of war bonds, and millions more through bond-selling shows utilizing actors and actresses under contract to him.

His concept of patriotism extended beyond service in wartime. He was a leader of public affairs and political thought in peacetime as well. At the height of his career in radio, he was thrown off the air for refusing to pay a \$1 union assessment which he found incompatible with his sure sense of freedom. The assessment was to be used by the union to fight right-to-work legislation. De Mille, who favored right-to-work, contended that the involuntary assessment forced him to support a belief contrary to his own. He lost the court battle but

fought for the principle for the rest of his life.

Cecil B. De Mille was honored by his contemporaries. Industrial awards, including the coveted Oscar, honorary degrees, and organization and Government awards came his way, justly earned. He received one of the first of 9 great living American awards bestowed by the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1957.

I mourn the passing of Cecil B. De Mille. He was a great man.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, my newsletter of January 24:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The 1960 budget, 1,275 pages, 2 inches thick, more than 4 pounds in weight, lists \$77 billion in Federal Government expenditures for fiscal 1960 (July 1959 to July 1960). Comparatively, this is \$3.9 billion less than this year, fiscal 1959. Receipts will be an estimated \$77.1 billion, which is \$9.1 billion more than this year. (However, total expenditures to the public are listed as \$92.9 billion and total receipts \$93.5 billion as distinguished from budgetary.) The President's 78-page budget message, a condensed explanation, discussed expenditures and receipts by Government departments, by military and civilian, and by specific legislative program.

Commendable, as I see it, are these thoughts: (1) We must have a balanced budget, live within our means, pay as we go; we must foster initiative and free enterprise, a sound economy and currency; (2) we need to review existing programs; (3) Congress, not the administration, is constitutionally responsible for the appropriation of money, and the size of the budget results from earlier congressional legislation; (4) Federal programs, wherever possible, should be shifted back to the States (along with tax jurisdiction); (5) we must assure maximum defense for each dollar spent; (6) research in many fields, particularly military, is continually being increased; (7) a better agricultural program is needed with less cost to the taxpayer and less control of the farmer; (8) Government whenever possible should sell surplus property; (9) more user charges and less subsidies are needed so that users, not the general public, foot the bill; (10) private financing, not Government loans, should be stimulated, through flexible interest rates.

Criticisms include: (1) Is a budget balanced and the Federal Government controlled when projects are deferred, rather

than canceled; when 43,000 new employees are to be hired; when more money is to be spent in aid to education, vocational rehabilitation, public works, urban renewal, public housing, and almost every welfare program? (2) since 1955 the budget has grown two to one in welfare over defense needs, when we know military requirements are paramount; simultaneously politicians assure us budget growth results from defense requirements; (3) increased population (as reason for budget growth) puts more strain on local government (utilities, schools, etc.) than on Federal Government; (4) Congress is offered additional opportunities to lose control. Example: (a) Foreign aid development loan fund is a revolving fund outside Congress' direct control; (b) other revolving funds are proposed; (c) item veto would transfer to the President great new authority; (d) foreign aid and Public Law 480 (Food Disposal Act) each transfer jurisdiction to the President; (e) requested presidential blanket emergency funds take the purse strings from Congress. (5) The foot-in-the-door programs where great spending increases follow program inception include: (a) Defense education bill; (b) public assistance under social security; (c) urban renewal; (d) world loans through various international banks; (e) many others; (6) the Federal Government intends to foster local initiative by offering more Federal money and control; (7) built-in growth factors and fixed costs are skyrocketing costs without new programs. (Example: Public works will be at an all-time high without even adding any new projects.) (8) Tax incentives to encourage private investment abroad—Isn't this tax bribery? Will this weaken investment at home as greater gains can be had in other countries? Is this fair or constitutional? (9) Non-service-connected disabilities of veterans are soaring.

The big question really seems to be, Has the budget gotten beyond all control? After all, it is almost \$8 billion higher than the \$70 billion budget of 2 years ago that precipitated a nationwide furor. And why the increase? Perhaps Budget Director Stans said it best—"Why is it that some business leaders join taxpayers' organizations to bring pressure on the Government to cut expenses, yet support industry groups seeking more Government subsidies? Why is it that some labor leaders press hard for wage increases to keep up with the cost of living, and then urge a massive program of legislative action which, if adopted, would lead to more deficit spending, higher taxes, and inflation—all of which could only demoralize the value of wages earned?"

Now the battle of the budget begins politically. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.) Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Appropriations Committee chairman, said, "All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget—he is at complete liberty to recommend a cut of \$5, \$10, \$15, or \$20 billion." Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, said, "The President cannot spend one penny which the Congress does not appropriate. We all know that." Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, said, "The chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations referred to the increase from \$65 billion to \$79 billion over the past 4 years. During those 4 years he has been chairman of that committee, and Congress holds the purse strings over expenditures." So it goes—expenditures are voted by Congress, Democrat controlled, whose leaders now try

to shift the blame to the President, who can only administer the law, which Congress passes. "The President proposes, but Congress disposes." We here know this, yet it is the people who are to be hoodwinked. True, the President could be a more forceful leader, but liberal Democrat spending critics offer only, "We must spend more." (First day of Congress, six Democrats put in bills with a 5-year price tag of \$117 billion.)

Why not review all existing programs, as the President suggested we do in the military, to be sure we get maximum value received for each dollar spent in the Federal Government? For maximum value in the military, let's get the Defense Department out of business operations. Why not apply evaluation yardsticks to every Government program now? (1) Is this a function of Federal Government? (2) Can we afford it?

Mikoyan and Russian propaganda experts will now demonstrate over and over the reason for his visit and the gullibility of American people. Mikoyan will speak for American people as set apart and opposed to their Government. Let's review a few Russian comments. Khrushchev called Mikoyan to his face a professional traitor. Khrushchev, speaking of the United States and Russia, "We cannot coexist externally. One of us must go to his grave. We must push them to their graves." Khrushchev again, "We Bolsheviks are a ravenous people. What we achieved in the past is very little" (enslavement of half the world). "We want more and more." On Manuilsky, Russian instructor of political warfare, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." Need more be said?

The Thinking of One of Our Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is copy of a letter received this morning. It is well worth reading:

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICH.,

January 10, 1959.

Senator Pat McNAMARA,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Received your letter on your stand, and report to the people of the State of Michigan.

Regarding Federal aid to education: More and more some people are inclined to let the Government handle all our problems for us. But that destroys initiative and self-government, and freedom; besides entailing excessive taxation. Federal aid to education would involve adding more employees to the Federal payroll, adding office equipment and buildings or space, new printing forms, and redtape.

All this would increase the cost of building more schoolrooms with Federal aid than if done by local talent alone. The local talent are right on the job, know the community needs, and can better determine, alone and without Federal restrictions and redtape, what to do in solving the educational prob-

lems in a way least burdensome to the taxpayers.

From your letter I gather you favor big government, inflation, and more and bigger taxes.

The only advantage I can see in higher wages and inflation is to the Government in the portion of taxes it collects.

I think it's a shame and a crime for our Government to sell bonds by advertising a return of \$4 (in 10 years) for every \$3 invested. A buyer of bonds, over the 10-year period, loses one-half or more of the money he invested in Government bonds, because the dollars he receives after 10 years, due to inflation, are worth only half as much as the ones he invested. In other words, the borrower profits and the lender loses. Is that fair?

You seem so favorable to admitting Hawaii to statehood. I'm surprised you'd even think of such a thing as long as Harry Bridges (an admitted Communist) is in charge of things over there. Are you trying to enthrone communism?

Our Government is committing treason against its citizens by confiscating property (including bank accounts) of private individuals whose only crime is exercising their God-given right to grow what they please on their own property for the purpose only of feeding to their own flocks and herds.

"Oh, but they are disobeying the law," you may say. In free America the Government has no business passing such a law, and certainly no constitutional authority for so doing. It just makes my blood boil at what our Government is doing. I supposed the victory over that kind of injustice was gained back in 1776. The Yankuses and Stanglands are the real patriots and Paul Reveres and Patrick Henrys of today.

Government agents coming around to confiscate your property or to boss you around on your own property is barefaced communism in its rawest form. And to think our own Government is doing that.

The way our Government is trampling all over our Constitution (especially articles 7 and 8 of the amendments) and Bill of Rights, and our Supreme Court making decisions of "policy"; also the way our Government is throwing away our hard-earned money like a drunken sailor on shore leave—why, if the Spirit of '76 were still alive, we'd all rise up as one man and put our Government in its rightful place—as servant of the people, not the master.

Our State governments and Federal Government, when they discover they've overrun their budgets, their first idea is to levy more taxes—always more taxes. Instead of boosting taxes, they should reduce their expenditures to fit the budget.

It's a very ominous statement you make in telling of your desire to close up the loopholes in taxes. This is merely a politician's way of saying you are out to levy all the new taxes everywhere you possibly can.

You men who have some say in the Government would do well to take a lesson from the Cuban revolt. It's the man in the street (whom you're supposed to represent) who is important, and not the Government.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN FREEDOM FIGHTER
ALFRED MCCAULEY.

You and Your Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased

to include for the RECORD a brief talk entitled "You and Your Chamber of Commerce," given by Leland H. Jones, president of the Phenix City-Russell County Chamber of Commerce, at their annual meeting November 7, 1958, Phenix City, Ala.:

YOU AND YOUR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(A brief talk given by Leland H. Jones, president of the Phenix City-Russell County Chamber of Commerce, at their annual meeting November 7, 1958, Phenix City, Ala.)

It has been said, the strength of America today is the sum total of the strength of its local communities, whether they be small towns or large cities, and to us a community is more than just houses, factories, paved streets or places of business. A community is people, people like you and me and others. People who live in these houses and work and operate these places of business.

Therefore, we believe for a community or a city to grow and become stronger people must band together in an organized effort, and one effective way to have this organized effort is through a city's chamber of commerce. Here is where the business and civic leaders work together to make a better place in which to live and carry on your business in a safer and a cleaner city.

The chamber of commerce is a place where the businessman, the farmer, professional man, industrialist, educator, and others can pool their ideas around the table that make their city a challenge and a source of pride. A community with an active chamber of commerce not only promotes progress, but helps to dissolve discontent among its citizens, and tries to promote harmony, peace and good will among men.

A chamber of commerce, first, must have an active membership; second, it must have an adequate budget before it can carry on its work to help community improvement, help to encourage good citizenship and sound business development.

Some of their duties today are to help business expand, try to attract new industry, promote tourist trade, keep in touch with local, State and National legislation, encourage citizens to vote, work with 4-H Clubs, build closer relationship among all the people, and to help build the community socially, politically, and culturally. These are only a few. There are also public relations, which is very important, hundreds of meetings, and hundreds of letters. There are all kinds of phone calls for information on many various subjects.

The remarkable thing I see in a chamber of commerce is this: Whatever is achieved is through the democratic methods, with voluntary membership and financial support—also contributed time and effort.

Your chambers of commerce financial support comes solely from the business community. Unfortunately, we are lacking some in this respect. Too many of our people are not members. The chamber needs your support, your enthusiasm, your suggestions and your association.

It is known a chamber of commerce cannot achieve its usefulness if we do not maintain perspective, faith, and enthusiasm. Chamber of commerce effort is that way. Its work is not the result of machine, not the result of muscles, or the pushing of buttons. Chamber success is achieved in its finest form through constructive thought, compelling spirit, and convincing action by men and women who are willing to devote part of their time and effort to build a better town.

It is basically a local institution. It embodies as no other agency its urge for community progress. Its genius lies in organizing the energies of men in the community who believe their city has a place in the sun—remember before Man made us citizens, great Nature made us men. It gave us a place to live. Its progress is in our hands.

One chamber of commerce executive has said "as business prospers, this great country gains in strength," and as you know, business thrives from individual initiative and citizenship. You might say—I cannot do much alone—and this could be true, but by joining hands much can be done. Your membership in the chamber of commerce will be investing something in your business and your community where you might reap a better living.

As you know, all communities have lots of problems, and will always have problems. The problem of growth and the problem of development, but we must keep working at these to build the kind of community in which we would like to live.

Last year State and local development agencies are estimated to have spent \$40 million trying to attract more industry—even so—some industrial executives say many towns are not ready. Communities may be seeking new industries mainly to gain new payrolls, but also industry last year paid \$7 billion in taxes that otherwise the local citizens might have had to foot themselves.

Imagine, if you can, a city without a chamber of commerce, a community chest, a parent-teachers' association, improvement clubs, civic organizations, and others too numerous to mention. I'm sure this would not be to your liking.

What would happen to a city of this kind? It would soon die of dead rot. It would be a collection of buildings and people who would be existing, but not really living. Yes, my friend, the miracle makers of a community are its citizens. Live, wide awake people who are upcoming planners and builders.

I would like to add this tonight, if I may: the next 4 years may be the most trying times in Alabama's history. A time when the Federal Government is invading the sovereign rights of the States, and many other pressing problems, but let us be proud that the man who will be at the helm of our government understands the problems facing us today and is not afraid to act for a just solution. Tens of thousands of people over this State supported John Patterson so he could continue his battle from the Governor's chair, not only to carry the banner of this State, but to place its prestige back where it belongs in this Nation.

It would be well that Americans be warned today—not to water down our free enterprise system for a form of socialism, or have it completely destroyed by communism. And to help keep down these movements they need the backing of local chambers of commerce—the backing of local citizens. They are heavily depending upon men who have interest in their investments and the future of this State and this country.

Let us organize our efforts as citizens, as well as you do your business. Keep informed on politics, sift platforms, check leaders, especially those who are interested in their own personal interest and personal gain. Not only on a State, but also a local level, because if these United States ever lose their present form of government and become a Socialist, welfare state, we think the world will blame the American businessman because they are the most influential group in our Nation today.

And in closing may I say when all is said and done, a city needs a strong chamber of commerce or development board, because as it grows—a city will grow, but it is not created by subscription alone. It primarily exists upon good leadership, constructive thought, enthusiasm, convincing action, and the participation of strong men. Men who operate banks, grocery stores, factories, furniture stores, law offices, physicians, all kinds of businesses. They are the ones who must provide the leadership—people who

believe their city has a place in the sun and will devote part of their time to its development as many of you are doing today.

Television Booster Stations Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, television has become an important part of American life. It offers educational, recreational and entertainment values that are appreciated by millions of citizens. Although it is a comparatively new communications media, methods have been devised to bring television not only to the population centers, but to rural areas and to families living in mountainous, rugged terrain.

In my own State of South Dakota, it has been necessary to make use of low-power booster stations so that television could be feasible in the rugged Black Hills and in some of the more thinly populated sections of the State. The people living in these sections are equally entitled with other citizens to enjoy the benefits of television.

It is an established fact that the use of ultra high frequency stations in such areas is not feasible either financially or from the standpoint of effective operation.

It is thus a matter of great concern to the people of western South Dakota and many other communities that on December 31, 1958, the Federal Communications Commission ruled that all booster stations must apply for conversion to high frequency operation within 90 days or cease operation. This order, if allowed to stand, can only mean that many communities will lose their television reception entirely.

Mr. Speaker, I am joining a number of my colleagues in the House and in the other body in sponsoring legislation to bring about a reversal of this unfortunate decision by the Commission.

The South Dakota State Legislature has recognized the serious nature of the FCC ruling and has passed a bipartisan resolution calling upon the Congress to intercede. The resolution was offered in the senate by Senators Al Roesler and Art Jones and in the house of representatives Carl Furchner and James Jelbert.

Under unanimous consent, I include this excellent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for television reception in certain areas of the State of South Dakota

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas there are many communities and farm areas within the State of South Dakota

whose people depend upon low power booster stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and

Whereas the rugged terrain of the Black Hills region makes the use of ultra high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities and farm areas to support, construct, or operate any other form of duly authorized television service; and

Whereas there is ample proof that low power booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or other services; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to repeater or booster stations operating in the VHF television band of frequency assignments; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration, all of which sought to procure reasonable rules which would permit the continued operation of said booster stations under the regulatory power of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all booster stations would be given a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra high frequency translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, That this legislature hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such 90-day period as the Congress deems fit through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications to insure the continued operation of low power booster stations, to the end that the people in the nonmetropolitan areas of the State of South Dakota shall not be denied their basic right to quality of access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural, and entertainment service of the American system of free television broadcasting; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

JOHN F. LINDLEY,
Lieutenant Governor.
D. K. HOLLAND,
Secretary to Senate.
ARCHIE GUBBRUD,
Speaker.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk.

Also under unanimous consent, I include the text of the resolution which I am sponsoring in the RECORD:

Whereas VHF television repeater or booster stations provide the least expensive and in many cases the only existing means of providing television service to many areas of the United States; and

Whereas the public in areas served by such stations is satisfied with the service provided; and

Whereas the replacement of such stations with other means of providing television service would involve considerable expense on the part of the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Communications Commission should (1) authorize the operation of VHF television booster or repeater stations in all cases where the operation of such stations is a public convenience and necessity and where such operation does not actually cause objectionable interference with other communications or does not endanger the public safety, and (2) modify such of its rules and orders as may be necessary to carry out the policy expressed in this resolution.

Bring a Soviet Crew to Lake Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of easing international tensions in the cold war the State of Washington, the city of Seattle, the University of Washington, and civic leaders throughout our State have enthusiastically supported the program of conducting sporting events with the Soviet Union.

Last year our fine University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against crews of other nations in London and Moscow. Although the Husky crew defeated the Soviet crews in Moscow, the contest was viewed in a true spirit of good sportsmanship by the Russian athletes. Because of the good will and better understanding which resulted from this sports rivalry, Greater Seattle, Inc., has proposed that the University of Washington reciprocate by inviting a Soviet crew to race on Lake Washington in August.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution, passed unanimously by the Washington State Legislature, calling upon the Secretary of State to give the greatest amount of consideration and cooperation to this proposal:

RESOLUTION BY REPRESENTATIVES WES C. UHL-MAN, PAT NICHOLSON, AND CHARLES P. MORIARTY, JR.

Whereas the University of Washington is a recognized leader of the world in all phases of eight-oared crew racing, its oarsmen, coaches, shells, methods, its consistency in winning national, international and Olympic championships, all attest to its universal preeminence in one of the few remaining sports untainted by any touch of professionalism; and

Whereas in furtherance of this highly desirable sport, the University of Washington crew accepted an invitation to compete against the crews of other nations at London and Moscow and was accorded full hospitality by the governments of the host nations; and

Whereas officials of the civic promotional organization known as Greater Seattle, Inc., have proposed to the U.S. Department of State that the University of Washington reciprocate with a like invitation to crews representing the Soviet Union to compete with the University of Washington and other invited American crews as part of the 1959 Seattle Seafair celebration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Government and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States consider and give the greatest amount of cooperation possible to the submitted plans and assist in bringing about the realization of this highly desirable international contest; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Members of the U.S. Congress representing the State of Washington.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the House January 14, 1959.

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

An Oil Grab in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Utah public is incensed over an injustice which they believe was dealt their State by the last Congress in the passage of Public Law 85-868.

The basis of their alarm is clearly and concisely explained in a recent column by Robert W. Bernick, business editor of the Salt Lake Tribune, and in an editorial in the Deseret News, in which the latter urged the Utah Members of Congress to make every effort to correct the injustice.

As these articles point out, the law may cost Utah millions of dollars in oil royalties which would possibly have accrued to the State but for the provisions of section 1(d), which is the focal point of the problem. In addition, the law may cheat the Federal coffers of even greater sums—sums which, ironically, would have been spent in large measure on reclamation and perhaps on the very project the bill was meant to help, the Glen Canyon development.

State officials have advised me that they had received assurances from the Department of the Interior, through the Senate, that the disputed section, which was slipped into the bill in the closing hours of the last session, would jeopardize neither oil-lease applications which then were pending before the Department, nor other State interests in the public domain. I have been told that the same assurances had been given the westerners in Congress who supported the legislation.

Utahans who are alarmed over this oil grab believe it behooves the 86th Congress not only to reexamine the law and the legislators' intent in passing it, but also to investigate the relationship between certain Interior officials and the Indians' legal counsel. The same Utahans suggest that unless a relationship of unwarranted closeness had existed, the Department likely would never have permitted such damaging provisions as

those contained in section 1(d) to be enacted into legislation at such a crucial moment, at a time when the lawmakers, under the press of last-minute congressional business, were without means to weigh those provisions carefully.

The Deseret News editorial of January 13, explaining the problem reads as follows:

SAVE UTAH'S OIL ROYALTIES

Congressman DAVID KING has made a good start in representing Utah's interests by challenging the Interior Department's ruling on a complicated, tremendously important question of oil and mineral rights within the Navajo Indian Reservation.

The way this question is finally settled can mean upward of \$9 million in oil royalties to the State of Utah, in addition to other benefits. We hope the entire delegation will join in a terrierlike effort to shake out a just decision on this point.

The problem arises because of "sleeper" language that was slipped into the legislation last year that authorized an exchange of land with the Navajos because of land necessary for construction of Glen Canyon Dam and filling of the reservoir.

That particular exchange, giving the Indian land in the McCracken Mesa area adjoining the northern edge of the reservation, created no particular problem, since mineral rights did not go with the exchange. But an amendment slipped into the bill and dealing with other lands can cause no end of trouble.

This amendment declares that all public lands, or lands in the public domain, within the reservation should be held in trust for the benefit of the Navajos. And it includes as public lands all original claims or withdrawals that have, over the years, been relinquished or abandoned.

Until the uranium-oil strike in the Four Corners area, ownership of those claims made precious little difference. It was land fit only for grazing, and little enough of that. But with one of the country's major oil booms developing in that area, ownership has become tremendously important.

If the lands are public domain, the claims filed by a number of Utah and other developers are valid; if ruled Indian lands, then the claims of two or three major oil companies take precedence.

Far more important from the State's point of view, if the lands are public domain, Utah will get 37½ percent of the Government's oil royalties, and other royalties will go into the Federal general fund and into the reclamation fund, from which Utah also benefits. If Indians lands, neither the Federal Government nor Utah will get a dime in royalties.

This dispute, it should be emphasized, has been developing for some time. As Congressman KING pointed out to the Interior Department the new law has the effect of deciding the dispute unilaterally, without a fair, just court decision. Utah's congressional delegation insists this was not the intention of Congress, as far as they could tell at the time.

The great bulk of the Four Corners oil and gas boom is centered on lands already part of the reservation. The Indians are doing fine. This new law, if allowed to stand, would have the effect of stripping away some of the relatively few benefits Utah expected to get.

As always in such cases, the issues are complex and neither the rights nor wrongs are all concentrated on one side. Certainly the morality as well as the legality of the issue is in enough doubt—and the matter is of such importance to Utah—that the law cannot be allowed to stand unchallenged. Mr. KING and others, keep hammering away.

Mr. Bernick's column from the Salt Lake Tribune, published January 21, reads as follows:

NAVAJOS' SUIT ASKS GAINS IN SAN JUAN

The Navajo Tribe Tuesday laid claim to all right, title, and interests the State of Utah has on State and other domain within the Navajo Reservation of San Juan County.

At immediate issue are two State school sections which in the last 16 months have poured nearly a quarter of a million dollars into the Utah school fund.

Ultimately, thousands of additional acres—much of it productive of oil—and millions of dollars of royalty payments to the State are involved in the action filed with the Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of Interior.

The lawsuit is based on wording of a bill passed by the last (85th) Congress which had as its apparent purpose the indemnification of the Navajos for lands to be covered by the lake created by Glen Canyon Dam.

But the Indians apparently are getting more than 60,000 acres of additional ground in San Juan County.

Their counsel now maintains the law wiped out all interests of the State in these two school sections and transferred all public domain within the Navajo Reservation to Indian trusteeship.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, was active in sponsorship of the measure in the final days of the 85th Congress.

The Indians, in their process served Tuesday on Frank J. Allen, State land board director, also asserted that the State school sections were rightfully Navajo because the Indians trod the lands prior to admission of the State into the Union.

They cite a number of decisions of the Federal courts backing up this finding.

One other recently publicized effect of the Littell bill was to wipe out the claims of several Utahans who had filed Federal oil and gas leases on lands which had been made subject to a prior mineral entry before extension of the Navajo Reservation in March 1933.

NINETEEN THIRTY-THREE LAW BARRED NAVAJO SAN JUAN EXPANSION

(An interesting portion of this bill creating the Aneth extension north of the San Juan River was its assertion that nothing in the 1933 law would constitute liquidation of prior entry on what was then Federal public domain. That 1933 law asserted that in no case were the Navajos to be given any more land in San Juan County. A quarter of a century later, the Congress repudiated its pledge, enlarged the reservation, and voided the articles on prior mineral entry.)

The assertion as to trusteeship of the Navajo on Federal public domain within the reservation raises an important and as yet unsettled question as to ownership of the bed of the San Juan River which traverses the oil-rich general Aneth area.

The State of Utah has been pressing—without any noticeable reaction by the office of the U.S. district attorney at Salt Lake City—for a quiet title action involving ownership of the bed.

Originally, the Navajos had no interest in this suit. If navigable, the San Juan bed belongs to the State. If not navigable—based on history of travel—the river bed is Federal public domain.

But the new assertion of trusteeship apparently would turn the river bed mineral rights to the Indians.

The Tribune was advised that the section of Public Law 85-868 (the Navajo Glen Canyon Indemnity bill) dealing with Tuesday's assertion of interests on the part of the Indians was prepared by Normal Littell, general counsel for the Navajo Tribe at Washington, D.C.

The Littell amendment apparently was accepted by Elmer Bennett, then Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and western Senators, including the Utah delegation.

The Department of the Interior currently is resisting any change in this section by the present Congress on moral grounds.

Mr. Allen told the Tribune—and Roger Ernst, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior has stated—that the acceptance of the amendments by the Senate was a "package deal involving the Indians, the Department, and the State of Utah."

However, "the State of Utah has been no party to any package deal involving the Indians or anyone else which would wipe out our rights and interests—and the interests of our schoolchildren—in oil production in San Juan County or any other county," Mr. Allen declared Tuesday.

WALLACE WIRE ASSURED NO ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mr. Allen said that all he had received from anyone in connection with the so-called Littell amendment was a telegram signed "Wallace" that the proposed changes in the legislation would have no adverse bearing on Utah's rights in the oil area.

Mr. Allen Tuesday called for "immediate amendment of Public Law 85-868 so as to remove all doubt as to the title, rights, and interests of the State in its oil holdings in San Juan County."

He also asserted that the action of the Indian counsel before the U.S. Bureau of Land Management on the two State school sections would be vigorously resisted.

Specifically involved in this latest move by Navajo counsel are section 16, township 40 south and range 24 east (Aneth Pool), on which lease was granted to Shell Oil Co., and section 16, township 40 south, range 26 east (Isamay Pool), on which a lease was granted to Carter Oil Co.

Legislative Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today offered seven bills for consideration by the House of Representatives. These bills, in my judgment, should be promptly considered by the appropriate committees and reported out for final approval at the earliest possible date.

The legislative proposals which I am making may be briefly summarized as follows:

I. EXCISE TAX REPEAL

One of the bills provides for the repeal of the excise tax on communication services and facilities, and another provides for the repeal of such taxes upon the transportation of persons.

Further collection of these excise taxes seems to me to be unwarranted in view of the fact that they were originally imposed as war-time tax-raising devices. These taxes constitute an undue burden upon individuals of small businesses. Repeal would result in very little loss of revenue to the Government and would serve as a stimulus to small business and individual savings.

In the 85th Congress we repealed the excise tax upon the transportation of

property, and it now seems highly proper that we should do the same with reference to transportation tax upon persons.

II. ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

One of the bills which I have offered will increase the amount which a taxpayer may deduct on account of expenses paid for the care of his or her dependents who are under the age of 16 years. The other measure would increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness.

The working mothers in our country are being heavily penalized under the present Internal Revenue Code by reason of their inability to deduct the costs of care for dependents while the mother is necessarily working to earn a livelihood for her family. To fail to give the consideration which this bill offers for taxpayers who must pay for the care of their dependents while gaining their livelihood will constitute the compounding of a wrong which has long been experienced by the working mothers of our country. I believe that this legislation is long overdue and entertain the hope that others in the House will concur with that thought.

An increase in the personal tax exemption for taxpayers from \$600 to \$1,000 will give tax relief to the lower income citizens and, thereby, should have a great stimulus upon business as well as personal savings by those in the lower income brackets. The increase in personal exemption which is envisioned will result in very little overall loss of revenue to the Federal Government and could, in the long pull, result in an increase in the revenue by reason of the stimulation which it will give to business.

III. SOCIAL SECURITY

Another bill which I am offering will amend title II of the Social Security Act by removing the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

This legislation is made essential by reason of the inflationary spiral in which those who are receiving benefits find themselves. Those recipients who are physically able to carry on gainful employment should not be penalized for their diligence and energy, but rather should be encouraged to continue to make their contribution to the business, economic, and industrial life of their country.

Those who have attained all eligibility requirements except the reduction of their own income should not be penalized but should be given the encouragement which this legislation proposes.

IV. WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN WIDOWS AND ORPHANS

Another bill that I am offering today provides that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I

veterans. This legislation, if enacted, will meet one of the real needs in the field of veterans' affairs in this country. Since 1934 the provision has been made for widows and children of deceased World War I veterans in the manner now sought to be extended to widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean veterans. Certainly it can be said that these individuals should receive the same consideration as now extended to those similarly situated by reason of casualties of World War I.

This legislation will mean a great deal to many needy and worthwhile widows and children in this land of ours.

V. SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

I am also offering a bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board.

It has alarmed most Members of Congress that young boys are being brought from their homes throughout the country to Washington to serve as pages in the two bodies of Congress without having any provision made for their supervision and housing upon their arrival in the Nation's Capital.

This is a situation which should not be permitted to exist beyond the current session of the United States Congress.

To establish a pages' residence would not require any tremendous appropriation, particularly in view of the fact that it is contemplated that the pages will pay such rates and fees, as far as practicable, as are sufficient to make the operation and maintenance of the residence self-sustaining.

This residence idea is not a new one. It has been discussed with and by many of my colleagues, and it seems to be uniformly agreed that something should be done immediately to eliminate the failure of supervision which we now observe in the handling of housing arrangements for our splendid young boys.

Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate that I entertain the hope that the legislative proposals which I am today making will be seriously and promptly considered by the House of Representatives through the appropriate committees and that action may be taken upon them with the greatest possible dispatch.

Tribute to Representative Herman P. Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, may I also join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, and other Members, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of the Honorable Herman P. Eberharter. He was a great Democrat and a most able representative of the people of his district and his State. He possessed a wonderful personality and served with great distinction

as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. We miss him and will continue to miss him.

May I extend an expression of my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

A Problem Confronting the Indian People of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to bring before the Congress one of the most vexing problems confronting the Indian people of South Dakota, confronting the counties and the State of South Dakota.

The problem results from a policy of the Indian Department established at the Washington level, that when an Indian has been away from a reservation for 1 year, the Department is no longer responsible for him or his family, either for medical care, for relief, or any other benefits intended by Congress for the Indian people, including such benefits as trades training, on-the-job training, educational loans, and so forth.

These latter programs, however, do not cause too great disruption between Federal and local governments, they have only a detrimental effect upon the welfare of the individual Indian.

One of the serious problems, however, arises from the fact that most States, including the State of South Dakota, have a statute providing that an indigent person or an indigent family moving from one county to another may not become a resident of the new county, and, therefore, become a county ward or a financial burden upon that new county, if the new county into which the individual or the family moves, does, within a certain time, serve upon him a notice to prevent acquiring a legal settlement.

Such notice in South Dakota provides that the individual coming into such county from another county or another State who is likely to become a public charge, is thereby warned to depart therefrom, and that service of such notice shall apply to all members of such family.

Through the years, the law has been upheld and interpreted many times by the Supreme Court. Families have been returned to their original county several years after leaving that county, if they should attempt to become a public charge upon the new county.

The Indian Department, however, refuses to recognize the laws of the State of South Dakota. When an Indian has been off of the reservation for a year, the Department washes its hands of him, regardless of whether the county into which he has moved serves a notice to prevent acquiring legal settlement or not. Public Health follows the policy of the Indian Department. The result is that counties in South Dakota located near Indian reservations, where Indian people

congregate for employment, find themselves in an unbearable position, with the Indian Department refusing assistance and the county unable to provide the assistance. The Indian finds himself caught in the bind.

One serious example is the hospitals in Rapid City, S. Dak., where many thousands of dollars of hospital bills each year go unpaid by either the county or the Federal Government. Indian people are brought to the hospital in serious condition, an emergency exists and they must be given treatment. Because the Indian is indigent and unable to pay, the hospital is required to carry the cost of treatment and hospitalization.

I would quote from a letter under date of January 19, 1959, from the St. John's McNamara Hospital of Rapid City, S. Dak., with regard to the hospital bill of one Bert Guy Eagle Horse, age 41, an indigent taken to that hospital for emergency treatment and hospitalization. Part of the letter follows:

He was found lying in the street, a tire iron lying nearby and with severe lacerations about the head. A severe blow across the base of the man's head caused a state of unconsciousness requiring immediate attention. I called Dr. Sicher, the Indian public health physician, at the clinic in the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., for authorization. This was refused. I explained that he had authorized treatment for the man for rattlesnake bite at a previous admittance, August 1, 1958, and that they had recognized him as being eligible for authorization. He advised me that this was true, but that he had discovered that this was a mistake and that he should not have given it.

When the hospital called Pennington County Welfare Office they were advised that Bert Guy Eagle Horse was not a resident of Pennington County and apparently was prevented from becoming a resident, because of the South Dakota law. The county in which the home reservation of Bert Guy Eagle Horse is located will, of course, not pay the bill.

This, Mr. Speaker, creates a no-man's land with the individual Indian and the hospital caught in the bind. The Congress appropriates millions of dollars annually in the belief that the Indian people are being cared for. The fact is, the policy of the Indian Department makes of these people, who are encouraged by the Department to leave the reservation, a man without a country and ineligible for any assistance. This, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is a field in which the Congress must act. It is unfair to the Indian people that a vacuum should exist in which these people now find themselves at the mercy of non-Indian hospitals located adjacent to an Indian reservation.

We are advised that the Public Health hospitals on the reservation will give service to Indian people regardless of the fact that they have left the reservation for a time, but there is no provision for their return and no provision for emergency treatment. Worse than that, there is no provision for any public assistance to these families who having been encouraged to leave the reservation in search of work and to integrate into the white society, then find themselves destitute in a county which has served legal notice upon them to prevent their acquiring a legal settlement.

Excerpts From an Address by Gen.
Carlos P. Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include excerpts from an address given by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, at the 38th annual meeting of the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce, India House, Hanover Square, New York, N.Y., January 21, 1959:

After having mentioned some of the efforts and achievements of the present administration in the Philippines, I wish to refer to recent newspaper articles published in this country about the Philippine Government which, to say the least, give a distorted picture of conditions as they are now in the islands. Regarding the lurid charges of graft and corruption, of shortages and inflation, of unemployment and low wages, of insufficient faith in government, I will not attempt to gloss over them. But I feel bound to declare in the interest of truth and fairness that most of these criticisms are made in disregard of the facts which condition the existing situation.

American correspondents who go to the Philippines seem to forget when writing about us that our country was twice ravaged and laid waste in the space of 4 years, that we were not unscathed by the ruthless acts of a brutal occupation, that while in true Christian spirit we are exerting every effort to forgive and forget, 15 years cannot completely efface the moral trauma that was the result of that occupation. A sense of proportion would seem to dictate that conditions in the Philippines be viewed in the proper perspective and that the faults of government be considered against the background of the almost total collapse and disorganization of Philippine life as the result of enemy occupation which, it must be stressed, was entirely different from the friendly and benevolent occupation of Germany and Japan by the United States and allied governments. Without condoning instances of corruption or incompetence, such an attitude would give praise or blame as the facts require. Judgment would be tempered by sympathetic understanding, and a nation that has been sick, no more than a man still recovering from the effects of his illness, would not be required to give performance equal to that of one who is entirely hale and sound.

We should not forget also that the inadequacies of Philippine life today are not peculiar to the Philippines. Most countries have them in a greater or lesser degree, including those that suffered no direct physical or moral damage from the war. There certainly is hardly any criticism now being leveled at the Philippines by visiting American newspapermen which cannot with equal justice be leveled also at Chicago or New York or Mississippi or Arkansas or Washington, and these latter without the partial justification which exists in the case of the Philippines.

Furthermore, the American correspondents would most certainly have a much sounder basis for judging the conditions in my country if they were to read up on the history of other countries, like the United States, for instance, say, 15 years after July 4, 1776. They will find that the picture was nowhere pretty at any time; certainly not of the United States, where there was great insecurity of life and property and where conditions became so intolerable there was a movement supported by respectable people to replace the Republic with a monarchy and make George Washington a king.

It is not my purpose to excuse the faults of our Government by citing the faults of another. My purpose rather is to show that we Filipinos are ourselves sharply aware of these deficiencies, and that our frank recognition of their existence is in itself a beneficent act of conscience, which constitutes the first step in the process of healing. We know these shortcomings to exist, we do not avert our eyes from them, nor do we wish to conceal them from the eyes of others. We are confident that the conscience of the nation, reacting to every evidence of negligence or incompetence, corruption, or abuse, will fashion the necessary remedies, as they in fact are now being fashioned, in accordance with our laws and constitution and in the interest of a more perfect democracy.

The present administration in the Philippines has undertaken a vigorous campaign against those accused of being guilty of malfeasance in office. The Manila newspapers are, therefore, filled with news about cases of graft and corruption because the evildoers are now being identified and exposed. As an earnest of his determination to eradicate this cancer from our body politic, President Garcia has proposed the creation of an anti-graft court to form part of our judiciary in order that it may be above the influence of both the executive and the legislative.

Rising from the wreckage of a destructive war, our people have wrestled with the problems of political reorganization, economic reconstruction, and social regeneration with high resolve and enthusiasm. The Government of our Republic is functioning on a sound constitutional basis. The will of the people continues to be expressed in periodic elections as provided by law. The basic civil liberties which are guaranteed to the citizens by the Bill of Rights are meticulously respected by the agencies of the state and by the courts. Freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly remains unimpaired. We have a bipartisan system and we have a real party of the opposition whose existence is generally recognized to be essential to any genuine form of representative government.

Philippine economy is basically sound. What we need in the Philippines today is foreign exchange and the reason for the low level of our international reserves is simple: Five years ago we were supporting 150 industries; now we are supporting more than 1,000 industries. If anything can show the fundamental soundness of our economy it is these figures, aside from the fact that we have registered remarkable growth in our agriculture, in manufacture, and in our export trade. Inflation in the Philippines is quite low compared with that of other countries, our per capita income has increased considerably as well as our national production.

We had hoped we could get more American aid than what had been given us to help us bolster our economy. The general impression that we have been beneficiaries of extra-lavish American assistance must be corrected for, aside from war damage payments which were certainly due us who suffered incredible destruction from any enemy attack aimed at the United States—the Philippines was American territory at the time—the actual receipts of economic help are much less than those given to other countries in Asia, some of them former enemy countries, others neutral or uncommitted, certainly none linked by political, military, and economic ties as closely to the American people as we Filipinos are.

Here are the figures: According to the report of the U.S. Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1958, the Philippines received during the postwar period a total of \$145 million in mutual security aid from the

United States. In contrast, Japan received a total grant of \$2,897 million; Korea, \$2,160 million; Formosa, \$2,373 million; Vietnam, \$795 million; India, \$310 million; Pakistan, \$343 million; and Indonesia \$139 million. I do not include in the total Philippine aid the amounts given the Philippine rehabilitation, UNRRA, agricultural commodities, Red Cross, and others which were for relief immediately after the war since certainly they were emergency measures necessitated by the terrible destruction we suffered.

As the Philippine Ambassador to the United States whose every effort has been to foster closer Philippine-American friendship and who has all these years endeavored to present the case for my people and plead their cause, I feel it is my duty to make known to our American friends the feeling that is unfortunately growing among my fellow countrymen that Philippine friendship is being taken for granted here. It is necessary for America to make and cultivate new friends; it is wiser for her to keep and maintain old ones. We who as a people have cast our lot unreservedly with yours and have always stood up to be counted thus assuming all the concomitant risks of such a forthright stand, we who as a nation have refused, unlike others, to sit comfortable on the fence, or stand on the sidelines, my people feel they deserve a more sympathetic understanding of their pressing needs and problems. The truth is that we have not asked for any handouts nor have we sought charity. We have claims against the United States amounting to \$972 million and these claims had been officially presented to your Government on January 14, 1955, 4 years ago. To date, these claims remain unsettled.

Then again Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER of California, introduced in your Congress, only last year, a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$100 million for additional war damage payments which is one of the items in our claims against the United States. Speaking on the floor of the House on May 19, 1958, he said:

"As we are all aware, to our embarrassment and sorrow, only slightly more than half of the amounts awarded to claimants in the Philippines for their war damage losses were actually paid, and even after reducing the amounts of the awards in excess of \$500 by 25 percent as provided by the Rehabilitation Act, still 22½ percent of each award remains unsatisfied."

There is also the long-delayed payment to us of the gold devaluation fund amounting to nearly \$24 million which the present administration is committed to redeem and which, we have been promised, will be submitted in a bill to your Congress at its session early this year.

The other claims are as follows: coconut oil processing tax, \$173 million; sugar excise tax, \$75 million; claims of Philippine customs duties of imports by the U.S. Army and Navy, \$1 million; various military claims, \$600 million.

If your Government can only see its way clear to settling these claims, we need no financial aid from the United States. It is not for me to make invidious comparisons. But if your leaders fear that the failure of democracy in certain countries of Asia would be a grave loss to the free world and for this reason you are giving them generous financial aid, would it not be a severe blow to American prestige if the democracy that was born under its aegis and which it helped create in the Philippines breaks down and turns out to be a tragic failure for lack of that economic support which America is granting to others with largesse?

There are two avenues which we can follow right away, through which the Philippines can be given a boost by the United States without extraordinary procedures or steps which call for anything but ordinary, sound business practice and equitable treatment.

First, in connection with the war damage

awards to Philippine victims of World War II provided by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946: Only 52½ percent of the awards allowed by the War Damage Commission have been paid whereas the law itself specifies that 75 percent of the fact amount of the awards in excess of \$500 each should be paid. The holders of the awards have always felt that they were judgment holders against the United States and, in fact, the awards may well be considered the moral obligation of the United States. The payment of the balance remaining unpaid of 22½ percent on each award would constitute a substantial source of economic assistance for the Philippines which can be effected by the Congress without further consideration of new loans or assistance programs; only as a discharge, indeed, of an undertaking commenced in 1946 and long overdue in fulfillment.

Second, in connection with sugar imports from the Philippines: When the Sugar Act of 1948 was amended 3 years ago the excess amount of sugar consumption in the United States above a basic supply of 8,350,000 tons was apportioned between domestic sugar producers to the extent of 55 percent and foreign suppliers, 45 percent. But the Philippines was not included in either category. However, both the President and the State Department said at the time that in a further extension of the Sugar Act, which comes up in 1960, the Philippines should be considered.

A consideration of the Philippines to the extent of a portion of the excess United States sugar consumption will create necessary dollar reserve and bolster the whole Philippine economy in the direction of employment of labor, replacement of sugar machinery, and the like.

Since the President and the Secretary of State have already indicated approval of participation by the Philippines, all that needs to be done is for Congress to include the Philippines in the next revision of the Sugar Act.

Heretofore, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce has been most helpful by sending telegrams to congressional committees requesting favorable action on such Philippine legislation as the chamber felt merited its support. These telegrams are usually inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since the chamber specializes exclusively in the enhancing of trade between the Philippines and the United States, it would be much more helpful if we could enlist the assistance of your 134-member firms having financial, industrial trade, business or professional interest in either or both countries to write letters to the Representatives and Senators from the district in which their plants are actually located pointing out the writer's interest in the Philippines together with the amount of business they do annually in this area and finally enlisting the Congressman's and/or Senator's support for the legislation in question.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the sudden passing of our former friend and colleague, Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois, who served with distinction in the 78th through the 85th Congress.

I was privileged to be associated with him as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During the 85th Congress, Tom Gordon, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, made notable contributions of which we are all very well aware. As a Member of this great body he has diligently served in the best interests of his constituency, the Nation, and the free world.

Tom Gordon was a man of amiable personal traits and no one who ever knew him could fail to be impressed by his quiet modesty and sincere humility. He was a man of the highest integrity who stood firmly by his convictions. His sincerity of purpose and friendliness of nature compelled deep respect and enduring affection. Tom Gordon's untimely death leaves a profound impression on us. We shall miss him. I join my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his loved ones.

In the Quality and Integrity of Our Young People Lies the Strength and Future of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce names its three outstanding young men and an outstanding young farmer of the year. On January 20 the selections for 1958 were made and it was with a great deal of gratification and pride that I learned that two of the four young men chosen for this distinguished honor are from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent.

Thomas B. Hagerman, selected by the Kentucky Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of its three outstanding young men, is a native of Bowling Green, my hometown in Warren County. And William T. Roark, chosen as the outstanding young farmer, is from Franklin, Simpson County. These two men exemplify, in the truest sense, the tradition of selfless service to community and fellow citizens which has played such an important part in the growth of Kentucky and this great country of ours.

The choice of Thomas B. Hagerman is quite appropriate as the variety of activities in which he participates with excellence makes him indeed worthy of the appellation "outstanding." As an agent for Aetna Oil Co., in Bowling Green, Mr. Hagerman gives freely of his time, energy, and leadership to the various groups whose common denominator is the betterment of the community and the instilling of worthy ideals of service and integrity in the youth of that community. In these troubled times when the newspaper headlines scream of juvenile crimes, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for young men such as Thomas B. Hagerman. I can think of no

better way to inspire the youth of our Nation with the ideal of service to their fellowman than by example. The emulation of men such as Thomas Hagerman cannot help but produce finer citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. Hagerman, who graduated from Western Kentucky State College, is a Jaycee, is active in church work, is a coach of the Small Fry Football Conference, a member of the Two Gallon Blood Donor Club, is a Warren County jury commissioner, a veteran participating in the Army Reserve program, and a high-school football official. The scope of his interests ranging from church work, youth direction, service to community as a jury commissioner, to Army Reserve activities indicates the fullness and maturity of character possessed by Mr. Hagerman.

As service to community enhances the facilities of our urban centers, so excellence in farming contributes to the productivity of our rural areas upon which this Nation was built. It is to men such as William T. Roark that we can look with pride and confidence to the further development of agriculture. During the past 11 years in which Mr. Roark has engaged in farming, he has increased the productivity of his 985-acre farm by 166 percent. He raises beef cattle and seed. In addition to his truly outstanding farm work, young Roark is active in his church, the Rotary Club, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Masons, soil-conservation work, county extension council, Simpson County Farm Bureau, and Simpson County Tobacco Association. When so many of our young men are leaving the land with the idea of quick success in the city, the example set by William T. Roark should serve as an inspiration to the youth who elect to remain on the farm and achieve a full and satisfying life in agricultural pursuits.

I am justifiably proud in being able to place in the RECORD a brief tribute to the accomplishments of these two fine young men from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. In the quality and integrity of our young people lies the strength and future of America and certainly Thomas B. Hagerman and William T. Roark are worthy of the trust placed in them.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, although we knew that Tom Gordon retired from Congress because he was not in good health, none of us recognized how few were the days left to him on this earth. Certainly I was shocked when I learned of his passing.

Tom Gordon had a long and honorable record of public service. He held several important positions in his native

city of Chicago. In those offices his devotion to duty and to the public welfare won for him a host of friends. Sixteen years ago his district first sent him to this House. Until he voluntarily retired he was returned in each election by large majorities.

Throughout his congressional career he served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He brought to his committee assignment an unusual interest in and knowledge of conditions in Europe, particularly in the countries of Eastern Europe. He had a deep sense of indignation at the treatment accorded the people in those countries under Communist rule and over the years became an acknowledged spokesman for them. Several times he engaged in lengthy study missions for the committee. His reports of these trips to his colleagues and to his constituents showed an understanding of the problems we faced in the countries he visited.

Tom Gordon's long service appropriately culminated in his election as chairman of the committee in the 85th Congress. Until overtaken by illness in late 1957, he provided the committee with a dignified, impartial, and objective leadership. I will always regard it as a privilege to have served with him for so many years.

Tom Gordon had many wonderful human qualities. He was quiet, patient, and understanding. He was a man with deep religious convictions, whose very devotion to his religion gave him a compassionate understanding of human nature that I much admire.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy upon the passing of a wonderful husband and father.

Importation of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill which would prohibit the importation into the United States of certain firearms.

I had introduced similar legislation in the 83d and 84th Congresses, but these measures prohibited members of the armed services and their dependents from bringing into this country pistols, revolvers, and other types of small firearms. The Department of the Army had submitted an adverse report on this legislation, primarily due to the fact that they felt that the bill would discriminate against military personnel and their dependents.

Last year I eliminated the provision restricting the ban to members of the Armed Forces only, and have asked that the prohibition be extended to everyone—civilian and military alike—who would bring such weapons into the country.

I have been in touch with many law-enforcement officers throughout the United States, and the vast majority of them have endorsed this legislation and have agreed that any attempt to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of criminals, potential criminals, children, and irresponsible individuals should receive the full support of all those interested in combating crime, and minimizing tragedy which results when some of these guns are accidentally fired. Our own district attorney, in Queens County, N.Y., one of the most heavily populated counties in the country, the Honorable Frank D. O'Connor, has agreed with me that the supply of illicit weapons should be stopped at its source, and fully supports the proposed measure.

Statistics have shown that as many as 50,000 of these contraband weapons have been brought into the United States on just one troopship returning from the European theater. Multiply that by the number of troopships and the number of civilians bringing such weapons into the country and we have an astounding figure.

I have been informed that in one county of New York City 75 percent of the crimes of violence have been and are being committed with these so-called souvenirs. Every day we read in the papers or hear over the radio and television of tragic accidents which occur, and of crimes which have been committed with these weapons. Just the other day Police Commissioner Kennedy issued a report indicating a substantial increase in crimes of violence in the city of New York.

The time has come to put an end to this potentially explosive situation. We simply cannot afford to wait any longer and must make a determined effort to prevent these crimes and mishaps at their source. I can think of no better way than by banning the importation of these weapons and by preventing them from getting into the hands of those who might be tempted to use them illegally or carelessly.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation every possible consideration.

Five Fallacies About Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Denver, Colo., Post, there appeared a timely article by Roscoe Fleming, on the subject of taxation and spending. In the light of current discussion of budget expenditures and Federal spending I believe Mr. Fleming's analysis, "Five Fallacies About Spenders," deserves careful reading. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have the article printed in the RECORD. The article follows:

FIVE FALLACIES ABOUT SPENDERS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, former mayor of Philadelphia, recently addressed the American Municipal Congress in Boston, and made the case for a strong, forward-looking national policy as well as anyone has done.

It might be taken as the answer of the "yes-sayers" to the "no-sayers," who insist above all on a balanced budget and cutting Federal expenditures in all fields save defense.

The nub of Senator CLARK's argument follows:

"The election was not a mandate to stand still. It was a mandate to move forward. What stands in the way?"

The answer we always get—whether the issue is national defense, or mutual security, or education, or housing, or urban renewal, or social security, or the development of Asia and Africa—is: "We can't afford it," or: "We must cut costs and balance the budget."

Now let me admit that most, although not all, of the problems that confront us do cost money. And let me also state my own strong belief that governmental budgets at all levels, local, State, and National, should be brought into balance.

So the issue of whether we master our problems becomes, in concrete form, the issue of taxation and spending.

I want to enter that debate by chopping away some of the folklore that surrounds the subject of public spending. Perhaps no topic in our time has been the victim of so much nonsense.

There are five main fallacies:

1. That private spending is inherently good and public spending inherently bad.

This fallacy is assiduously cultivated by conservative molders of opinion. The word "government" is equated with other nouns having an evil connotation, such as "waste," "extravagance," "socialism," "bureaucracy."

This is a pernicious tendency. Taxation and public spending are the means by which we divide resources between the public and private sectors of the economy.

Those activities which are in the public sector are there not because they are naughty and ought to be destroyed, but because they are essential, and cannot be adequately performed by private enterprise.

2. That the Federal Government is crushing people and endangering the economy with a growing burden of taxes, expenditures, and debt—and that this endangers the health of our free enterprise system.

What is overlooked is of course that the ability to carry taxes and debt is related to income. Other things being equal, a man making \$10,000 can pay at least twice as high taxes, and carry without hardship twice as large a debt as a man making \$5,000.

The same is true of the country as a whole. And taxes, expenditures, and debts are actually less today—as a proportion of the gross national product—than at the end of World War II.

3. The notion that Government spending is inflationary.

Government spending is no more inflationary than private spending—provided the Government balances its budget.

4. That all Federal expenditures are alike. If a private bank makes a loan, that is called an investment; if the Small Business Administration makes a loan, that is called spending.

It may be that for bookkeeping purposes, we must continue to lump all accounts of Government disbursement together.

But there is no reason why intelligent people, for purposes of public discussion, should not distinguish between operating expenses, loans which create accounts receivable, and

investments which are offset by created assets.

5. If the Federal Government shoves its functions back to the States and cities, this means economy.

There are good reasons for decentralized administration. But that does not mean that the financial burden should be thrown back on the States and cities, too.

The Federal tax system is far superior in justice and efficiency to those of State and local governments, and there is great merit in using it for urban functions.

The Federal tax burden falls evenly across the land, based in large part on ability to pay. There is every reason to use it in preference to State and local systems, where the choice exists.

Great Lakes Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, several proposals have already been introduced in this session which would permit the diversion of additional amounts of Lake Michigan water into the Illinois Waterway.

No more graphic account of the damaging effects of such action has come to my attention than that contained in a letter written August 11, 1958, by N. G. Damoose, city manager of Traverse City, Mich., to Jay Smith, editor of the *Traverse City Record-Eagle*.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Damoose's letter:

CITY OF TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.,

August 11, 1958.

DEAR JAY: I just read that the Senate subcommittee approved the water diversion bill passed by the House. This just isn't right. I thought we had a chance in the Senate but I guess politics or something takes precedence over the preservation of the country's natural resources and the welfare of 50 million Americans and Canadians in the Great Lakes area. What a shameful and disgraceful sense of values.

I wonder if the politicians down there know or ever tried to figure out how much water 2,500 cubic feet per second amounts to? It's deceiving to talk about 2,500 cubic feet and stop there? Certainly, someone somewhere must have converted this innocent little figure to quantities that people can appreciate and visualize. If they haven't, it borders on subterfuge; surely it is not straightforward.

Look Jay:

1. 2,500 cubic feet of water per second is more than a million gallons a minute; 67.5 million gallons an hour and more than 1.6 billion gallons a day.

2. Under the new authorization Chicago will steal, every day, four times the water that Detroit used (about 400 million gallons), for all purposes, every day. In about 6 hours Chicago will waste as much water as all Detroit used in 1 day.

3. Five hundred thousand gallons of water will cover a city lot 60 feet wide and 120 feet long to a depth of 10 feet.

4. The amount of water Chicago will divert, in 1 day, will cover 3,240 lots of this size to a depth of 10 feet.

5. One billion six hundred and twenty million gallons of water per day will fill a

trench 20 feet wide to a depth of 10 feet and extending a distance of 204 miles or the distance from Traverse City to 4 miles this side of Kalamazoo.

6. In 15 days Chicago's diversion of 216 million cubic feet per day would make a river 20 feet wide and 10 feet deep all the way across the United States (3,000 miles) in just 15 days.

7. Let's go a little further. We found that in 1 day we could build a river 204 miles long with Chicago's unique and unorthodox sewage treatment plan.

8. It's 25,000 miles around the earth at the equator. In about 123 days Chicago's daily diversion of Lake Michigan water would extend our imaginary river all the way around the earth (20 feet wide by 10 feet deep).

9. In 1 year—just 1 year's water grab—this river would wind itself around the earth three times. Or, if you prefer, we could have a river 60 feet wide by 10 feet deep by 25,000 miles long in 1 year. It's gotta be a leap year, though.

10. At the rate of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second, an area of 7.8 square miles would be covered with 1 foot of water in 24 hours.

11. In other words, the amount of water Chicago will swipe from Lake Michigan in 1 day, under the new authority would virtually cover the incorporated area of our city to a depth of 1 foot.

12. In 31 days, the amount of water diverted would inundate Traverse City to a depth of 31 feet, covering virtually ever home in the city and the downtown section to the height of the new street lights.

13. The whole Nation uses, for all purposes, in 1 day, only 143 times as much (231 billion gallons) water as Chicago will drain out of Lake Michigan in 1 day.

14. The Nation's entire industry uses 80 billion gallons of water per day which is only 50 times more than Chicago will chisel every day. Her water diversion for only 1 minute would process almost 19 tons of steel or rubber; 28 tons of craft paper pulp; wash 112.5 tons of laundry or test 22 aircraft engines—that is 1 minute of water diversion (1,125,000 gallons).

15. The amount of water Chicago will drain in 1 day would last Traverse City almost 1.5 years at our average rate of 3 million gallons per day. In 3 minutes they will take enough water to supply our city for 1 day.

16. The 1-day Chicago grab is equivalent to 8 times the average aggregate daily water requirements, for all purposes, of Michigan's 10 largest cities, excluding Detroit. Less than 3 hours of diversion would be enough to supply these 10 cities for 1 day.

17. The 1,620 million gallons of water Chicago will "rob" each day would weigh more than 13,500 million pounds, or 6,752,000 tons.

18. This weight (almost 7 million tons of water per day) translated into coal supply, would meet the requirements of the city light and powerplant for about 335 years, at its present rate of use.

Jay, 2,500 cubic feet of water per second is an innocent little figure as we read it and dismiss it without converting it into more familiar terms.

Most of the 50 million people in the Great Lakes area have expended millions upon millions of dollars to treat their sewage and return it to the public water in clean, safe condition. We've met our moral obligation. Why even a cat has enough conscience to recognize its moral obligation. Where is Chicago's sense of decency and duty?

As of 1955 it is estimated that 40 million Americans are face to face with water problems of either quality or quantity or both, and Chicago is going to pollute 7 million tons of it every day of the year. Nuts.

In one area I heard about (there may be others) an industry has to use sewage plant effluent (treated sewage) for its processing or cooling water—this is good and safe and it represents conservation in the finest and

most commendable sense of the word, but Chicago is getting ready to pollute over a million gallons of beautiful Lake Michigan water every minute of every day of every year. Nuts.

I had to blow my top someplace with someone and you have always been so charitable as to give me your ear. Thanks—a million gallons worth every minute.

Respectfully yours,

N. G. DAMOOSE.

Justice for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a statement made by me before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union.

The statement follows:

JUSTICE FOR HAWAII

Mr. Chairman: In the last Congress, Alaska came of age; it is now long past the hour to end Hawaii's apprenticeship. It is an indisputable fact, that Hawaii met the traditional threefold test of eligibility for statehood.

Before analyzing Hawaii's eligibility, permit me to remind my colleagues of the three basic requirements demanded by tradition and precedent for admission. First, the people of the Territory must evince love for the ideals of American democratic government. Second, a majority of the electorate must express a clear desire for statehood. And third, the Territory must possess sufficient resources and population to support the cost of State government. I shall demonstrate that Hawaii has passed these tests with high honors.

The Hawaiian people have been drawn to America almost from the very dawn of their modern history. In 1820, 17 New England missionaries arrived in the archipelago; and before the passage of many years the natives in large measure were converted to Christianity and made familiar with the ways of the West. White whalers, traders, speculators, and sugar planters migrated to the islands in progressively greater numbers.

By 1842, five out of six ships calling at Hawaii were American; and Yankee cultural influence, despite strong British competition, rapidly assumed predominance. In 1842 a constitution modeled in part after that of the United States was adopted. Fourteen years later the people of this constitutional monarchy urged their king to negotiate for annexation to the United States. He complied, but the project was abandoned with his untimely death.

In 1893 Hawaii became a republic, and negotiations for annexation were immediately undertaken. A treaty linking the two republics was soon fashioned, but it was withdrawn from the American Senate by President Cleveland, who had not been in office when the Hawaiian revolution erupted and who disapproved of what he considered the unseemly haste by which the annexation convention had been drafted.

Four years later a new treaty of annexation was signed, but it, too, failed of ratification. Finally, sponsors of the treaty abandoned it in favor of submitting to Congress a joint resolution of annexation, the passage of which required only a simple majority vote.

The resolution was approved, and President McKinley signed it on July 7, 1898. Two years later, on April 30, 1900, the Organic Act for Hawaii was approved (to take effect June 14, 1900), and Hawaii thereby became an incorporated Territory.

Since 1903 the Hawaiian Legislature has petitioned Congress for statehood nearly a score of times; and from 1920 to the present time, approximately 50 bills providing for statehood have been introduced in successive Congresses. In 1947 substantive, if incomplete, action was finally taken. On June 30 of that year the House passed the statehood bill, but it died in the Senate. The same melancholy story was repeated on March 7, 1950 and March 10, 1953.

In 1954 the Senate saw fit to combine the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and on April 1 of that year approved the dual measure. There are some who still maintain that passage was obtained only because assurance had been given the anti-statehood bloc that the House would reject the joint bill, despite the fact that House support for Hawaiian admission alone was overwhelming. Whatever the reason, the prophets of disaster were vindicated.

In 1955, during the succeeding Congress, another dual bill was introduced, this time in the House. On May 10 of that year it was recommitted. This year there is before us only the single Hawaiian bill; let us pray that it will meet with a deservedly kinder fate.

Let us turn now from the representatives of the people in both Hawaii and the United States to the respective peoples themselves. In a 1940 plebiscite, the Hawaiian people voted 2 to 1 for statehood. A decade later they approved the proposed State constitution by more than a 3-to-1 majority. As for the views of mainland Americans (incidentally, the Hawaiians, of course, are just as much American as you and I), Dr. George Gallup has found that a decisive majority has supported statehood ever since pre-World War II days. More recently, the ratio of approval has jumped from 3 to 1 in 1946 to 8 to 1 in August of 1958.

We know that Hawaiians and their compatriots in the States want statehood. But are we sure that the islanders are loyal enough and Americanized enough to deserve such status? I say that the question was answered affirmatively long ago, and particularly so during World War II and its aftermath.

Immediately after the infamous assault on Pearl Harbor, rumors were rife, especially in the States, that Americans of Japanese ancestry engaged in the most heinous sabotage, even designating targets for the attacking planes. Mr. Robert L. Shivers, former special agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Honolulu from 1939 to 1943, gave the lie to such calumnies. He testified that all those rumors were false . . . and that sabotage and fifth-column activity was never engaged in at any time prior, during, or subsequent to the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Perhaps even more eloquently expressive of Japanese loyalty was the story of the 452d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion. The combined record of these units is probably the most remarkable one in all American military annals. Approximately 10,000 men, most of whom were Japanese from Hawaii, saw action in Europe with the famed outfits. Of these, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. The quantity, as well as quality, of other awards is equally impressive, particularly the 353 Silver Stars and 112 Army and division commendations. Crowning their glory was the fact that not a single one of these boys displayed the slightest cowardice. It's true that three of them went a.w.o.l.—from their hospital beds back to their foxholes.

The unmatched record of the Hawaiian soldier remained untarnished throughout the

Korean conflict. Not a single case of cowardice or defection to the enemy was recorded. The battle-casualty rate for Hawaiians was three times as great as the rate per capita for stateside contingents.

One might well ask, in connection with statehood: So what? No one questions that the Hawaiians were brave, but does courage alone entitle a people to statehood? No, it doesn't; but it does prove that those "go for broke" Americans loved their country with an awesome passion. And certainly patriotism must constitute an integral part of any legitimate concept of Americanism.

Other manifestations of similarity with things American are widely prevalent. Despite the oriental heritage of large segments of its population, Hawaii's culture, for the most part, is American. And Hawaiians, regardless of ancestry, look to the west for guidance and emulation. Whether it be business, education, sports, politics, or mores, the pattern is always, and unmistakably, American.

Further evidence of the deep-seated Americanism of all Hawaiians—not merely the Japanese—lies in their chilly reception of the commonwealth idea. They refuse to trade what they consider their birthright for tax exemption. In other words, they insist on being recognized as first-class Americans, and demand the right to assume all the obligations that such a cherished condition would entail.

The Hawaiian people, I'm sure, are also aware that the imposition of commonwealth status would, in all probability, be unconstitutional. In *Downes v. Bidwell* the Supreme Court of the United States declared that "where the Constitution has been once formally extended [in all its parts, both fundamental and formal] by Congress to territories neither Congress nor the territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith." Mr. Justice Brown, in *Rasmussen v. United States*, another of the famous insular cases, asserted that "the extension of the provisions of the Constitution . . . once done, is irrevocable." It follows, then, that those who would remake Hawaii in the image of Puerto Rico are at least disingenuous when they extol the benefits Puerto Ricans derive from Federal tax exemptions. As an incorporated Territory, Hawaii is subject to section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which provides, in part, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." It is doubtful, to say the least, that Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to exempt the citizens of Hawaii from the applicability of this uniformity clause.

It might well be, too, that the Hawaiian people are cognizant that the promise of statehood—at least by implication—was tendered them long ago. Of the 31 incorporated Territories in our history, all but Hawaii have graduated to statehood. From a legal, or constitutional, standpoint, Hawaii is no different from its more successful predecessors. The Federal courts repeatedly have said that incorporation leads to statehood. In 1883 an incorporated Territory was defined to *Ex parte Morgan* as an inchoate state. About 40 years later, in *Balsee v. People of Porto Rico*, among many similar cases, the Supreme Court asserted that "incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." Admittedly, the Organic Act establishing the Territory of Hawaii did not explicitly promise statehood; yet it must at the same time be conceded that precedent and judicial opinion, whether dicta or not, alike have considered Territories as destined for statehood after a reasonable period of tutelage. It would seem that 59 years is long enough.

It behooves us to heed the Hawaiian argument that statehood for the other 30 incorporated Territories has never resulted in failure. Almost without exception, those

Territories experienced an immediate and marked expansion in population and in agricultural or industrial development following their admission into the Union. Above all, the people of those new States demonstrated that when they were their own masters, progress recognized no shackles.

The third requirement for statehood—the ability to pay for statehood—poses no problem for Hawaii. The islands constitute, in terms of financial solvency, the richest Territory ever to knock on the statehood door. The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about \$1¼ billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission. In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

Hawaii's population, estimated in 1958 to total 568,504, is larger than that of any one of five States, and is more than twice that of Alaska. It is also larger than that of any State at the time of admission except Oklahoma.

Now that it has been established that Hawaii merits statehood, it is in order to examine the principal benefits that would accrue to the people of Hawaii under statehood. They may be listed as follows—and no rights were ever more precious: (1) the right to full voting representation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress; (2) the right to vote for the President and Vice President; (3) the right to choose their own Governor and to carry on functions of government by their own elected officials instead of by Federal administrators; (4) the right to determine the extent of the powers of their own legislature; (5) the right to have their judges locally selected rather than federally appointed; (6) the right to have Federal and local jurisdictions clearly defined and separate; (7) the right to a voice in any proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution; and (8) the right to help write the Federal taxes. Can any reasonable person deny that these rights are basic to the American way of life; or that so long as they are withheld, no citizenship can be first class?

Benefits to the Nation as a whole would also be substantial. Among these would be (1) enhancement of national security; (2) favorable psychological effect on the peoples of the Pacific basin; and (3) inspiration to racial harmony on the mainland.

The strategic importance of Hawaii is obvious, especially so now that our Pacific military commands have been enlarged and moved to Oahu. Headquarters for the commanding general, U.S. Army Forces Pacific, are at Fort Shafter, in Honolulu.

Statehood opponents concede that Hawaii is strategically vital, but they profess to see no relevancy between military considerations and the statehood issue. Statehood, they argue, would have no effect one way or the other on our defense posture in the Pacific. Apparently they are all materialists; things of the spirit escape them. I say to them that the greater stability afforded local government and the greater popular pride in full citizenship under statehood would enable the Armed Forces to be supported materially in time of war more effectively from the twin standpoints of local economic assistance and local civilian cooperation. And the will of the people themselves to fight, should total war ever become our lot, would be immeasurably strengthened were they called upon to defend their own State—and not a colony.

I reply to the isolationists and the racists who sneer at world opinion and deny any need to impress the East with such a meaningful demonstration of the dynamism of democracy as the elevation of Hawaii to statehood would present, with the observation that the American people have indicated that in these parlous days it's a pretty good idea to miss no bets in the pursuit of friends.

Hawaii justifiably has been called the melting pot that melts. Although its people comprise diverse blood strains, the Territory has a unique record for interracial harmony and cooperation. With the closer association between the islands and the mainland which would accrue from statehood, continental Americans would become more acutely aware of the degree to which democracy is practiced in Hawaii. The example assuredly would have a salutary effect on race relations throughout the States.

The reasons for statehood as outlined above surely dwarf the importance of the opposition's arguments. Chief among these are the alleged dominance of communism in Hawaii, and the disproportionately large representation that Hawaii would enjoy in the Senate of the United States.

The communism scare is strictly a phony. The constitution of Hawaii, which the people themselves drafted a decade ago, disqualifies Communists from holding any public office. And dock strikes, which formerly were both embarrassing and damaging, have been rendered impotent by the enactment of a law enabling the Territory to seize and work the docks.

As for disproportionate representation, that question was resolved, legally and constitutionally, in the Connecticut Compromise of the Federal Convention of 1787.

Hawaii has met all the arguments, and they are hers.

I strongly urge the committee to act favorably on legislation to admit Hawaii as a State of the Union. I shall program the bill after it is reported for as early consideration by the House as is possible.

Foreign Aid and Other Factors Make Balanced Budget Unlikely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the January 21 issue of the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, the Knowland newspaper. The editorial is as follows:

FOREIGN AID AND OTHER FACTORS MAKE BALANCED BUDGET UNLIKELY

"If we knew where we are and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do and how to do it," said Abraham Lincoln in his "House Divided" speech.

The challenge of the Federal budget shows that we have some tough decisions on "what to do and how to do it."

It is highly unlikely that the Federal budget will be brought into balance as long as over \$3.8 billion is going into foreign aid.

Justified or not, the fact remains that this large sum triggers off demands for enlarged spending in all other Government activities.

It is time for the Federal Government to embark upon a program to terminate government to government loan and grant activities except perhaps for technical assistance to countries lacking certain "know how" in medicine, public health, agriculture and commercial problems.

These countries should seek to attract private capital not only from the United States but from other European, Asian or Western Hemisphere countries. The free enterprise system of the United States should not con-

tinue to carry heavy tax burdens to support public ownership and state socialism abroad.

To be sure this may be rugged for those countries that have come to look upon American foreign aid as an inexhaustible horn of plenty. But the issue has to be faced up to by them and by us.

Our Federal debt is approaching \$285 billion. Interest alone amounts to over \$8 billion a year, which is more than the total expenditures for all Government operations as late as the year 1938, and is greater than all receipts into the Treasury for governmental purposes as late as the year 1941.

In the opinion of this newspaper the administration has overestimated revenues and underestimated expenses. This is even more apparent when the reluctance of Congress to curtail appropriations or vote new taxes is taken into consideration.

The administration and the Congress together are the trustees of our future and should we become insolvent there is no country in the world that could or would "ball us out."

The time to put our house in order is now.

Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Dan Lambert, county commander of the Penobscot County Council, American Legion, and Theodore A. Johns, public relations director of the same organization, have provided me with the following announcement of an event which I feel eminently deserves the attention of my colleagues:

FOUR CHAPLAINS MEMORIAL SUNDAY AND AMERICAN LEGION RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEK, FEBRUARY 1-8

On Sunday, February 1, 1959, our Nation will pause to honor the memory of the four military chaplains who perished on the troopship *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic during World War II. The courage and faith of these four men of God, representing all major faiths, should be an inspiration to us all.

As in previous years, the Penobscot County Council, Department of Maine, the American Legion, is taking the leadership in the promotion of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. We call upon all members of the clergy in Maine and all posts and units of the Legion and Auxiliary to assist in the proper observance of this day of remembrance.

We urge that prayers be offered in all the churches of Maine for the spirit of freedom in our land and for peace with honor in our time. If we as Americans, take the shining example of love of God and country, as exemplified by our four chaplains then we shall have the strength to carry on the struggle for justice, freedom and democracy.

Coupled with the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday, the American Legion is holding a special religious emphasis week during February 1-8. Theme of the observance will be the moral leadership and the part played by military service in building character. As veterans, we in the American Legion should be greatly interested in this program.

The National Broadcasting Co. (NBC) will air the American Legion's annual "For God and Country" telecast 2:00 to 2:30 p.m.,

Sunday, February 1, 1959. It will all be carried by the radio networks during the period of observance. We urge all to consult with radio and TV outlets in Maine for time and station. Following the program, we suggest you drop a note of appreciation to your local stations.

Never before in history of America have we had greater need for religious emphasis. Everywhere we turn, the forces of communism and materialism have religion under attack. Members of the Legion and Auxiliary began their meetings with the words "For God and Country," let us resolve to this pledge by contacting your local priest, minister or rabbi and acquainting him with the Legion's Back to God movement.

The sacrifices of the four heroic chaplains should bring to our minds that here in America there is no room for bias or prejudice in regards to race, creed or color. Any organization which uses bias or prejudice in regards to membership or activity is unworthy of the real meaning of the Four Chaplains Sunday and a discredit to our God, Flag, and Country.

The Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday and Religious Emphasis Week should also serve to awaken within our Legion posts and units the use and purpose of the post chaplain. All meetings should be opened and closed with prayer by the Chaplain.

Let us remember that religion is not something that can be fitted on like a new suit. One's real religion comes deep from within. Religion may be learned on Sunday but is lived in the weekdays, work. The torch of religion may be lit in the church but it burns brightly in the home, shop, and on the street. Religion seeks its life in prayer but lives life in deeds. It is planted in the soul but does its growing out in the light of the world.

Role of Business in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 23, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we are all aware of the increasingly active role being adopted by business and industry with respect to politics. There are hundreds of opinions on the relative merits of such participation. I recently read the opinion of one of our young industrial leaders which I believe will be of considerable interest to my colleagues and all who have the opportunity to read and evaluate it.

Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp., stated recently in a speech before the annual conference of the United States Savings & Loan League in San Francisco:

Business must concentrate on political leadership, not political partisanship. Our job is one of education, not one of persuasion.

This young industrialist also called for more cooperation between labor and management. He stressed that it was "high time that management and labor realized they have a common responsibility, the American people." I submit that this is an enlightened and constructive approach to a problem that is causing business and industry considerable concern.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES OF CORPORATE MANAGEMENT

Up until a short time ago—perhaps some of you out-of-staters may not know this—there were trains running back and forth across the Bay Bridge, between San Francisco and Oakland.

They were a part of the bay area—these trains—like the ferryboats used to be.

One day, about 6 months ago, they took the trains off the bridge, and put on buses instead. It was cheaper to do so. Well, we have a little boy, who's just turned six; and little Henry—this is a rather popular name in our family—had come to love those trains. He loved to ride on them, whenever he could. And he had set his heart on becoming an engineer, when he grew up, so he could gain permanent possession over them.

I explained why they had to take the trains away, and how they would have to charge the people a lot more money, for riding them.

A short time later, when he was riding across the bridge with his mother, he suddenly turned to her, and said:

"Mama, when I grow up, I'm going to be a bus driver."

Asked why he had decided on this career, he replied: "Because when I become a bus driver, I'm going to charge the people so much money that they'll have to take the buses off, and put the trains back on again. Then I'll be an engineer like I've always wanted to."

Well, when my wife came home and told me that story, I was floored. That's planning. I told myself. That's really looking ahead.

And I thought I'd like to tell that story here today, friends, because I think it illustrates, what we all like to do, when we have the opportunity. To plan. To think far ahead. To have a goal, and stick to it. Trouble is, when you're grown up, it's sort of difficult now and then, to look out over the breakers, and find out which way you're heading.

I think that's why we've gathered here today, to plan. That's why we have conventions, to find for ourselves a course of action.

I look at this gathering today—at all you men and women of experience, ability, judgment—and what do I see? I see a much larger convention, than the one assembled here. I see this as representative of the business community across the United States. You are asking the questions businessmen everywhere are asking. Where do we go? What is our relation to society, to labor, to politics, government—the general public?

I don't think there's been a period in our history, when we've been asking so many probing questions of ourselves. And I say this is a good sign. Suddenly we are coming to life. Almost overnight as it were, we are catching up to our physical growth as a nation. We are becoming mature, perceptive, aware.

We turn to our educational system—we American people—and we say, "It is not strong enough." And we take immediate steps to improve the curriculum—deepen it.

We do the same with all other segments of our society. Not a single group escapes its share of analysis and criticism.

The business community is certainly no exception. On the contrary, I think we businessmen have been at the very center of this cry: "What's wrong with America?" The businessman is an easy target. He is a man who is concerned with material things; profits, capital gains, plant investments, production curves, tax carryovers. He borrows,

and lends. He is powerful. He is also a stereotype.

The existence of this stereotype should concern all of us, deeply. For as long as this false picture of the businessman exists, just so long will we be looked upon as a special-interest group, whose interests run counter to those of the American people. And what is this picture, this stereotype? Unfortunately, it is almost always a negative one, and one which we ourselves, have helped to create. The businessman is pictured as someone who is antilabor, antigovernment, anti-free-trade, antiprogress, in any shape or form. He is a man who stiffens his back, the moment anything new comes along. And if he supports such things as the United Crusade, he does so only when he is given assurance that his gift is tax deductible. In short, he is a man who resists things.

Like it or not, this is the way we are pictured by a great many Americans. Is the picture a true one? Do we really resist change? Are we really against progress? Do we lend support to our communities only when we feel we can get something in return? No, of course not. The very opposite is true. Then why aren't we doing something to correct this picture?

I think we are. I think the business community today, is far more conscious of its social obligations, and community responsibilities than it has ever been before. We still have a long way to go, however. Too often, we are still substituting hopeful resolutions for quiet actions, ringing phrases, for simple deeds.

I have been asked to talk to you about the citizenship responsibilities of corporate management. Since there is always a danger in trying to say too much to a group of experts, I will merely examine this topic of ours quietly with you, if I may—and see what we can discover, together.

A "convention," says Webster, "is a meeting or assembly . . . for action on particular matters." I like this word "action." I think it is time for the business community throughout this Nation, to take action, not merely for its own benefit, but for the welfare of this country. And on what particular? On a very vital one, that of leadership.

A century ago, it may have been all right for a corporation to come along, and run its business with little or no regard for its neighbors. A century ago—less than that; only as far back as the twenties—many businesses were operating in just this way. Communications, transportation, machines, bigness, hadn't thrown us all together as yet. Our destinies as a people were still to be worked out. New land was yet to be discovered and developed. Mass production on the scale we now know it was something in the future.

Today, you can locate your plant on a hill. If you like, but you're really right down in the center of town, on First and Main Streets. And what you do—especially if you're a fairly large business or industry—affects the farmer, the realtor, the housewife, the banker, the school-board—everybody. Furthermore, because your marketing and sales area, may extend across this Nation, you've got to think of your "community" in exactly the same dimensions.

We've got aluminum plants in West Virginia, Louisiana, Washington, and in several other States as well. We've got a steel plant down at Fontana, Calif., a coal-mine in Utah, and more coal mines in New Mexico. We make Willys Jeeps in Toledo, and in several foreign countries as well. We produce cement up and down the Pacific Coast, and ship it to Hawaii and Alaska. And we produce parts for guided missiles here in California and back in Bristol, Pa. All told, we

turn out 300 different products in 78 plants covering 17 States and Territories, and 5 foreign countries.

Eighteen years ago—in 1940—we had only five plants, all of them located right here in the State of California. Today, we've got 64,000 employees, 78,000 stockholders, and sales of more than one billion dollars per year. So we've known what it is to grow, and take on responsibilities. We've known what it is, to pioneer, too.

A short time ago, I ran across an article in a magazine which shocked me. The central figure in this article—a very successful businessman—was asked why he didn't engage in "community relations". His reply was something to this effect: "When the going gets rough, the community will only be thinking of itself. All this welfare stuff, and hoopla about 'improvement'—won't amount to a hill of beans."

This article disturbed me. For here was a seemingly intelligent man—with a highly successful business—whose attitude toward the community was: "What can I get out of it, by helping others? Where is the payoff? Show me how I can serve my own interest—and I'll do something about this community relations stuff."

To me, this attitude is not only thoughtless—but by being thoughtless—it is dangerous. For if all of our responsible leaders—our men of influence and standing—were to neglect their moral responsibilities in this fashion, we would not endure as a democracy. We would not deserve to endure. A community's strength is our strength. Who prospers in a strong community—if not the businessman? And who suffers when a community is allowed to fall apart, through negligence and indifference—if not the businessman?

For a concrete illustration of this community-business relationship, take a look at our urban renewal programs. No one will deny the enormous benefits to be derived from upgrading our cities—and eliminating unsightly slums.

Here's a real opportunity for our financing institutions. You savings and loan people, together with banking establishments, can play a major role in the rebirth of our communities. Together, you can provide the monetary means of transforming substandard dwellings, into liveable and valuable properties. You have done this already in Cleveland—and it's been a terrific program. Savings and loan firms in that city, have become corporate parts of their community. They have joined the family. More efforts such as these, will help us meet one of the major challenges, facing private enterprise. Namely, the challenge of initiative.

If we are to minimize the need for Federal support of such slum clearance, and urban renewal programs, we have to step in, and roll up our sleeves, and get the job done on a voluntary basis. Each of you would do well, on returning to your communities, to analyze your own needs for urban renewal. When you find that there is a job to be done you must accept such a challenge as a real opportunity.

We have a responsibility to our communities—farm and city alike. But particularly, we have a responsibility towards this private enterprise system. Nature helped build this system of ours. She gave us new land to work with, immensely rich resources, room to live in, and expand, and a chance to work out our individuality, in a frontier world. Now, all that is gone. From here on in, we alone are responsible for the continuance of democratic government. If we prove ourselves too self-interested in our goals and actions, we will lose every advantage we now possess. If, on the other hand, we recognize that these so-called responsibilities are really

blessings—wonderful blessings—we will prosper as never before. For to be responsible, is to be free. How responsible do you suppose you would be in Moscow?

You hear a great deal about how much corporations are doing in community affairs. And much of this is true. But there are also quite a few businesses—large and small—who are still trying to get by with the lipservice, of tax-deductible donations. Certainly, a businessman's first job is to run a successful business. Too often, however, he forgets that he is also a citizen, and a leader. If we, as businessmen, do not take the lead in community affairs—in education, industrial development, slum-clearance, welfare support—who will? Labor? Perhaps. Right now, it's doing a pretty good job along these lines. The Government? Very likely. And what do we mean when we say "the Government"? We mean "that organization which must step in, and do the job which we have failed to do."

Friends, the moment we all recognize, really understand in our hearts and minds, that "business" and "community" are merely two different ways of spelling the same word, our future will be more secure.

Business will advance according to the breadth of its viewpoint. This in turn will call for breadth of participation. And when do we assume responsibility? When it suits us? When we hope to gain something out of it? You can always gain something out of responsibility. To wait until a tit-for-tat situation develops isn't leadership; it is horse trading. Times have changed. Times are tougher now. The laggard is not going to be tolerated. The freeloader will find himself unloaded, but fast. We will survive if we are fit to survive. And the test will be made in the area of intelligence. Horse trading is a thing of the past as far as survival is concerned. When you hold as many cards as we hold, you don't trade on them, you play them for the benefit of the entire house.

One of our firms—Kaiser Metal Products Co.—is located in Bristol, Pa. We have two plants there. One plant produces bathtubs, kitchen cabinets, sinks, and so forth, and the other turns out subassemblies for guided missiles like the Polaris and Minuteman. I went back there about a month ago to speak with our men and also with the men and women of the community.

In one of the talks I made I stated something which I would like to repeat here today. I said that I felt it was high time that management and labor put away their clubs and started working together at a round table instead of a long and narrow one where labor sits glaring on one side and management glares back from the other.

I said I felt it was high time that labor and management recognize they have a common responsibility—the American people.

We've uncovered a few bad apples among labor unions. And we're getting ready to enact legislation which will help prevent such individuals from again seizing power and abusing that power. But this legislation, let us remind ourselves, is being introduced for what purpose? To curb, possibly to break, unions? No—to benefit and protect the working man. There's nothing wrong with unions. Unions are a strength in America. They insure against the abuse of power on the part of management. They are necessary to our industrial way of life. And some of our greatest patriots, our most sincere advocates of the free enterprise system, are to be found within the ranks of labor.

It was not so long ago, if you'll remember, that business had to undergo its own housecleaning. Legislation had to be passed to protect the American people from monopolistic practices, unfair trade usages—price fixing and the like. Was all business to

blame? Not by a long shot. But loopholes had to be filled to prevent the unscrupulous few from engaging in practices which would wreck the economy.

So today, instead of joining in the popular hue and cry that all labor is suspect of racketeering, because of a guilty few, we should find a means of bringing about reform, quietly, sensibly, and in a spirit of cooperation.

In this election year, one hears a great deal about the need for businessmen to take a more active part in politics. You hear this each election year, and in many cases it's a good sign, and a necessary one. The business community can ill afford to remain aloof from politics. The legislation that is passed each week, and each month, on the local, State and Federal levels affects each one of us. And so we have to make sure our interests do not fall by the wayside, through default.

At the same time, however, I think business must beware of assuming a partisan role in politics. I do not think it is the proper function of business to march the streets with placards or to tour communities from one end to the other in support of such-and-such a candidate or proposition no matter how favorable the cause.

We cannot afford to place ourselves in the position of becoming a power bloc. This is just what the unions have been accused of doing—pressure politics. Indeed, union-supported campaigns are being looked upon with increased suspicion because they are politically obvious. Is the union really campaigning for the interests of the workingman? Or is it merely out to increase its own power? Reverse the picture. Put business in the campaigner's seat. And recall, if you will, the stereotype which we discussed earlier. Will the American people consider that such partisanship is truly in their interest—or will they feel that we are merely trying to augment our own power? Labor stands here—business stands there—they say. But what about the great huge public which stands in between?

My friends, we can't tell people how to vote. Our job is one of education, not one of persuasion. Let us become active politically, by communicating both sides of an issue to our employees—so that these men and women may more intelligently support that legislation which will mean good government for all people.

This is still a free country, friends. The American citizen still—thank heaven—enjoys the privilege of making up his own mind. It would be the height of impertinence for a corporation to gather its employees together in order to tell them how to vote.

No, where business must concentrate its powers and energies is in political leadership, not in political partisanship. Let us work to inform our employees, our own managers, of both sides of a proposition, reserving to them, the sacred right of deciding for themselves how they will vote. Business will do itself a grave injustice if it attempts to combat labor on its own terms. For this will only serve to prove to the general public that labor stands here, and business stands there, and that this position is an irrevocable one, nothing can change it.

Friends, I ask you, seriously, go outside now and stop the first 10 people you meet and ask them this one question, "Who do you believe truly represents the interest of the workingman, labor or business?"

You know what their answers would be as well as I. Labor has succeeded in identifying itself with the workingman's interests, and business has foolishly, thoughtlessly permitted this to happen.

So this is our challenge: To find a means of identifying the interests of business with the interests of the workingman—and by workingman I don't mean just the fellow with the lunch pail. I mean the people who

are employed in business and industry, in any and all capacities, wage earners and salaried personnel alike.

And we accomplish this, not by words or slogans, but only through the sincerity of our actions. By supporting legislation which will benefit the majority of the people, whether it concerns our own affairs or not, we will conclusively prove that our true interest lies in the welfare of society in general. By taking the initiative in progressive measures which can benefit our employees, we, one and for all, will be taking a big step toward eradicating the stereotype which pictures the businessman as a self-interested profiteer. Actions, mind you, not words.

This should be the manner in which we business people answer this challenge to immerse ourselves in politics, not as partisan advocates, not as Republicans or Democrats, not as ax grinders for special interests, but as political leaders who intelligently communicate with our employees and the local, State, and Federal legislators who can use our support. We must prove that business is as close to the people, to the wage earner, emotionally and spiritually as the labor union.

Only in this way can we maintain the advantages of a free economy which, by its strength and purpose, can withstand the threats of socialism or supergovernment control.

What does the worker want which is so different really from the desire of the businessman? Security? That's what we are trying to build into everything we do. We want our plants, our businesses, to grow on firm foundations. Higher pay? We're not against higher pay, because higher pay means more security, more incentive for advancement, and higher production. Higher pay means higher living standards, greater purchasing power. What we are against are higher pay demands which are unrealistic and which will damage the security we are trying to build, especially the worker's security. Why? Because such demands will end by undermining our companies and the workers' own jobs. So why don't we tell our employees this? Why wait until the union tells them that here's that old stereotype at work again, the fellow who always resists things, the fellow who's antiprogress? We should be taking the initiative wherever possible. As long as we permit others to interpret our motives for us, we cannot hope to have the values we support made clear and reasonable.

We have a job of communications, then, and a job of education as well. And perhaps this is as far as our partisanship should go—to put forward, in clear light, the values which we know are essential to a prospering community. We should encourage our employees to thoroughly study the background of candidates and issues so that they may become better citizens. We should encourage them to make use of their own resources in order to arrive at their own political evaluations.

It does little good for the business community to buy full-page ads in a newspaper, bragging about how good our system is over another. The ads we buy must be our actions, and our ability and willingness to serve, as well as to make profits.

Speaking of profits, the best profit-sharing plan I know of is the one where all of us—business, labor, and general public, the community—work together to earn for ourselves, a share in freedom, prosperity, and continue high production.

So, to sum up, I would say that the citizenship responsibilities of corporate management should be these:

First, to actively work with, and support our community, locally, and on the State and Federal levels.

Second, to identify the interests, and objectives of business, with the interests and objectives, of the workingman, and workingwoman.

Third, to improve our communications, between management and employees, particularly in the political field. To acquaint our people with both sides of political questions, and to encourage them to exercise mental initiative as voters. I like to believe these people are intelligent—I know they are—and I think the most intelligent thing for us to do, is to operate on this principle.

Fourth, to seek the passage of legislation, which will benefit the community as a whole, regardless of selfish, or short-range interests. For through such action, we will help insure the continuance of free institutions, in this country.

Fifth, to take the initiative in finding a common ground, in which to work with labor and the community. To extend a hand to the working citizen, and the labor union, and to bring about a speedy resolution of our differences.

By doing all of these things now, I think we will find the means of withstanding not only the threat of foreign ideologies abroad, but the dangers of division and mistrust, here at home.

Thank you, friends, for this opportunity. Good luck, and God bless each and every one of you.

New Products Boost Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 8, 1959, edition of the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review. Reporter Brad Slack recently visited a plywood manufacturing plant in my district which today is manufacturing a new product and helping bring to Oregon diversified production. An account of this process follows:

PACIFIC PLYWOOD FLOORING PRODUCT ATTRACTING INTEREST AMONG BUILDERS—SALES BOOM AFTER YEAR ON MARKET

Pacific Plywood Manufacturing Co. at Dillard has introduced a new idea with a new product in this area that may lead the way to an increased and more diversified production of wood products.

Long recognized as the Northwest's timber capital, the Roseburg area is known for the excellent plywood boards turned out here. However, while serving scores of needs in American industry, many of the plywood products are completed or finished elsewhere such as California, the Midwest, and even eastern United States.

Pacific Ply, with its new Par-Tile product scarcely a year old, is providing a major breakthrough in one respect. The tough but beautifully grained building board is a finished product when it leaves the sheds of Pacqua division at the company mill.

And it is beginning to sell. Since September 1957, when the first Par-Tile squares were packed in cartons for shipment, architects and contractors as far distant as Chicago, Dallas, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Seattle have begun to recognize the product for its strength, durability, low cost, warm good looks, and simplicity of installation.

PRODUCT WITHSTANDS WEAR

Diversified, it has a soft, sound-absorbing quality that makes Par-Tile adaptable for wall paneling and flooring. Tough enough to withstand long and rough wear, it can be used in schools or office buildings, homes, and playrooms. It will stand up readily under the pounding of a basketball court, and is simple to maintain.

The president and general manager at Pacific Ply, Bill Forrest, thinks the company has something really good.

"What makes me happy," he said, "is the fact that we've found another use for the fine lumber in this area. Up to now we've been able to develop uses for only about 50 percent of the logs brought in from the woods.

"Development of Par-Tile shows that the Roseburg area can turn out a finished building product rather than sell just the board for completion by some other plant far away. I think this area could do more of this kind of manufacturing." Forrest added, "and be less dependent upon outside companies."

FINISHED PRODUCTS NEEDED

He is convinced, he said, that development of finished products would be a definite shot in the arm for the local economy.

Bill Gray, assistant sales manager for particle board and Par-Tile at Pacific Ply, reports enthusiasm everywhere for the new product, once it is tried. "Our biggest job," he said this week, "is to acquaint builders and architects with the product so they can write it into specifications. We have no trouble selling the material once people become acquainted with it."

A little over a year ago the first 250 cartons of the 9¼-inch-square Par-Tile products were shipped from the Dillard plant, 80 pieces to the carton. The squares are three-eighths of an inch thick and ready for laying upon arrival.

To protect the unique and versatile wood product Pacqua Division engineers, headed by Bill Cooke, manager, have patented a method of scoring the unfinished bottom of the board pieces into small squares. This not only provides manufacturing rights, but is a major feature of the product, according to Cooke.

SQUARES EASY TO LAY

"The scored underside of the material fits easily and quickly onto mastics used in laying flooring," he explained. "It is very good to put down on cement or concrete."

Called "Flexo-Grid scoring," it is a most important feature in the manufacturing, and done on a special machine with rotating, hard steel saw blades.

The product itself is made from small chips or slivers of wood, treated under heat and pressure after being mixed with a special resin formula developed in Cooke's laboratory. The manager first began experimenting with the idea 5 years ago at the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory at Oregon State College where Cooke was lab head for the State Board of Forest Research.

Particle board was an earlier product to be developed at the Pacific Ply plant. Par-Tile is similar, though subject to special treatment and considerably more pressure. About 15½ tons of pressure is applied in the process of preparing the board which is produced in sheets 8 feet long and 4 feet wide under hydraulic pressure.

OTHER WOODS UNDER STUDY

The company now is experimenting with other native Oregon wood such as oak and cedar, although manufacturing to date has been exclusively with Douglas fir.

Two weeks ago a night shift was added at the plant as orders for the new Par-Tile product built up. Soon about 5,000 cartons daily will be packed and shipped at Dillard. Thirty persons have been hired to turn out the product and the night shift has required

four to five more on a regular shift. Forrest expects about 50 or more persons will be needed when other machines are delivered to speed production.

Under tests the Par-Tile product has nine times the wearing power of cork, and six times that of many floor tiles. It is considerably more durable than regular oak flooring, laboratory tests show.

Cooke explains that by using chips or splinters the product, under pressure, has greater density and uniformity of strength than some of the hardest woods.

ADVERTISING PROGRAM STARTS

Gray now has begun an extensive program for acquainting the public with the new product through newspaper, radio, and TV advertising from Chicago to the west coast. Just last week the company got an order, its first locally, for flooring a considerable part of the Winchester School north of Roseburg which is to be remodeled.

This is the way the product has been selling, and one reason why the Pacqua division material has a long backlog of orders.

Rumanian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a speech made by me Thursday evening, January 22, 1959, on the occasion of the dinner given by the League of Free Romanians in Washington, D.C., commemorating a century since the re-establishment of Rumanian independence:

Mr. Parcasanu, ladies and gentlemen, the event we commemorate this evening is indeed a historical one. It commemorates the 100th anniversary of the firm intervention of the Western Powers in order to re-establish the independence of Rumania's lands and thus stem the Russian invasion in Europe, suggests a definite similarity as to the basic facts of today's situation.

A century ago, Moscow imperialism was making aggressive inroads toward the heart of Europe. It was at that moment, after a long and bitter experience, that the Western Powers realized that acquiescing in Russian encroachment in Eastern Europe was not the proper method to insure the balance of power in Europe. The security of nations in Europe depended on checking the Russian advance, or peace in Europe would be in permanent jeopardy.

At the Treaty of Paris in 1856 a successful attempt was made to substitute collective action on the part of the concert of Europe for aggression by Russia. Today a greater alliance of free people is confronted by the recurring and intensified danger from Moscow under communism. This danger has spread from the relatively small area of Eastern Europe to the greater part of Asia. The problem which now faces all those who stand for freedom is to stop the expansion of a ruthless Soviet tyranny aiming at world domination. The dimensions and implications of this issue are far greater today. The new feature of this Soviet drive for world dominion is its implacable and universal subversive organization.

As chairman of House committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacres, I had the sad opportunity to go deeply into the ruth-

lessness of Soviet Communist schemes. The coldblooded killing of thousands of pro-Alled Polish officers and civilians was done with the same cynicism and purpose as the wholesale murder of the Hungarian freedom fighters; the purpose being, by physically liquidating the fighting elite of these nations, as they did also in Rumania and elsewhere, to destroy the backbone of independence in the respective countries.

But in spite of it all hate for Soviet-Communist domination is deeper than ever. That is one of the reasons why, in Rumania for instance, the Soviets have organized the largest concentration camp in Europe, the Danube-Black Sea Canal and recently, after the Hungarian uprising, the Danube Delta slave-labor camp. It is reported that this Danube Delta camp is an international pool of slaves, where besides Rumanians there are Hungarians, Poles, Koreans, Germans, and others.

These are a few features of a situation on which the Soviets would like us to make new agreements implying fresh concessions either in the West or in the East. Such concessions would consolidate and augment the menacing strength of the aggressive Red bloc.

I am sure the American people now sense the inherent danger latent in any new concessions. Our own security requires, on the contrary, that we uncompromisingly follow a policy of restoring freedom to Rumania and other Soviet satellite nations.

The following is a statement by Rev. Father Eugene Lazar, of 1133 Madison Street, Gary, Ind., made at a dinner given Sunday, January 25 observing the 100th anniversary in East Chicago, Ind.:

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE UNION OF THE PRINCIPALITIES OF MOLDAVIA AND MUN-
TENIA UNDER ALEXANDER ION CUZA

Saturday, January 24, marks the observance of the 100th anniversary of the Union of the Principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia under Alexander Ion Cuza. The event is one of the most important in the history of the Rumanian people.

The 19th century was a time of flourishing idealisms and of realizations for the national state. Some of the most recent writings claim that the beginnings of such attitudes are to be found in the 16th century writing of Machiavelli. It took much time before it came to the attention of the political and spiritual leaders of Europe, that the people aspired for a free and independent national life. The completion of this movement commenced with the unification of Germany and of Italy in 1870-71. The principles of self-determination of President Woodrow Wilson and of the peace treaty of Versailles, which had adopted this principle, further solidified this world change.

A hundred years ago when Rumania was not to be found on the maps of Europe as it was known in later years, brothers of the same nationality and blood of the two principalities of Moldavia and Muntenia were forced to fight each other for the ambitions of foreign sovereignty. Rumanians decided to end this situation with the election of the same sovereign in both Moldavia and Muntenia in the person of Col. Alexander Ion Cuza.

During that period of time the peasants were exploited without any compassion by the lords, who in the majority were foreigners.

Alexander Ion Cuza, who himself was the son of a lord, understood the peasants' situation better than anyone else, and gave heed to the cry and aspiration of the peasants, and began to give justice to the people, and gave to the people some of the land that they had worked for their masters.

This certainly could not have been of any liking to the lords and therefore began to maneuver through the liberal and conserva-

tive party to force Cuza to resign. The first try at dethroning Cuza, the "lord of the peasants" was in 1865, during the absence of Cuza from the country.

To a great extent the parallel can be made between Lincoln and Cuza, each in his manner—unifying a torn country and freeing those that had been oppressed. Another Cuza will arise, not only in Rumania, but in other Iron Curtain nations, and destroy the Communist tyrant and restore liberty and self-government. Freedom-loving people throughout the world hope that day is not far distant.

Huntington, W. Va.: All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pride that I rise to announce that I have been informed that my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., has just won the coveted title of "All-America City," and will receive 1 of the 11 annual awards presented under the joint sponsorship of the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

For Huntington, this has been a dynamic decade of progress. The progress has been achieved through the unselfish cooperation, hard work, and good will of many dedicated Huntington citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the American city is now our frontier of progress. I am sure that municipalities throughout the country will draw inspiration from the example of Huntington, W. Va., and the other 10 all-America cities.

I ask to have printed at this point the main steps listed in Huntington's application for all-America honors, followed by an editorial in the January 22, 1959, issue of the Herald-Dispatch, of Huntington, W. Va., entitled "Go Ahead, Huntington."

The articles follow:

STAIRWAY TO HONOR—CITY'S ACHIEVEMENT LIST IS IMPRESSIVE

Here are the main steps in progress which were listed in Huntington's application for all-American honors:

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight: First of 4 successive 3-year school levies which provided improvements and the addition of 282 classrooms, 27 gymnasiums-auditoriums, 42 kitchens, 4 libraries, and 2 band rooms.

City-county health department formed.

Huntington Industrial Corp. raised \$40,000 to purchase airport site.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: Tri-State Airport Authority organized under State legislation demanded by the citizens of Huntington.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: Excess levy voted for four municipal swimming pools.

Voting machines used first time following legislative action demanded by citizens of Huntington.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two: \$3 million bond issue voted to build 237-bed Cabell-Huntington Hospital.

Opening of \$600,000 Huntington Galleries. Central Ohio Valley Industrial Council formed with Huntington leadership.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: Opening of four municipal swimming pools.

Public subscription of \$325,000 to equip Cabell-Huntington Hospital.

Purchase of permanent theater by Community Players.

Organization of United Fund with 27 participating agencies.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five: \$650,000 bond issue and supporting 3-year excess levy voted for 33-mile street resurfacing program.

Formation of Huntington production pool by small industries.

Organization of All Huntington Association to obtain council-manager charter.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six: Citizens voted 12,005 to 6,130 for drafting a new charter and elected 10 manager plan proponents to 11-member charter board.

Excess levy voted to retire \$940,000 debt against Memorial Field House.

Cabell County bond issue of \$1 million plus Wayne County bond issue of \$225,000 voted to obtain matching Federal funds for Tri-State Airport.

Twenty percent increase in property assessments and property reappraisal demanded for school purposes.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven: Council-manager charter adopted by vote of 9,577 to 5,330.

Election of seven All Huntington Association-endorsed candidates to seven-member council.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight: Transfer of \$170,000 levy by county court to board of education for recreation and library purposes.

Public subscription of \$51,696 to purchase 226 acres of additional park land.

In addition, there are listed dozens of projects of various organizations which were not citywide in their impact.

GO AHEAD, HUNTINGTON

Go ahead, Huntington.

The Herald-Dispatch not only desires that Huntington go ahead but urges the city to adopt "go ahead" both as a prevailing attitude and slogan.

This newspaper this morning rejoices with the community that Huntington has been signally honored by being named an all-America city, 1 of 11 so chosen by the National Municipal League and Look magazine because civic groups continually pressed for civic improvements.

We join in congratulating those civic leaders who worked so valiantly for those improvements for which Huntington is honored and those persons who so ably stated the city's case before the all-America city awards jury last fall.

We all may take justifiable pride in the fact that the name "Huntington" today is being recognized nationally as a community where accomplishment is possible.

But elation, however pardonable, must be tempered with the fact that we cannot and must not rest upon the laurels of past achievement. That way lies stagnation.

We can be proud, yes. But we have not reached the millenium of municipal excellence—far from it. The criterion for the award was not civic perfection, it was accomplishment through continuing citizen participation.

There is only one direction for Huntington to go today—"go ahead."

Our problems are still multiple and complex. But we, situated as we are in the everexpanding Ohio Valley, have an unrealized potential for growth in all fields.

Continued growth means continued citizen participation.

It means continued citizen awareness, continued citizen desire to have even a better community in which to live. As in the past, it shall be the welcome task of the Herald-Dispatch to keep the citizenry aware and informed of those goals toward which it should be striving.

When one follows a city's progress day by day it is easy to lose sight of long-range gains. For that reason we review briefly the accomplishments gained over the past decade, the merits of which led to Huntington's being honored.

We have a new hospital, a new tristate airport and memorial fieldhouse. A street resurfacing project was undertaken and municipal swimming pools were built; 4 excess school levies were approved by the voters and 226 acres of land added to the park system.

We achieved a 20-percent increase in property assessments and property was reappraised. A council-manager charter was approved.

These accomplishments did not come about overnight, and they did not happen by themselves. They were accomplished because someone cared enough to assume the community leadership. They were accomplished because the programs were worthwhile and had a broad basis of community action and underlying community support.

None of them were accomplished easily. All change, all expenditure, for change brings with it opposition—sometimes bitter and temporarily victorious opposition.

There is only one way for Huntington to go—go ahead.

Huntington receives more than an honor today. It has learned a valuable lesson.

And that is that any community improvement must have as its base concerted citizen action. It has to be wanted badly enough for representatives from all walks of community life to band together to see that it gets done.

Cabell County is making preparations for the celebration of its centennial. This is an event not totally divorced from today's theme of municipal recognition. The centennial itself should serve not only for a fond look at the past but as a springboard for future growth.

The nearness of the centennial further serves to remind that Huntington's growth and accomplishments did not transpire only in the past decade. It has been a long, continuing process and we today are in no small measure reaping the benefits planted by unassuming community leaders of a century ago.

The Herald-Dispatch has great faith in Huntington and the tristate area which Huntington serves. But we gain nothing by denying or ignoring existing problems.

Huntington and this area need new industries. We need new and adequate highways to attract those industries. We need a new bridge across the Ohio River. Much remains to be done to make our present airport adequate for the jet age. We have a downtown parking problem. More street resurfacing is needed. The community has a great stake in an expanded Marshall College. Local schools face a financial dilemma. We need a modernized city market. A municipal wharf and expanded river terminals are called for if the city is to continue to grow. Urban renewal and zoning lie just ahead.

Any list aiming at community betterment could be endless.

Huntington has been honored primarily because of continuing citizen action.

Such citizen action must not stop with the award. Too much remains to be done. It can be done.

We do not pretend for a moment that it will be easy. There probably won't even be any prize for it. Its only reward will be headache, heartache, disappointment, delay, brickbats instead of honors. It will be done because a handful of dedicated people love Huntington. It will be done because the citizens of Huntington have the will to do it, and the good commonsense to band together to see that it gets done.

Go ahead, Huntington.

Sioux Falls, a City With a Heart, Lifts Her Mentally Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, America's most precious resource is the minds of our children. Aside from the humanitarian considerations at stake, we cannot afford to ignore the mental development of a single one of these young minds. This is true of the gifted child, the so-called average child, and the youngster whose mentality is retarded.

It was a genuine satisfaction to me in the last Congress to sponsor legislation that was enacted into law which is designed to assist mentally retarded children. There are approximately 1 million of these children in the United States. Unfortunately, only about 15 percent of them are being given the opportunity to learn under the direction of specially prepared teachers. The legislation passed by the 85th Congress will help solve the critical shortage of qualified teachers by providing a modest Federal grant to encourage the training of teachers to meet the problems of mentally retarded youngsters.

I am very pleased that citizens in my own State—South Dakota—are moving ahead in providing special education for mentally retarded children. A recent article by Mr. John Wooley appearing in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of January 11, 1959, relates some of the remarkable progress being made in this field by the Sioux chapter of the Association for Retarded Children, whose president is Mr. Bill Green. Under unanimous consent I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

IGNORANCE, APATHY SEEN—SIOUX FALLS RETARDED BEING REHABILITATED

(By John Wooley)

Day by day, week by week, one step at a time.

Gradually mentally retarded children in Sioux Falls learn the habits and activities shared by their brothers and sisters.

But some retarded are still hidden in darkness of ignorance and apathy. Others are taught to be useful and happy.

Today, 1,800 Sioux Falls men, women, and children are mentally retarded, with 120 of that number becoming rehabilitated in private and public schools. But 16 years ago the number of persons receiving special adjustment training was almost nil.

Not until the early 1940s did Sioux Falls have a school for persons with mental deficiency due to impaired brain development.

Doctors say mental retardation may be caused by any one of a wide variety of diseases, accidents, or genetic deviations. In many cases the mental deficiency originates before or during birth or in early childhood.

Retardation plays no favorites, a fact prompting the late Mrs. Dorothy Hollister to start the first of the present four homes for mentally handicapped in Sioux Falls. Her child was retarded.

Later came to South Dakota Home for Speech Handicapped Children, Inc., 3901 S.

Hawthorne Avenue; Hope School, 1909 East Sixth Street, and Shirley White School for Exceptional Children, 426 South Willow Avenue. The Hollister School is located at 1020 East 26th Street. The schools operated without group affiliation until 1954, when the Sioux Chapter Association for Retarded Children was organized by parents.

Associated with the State and national organizations, the Sioux chapter has helped secure funds and support for the schools, promote public understanding and secure favorable State and county legislation.

Bill Green, chapter president, said the past 5 years of organizational work with members has seen a significant step forward in the retardation field.

Like most of the other 85 members in the chapter, Green has a retarded child. He believes most mentally handicapped persons can master the three R's, or at least become a nearly normal citizen.

Among problems facing the chapter are securing sufficient funds, hiring qualified instructors—and educating the parents of a retarded child.

"Many parents think a mentally retarded person should be hidden in a closet, for he can never fit into society," the chapter president said. "Parents are amazed to learn we want to help their retarded children."

Unfortunately, not every retarded person in Sioux Falls and area can be helped by the chapter because of limited school facilities and employees. Consequently, the organization must be particularly interested in children of school age.

But, still, some Sioux Falls schools must refuse applicants because of crowded conditions.

In addition to the Sioux Chapter, schools have faced many problems in an effort to exist.

Mrs. George Sweeney, director of Hope School, was prompted by a retarded daughter to start a school in her farm home. Later she used a church basement, garage, and a truck terminal building for classrooms.

All the centers except the Shirley White School receive United Fund and other organizational support. Schools are paid \$35 a month for each child from the individual's school district. In addition, some schools have parental support.

The South Dakota Home for Speech Handicapped, which also has a school, is typical in that it has 20 retarded persons from ages 4 to 21 in its rehabilitation program.

Although enrollment and teaching methods have increased since the first school was organized in Sioux Falls, an existing problem is persons past school age.

Classrooms prepare students to be active and somewhat independent. But the retarded person must know a trade to be economically independent.

"We're attempting to develop workshops so retarded persons are not a burden to society," Green said. "Training of these persons in Sioux Falls has come a long way—but we have a long road ahead."

Tribute to Representative J. Harry McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Ohio, and

others, in paying a brief tribute to the memory of our late friend, Representative J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, whose sudden and untimely passing during the recess of the Congress came as a great shock to his many friends in this Chamber and throughout the country. He was a friendly and most personable Member who represented the people of his district and State most ably.

May I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Good Place To Start Economy Try Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the January 20 issue of the Saginaw News. It is very encouraging to find a newspaper that supports the President's budget even though that budget does not include their own hometown Saginaw Valley flood control project. It would be far easier to us to practice economy if all newspapers who preach economy were willing to advocate curtailed Government spending even though it directly affected local projects:

GOOD PLACE TO START ECONOMY TRY IS HERE

The temptation to preach economy for others and to protest refusals to indulge our own wants is always with us. Hence there will be no critical comment here in the wake of the news from Washington announcing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's decision to exclude from its requests funds for two Saginaw watershed improvement projects.

In doing so, the Corps of Engineers is only pursuing a policy strongly urged by President Eisenhower in his economy budget message in which he ruled out appropriations for flood control and navigation which were not already under construction.

To have brought the \$20 million Saginaw Valley flood control project to the construction stage would have called for \$500,000 in planning funds. The Corps of Engineers has \$300,000 on hand for a start on the Saginaw River navigation improvement project, but it would be pointless to undertake that much of a \$5.5 million job at this time.

Aside from the fact that we believe as strongly as anyone that spending from Washington must be curbed if inflation is to be checked, there is reason also for citizens of this area to distinguish between the two projects which have been sought here.

The river improvement project is, when it can be afforded, a justifiable Federal undertaking. The Saginaw River is a navigable stream by every standard, including established usage on a commercial tonnage basis. It stands to become an increasingly important carrier of water traffic with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. As such, we need offer no apologies in seeking participation in what has long been accepted as a legitimate function and responsibility of the Federal Government.

We recognize, however, that legitimate requests must await priority of importance and urgency in keeping with the Government's limited annual commitments.

As for the flood-control project, we can hardly protest this watershed's right to consideration, simply because the 21-county plan has considerably more merit than did many others approved by previous Congresses and Presidents.

Nothing in the years of preliminary local studies and surveys demonstrated that the Saginaw Valley could not manage the financing from its own resources. Nor is there anything in this proposed project to suggest that it serves wide areas of regional scope far beyond the bounds of the project as defined. The farmlands, rivers, game sanctuary and communities along the way stand to benefit directly and exclusively.

We express this view, knowing that our Congressmen have been eager and alive in promoting something for the people back home, especially since precious little "pork-barrel" indulgence has been brought this way from Washington in many long years.

There are those who criticize pretty pointedly the Congressman who doesn't bring home the bacon. We do not count ourselves among them. Today, the best service a Congressman can render his constituents is, in our view, to stand as firmly as he knows how against the spenders who care not for deficits and inflation which has reduced the value of the dollar to a second-grade 42-cent coin in just 20 years.

In foregoing legitimate Federal spending here this year as well as the questionable variety we should, however, be entitled to demand that equally stringent rules of justification be applied everywhere else in the United States. If less than that is done, no administration or Congress can protest the disillusioned cynicism that leads the public to grab, before someone else gets there first.

A Petition for Continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include extraneous material.

The Santa Barbara, Calif., unit of Pro America has forwarded to me a petition urging that the House Un-American Activities Committee be continued in recognition of the past achievements of the committee and as a recognition of the continuing threat of communistic and other un-American organizations. I fully concur with these splendid citizens and join them in calling for the carrying on of the committee and its vitally important work:

THE COMMITTEE FOR CONTINUATION OF THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas it is an established fact that our concept of government based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States is under attack by an opposing ideology, despotic and godless in nature; and

Whereas the perpetrators of this ideology have ceaselessly proclaimed to the nations of the world their plans for subjugation of said nations; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has been designated as a major objective of aforementioned subjugation; and

Whereas one of the approved techniques of appropriation is the infiltration of the subversive element into policymaking levels of government and into strategic defense positions;

Therefore, the undersigned do petition the Congress of these United States for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the past achievements of which have been of inestimable value to our national security.

Barbara S. Whittaker, Ellen Hayward, Paula A. Chauvel, Florence C. Sounsen, Helen M. Wood, Pearl E. Harley, Mrs. Charles S. Stevens, Maude I. Long, Mary Elizabeth Thomas, Meriam E. Storey, Mrs. Flint H. Jones, Myrtle M. Crafts, Margaret Nixon, Marion B. Phillips, Roy A. Lippencott, Genevieve G. Lippencott, John K. Northrop, Chuck Northrop, Margaret C. Northrop, Santa Barbara, Calif.

I Want To Stand on My Own Two Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Alfred Wilken, of Owego, N.Y., expressing his opposition to the many Federal Government spending programs. The views expressed in this letter from one of my constituents clearly reflects agreement with our President's determined stand for fiscal responsibility at the Federal level as the very least elected representatives owe the long-suffering taxpayer.

OWEGO, N.Y., January 17, 1959.

Congressman HOWARD W. ROBISON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBISON: I have received my W-2 form, and what I see is that—

I have helped to stuff the mailboxes of other people with Government checks.

I have bought farm products that I, and probably no one else will eat.

I have bought irrigation in the American desert so that I can pay for more farm products I, and probably no one else will eat.

I have bought power stations and power for people living a thousand miles from here.

I am buying superhighways in sparsely settled areas halfway across the continent when we can't get the lumps chopped down on the road between Flemingville and Newark Valley.

I am buying plushier offices and appointments for an ever-expanding military and civilian bureaucracy, not to mention expense accounts, etc.

I am only a man working for a salary, as my receipt of a W-2 form would imply, but now it is proposed that I also pay for—

Somebody else's hospital and medical bills.

Junk real estate in the big cities all over the United States in the name of slum clearance and urban renewal.

Some other kid's college education, while I try to figure out how I can educate my own. Of course, in my day, I and many others paid for an education entirely ourselves, even without help from parents and scholarships, etc.

Of course, all the time I am expected to put up more and more money to guarantee more and more shaky mortgages, when I figure I can't afford to build a house myself.

I never have received 1 penny of compensation, either directly or indirectly from any government, except for 4 years and 5 months pay while in the Army in World War II. If anyone wants to say I have indirectly benefited from Government spending I dare them to give me something more than hypotheses, theories, and semantics. I dare them to trace it right into my pocket-book.

It would be to the interest of the entire country if the Congressmen of the northeastern quarter of the United States joined together and stopped the march of Federal dollars across the Mississippi River.

To balance the Federal budget the Government should send a bill assessing each income taxpayers his proportionate share of the deficit, payment to be made in one lump sum in 30 days. Such a sudden and heavy blow to the household budget would be more educational of the evils of inflation than all the newspaper and magazine articles.

Of course, if the trend of Federal spending persists, about all the spenders will soon be able to do with fellows like me is to chop us up and fertilize the grassroots with us.

Yours truly,

ALFRED WILKEN.

New Civil Service Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an enlightening editorial by James A. Campbell entitled "New Civil Service Era" as printed in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 17, 1959:

NEW CIVIL SERVICE ERA

(Once a year, during National Civil Service Week, James A. Campbell, president of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Government Employees, takes over this column to talk about whatever's on his mind. This is the week—and the day.—John Cramer.)

(By James A. Campbell, president, American Federation of Government Employees)

The civil service is a sleeping giant. Potentially the 2 million Federal employees and their families represent a might force in American life. If they should ever speak in a single voice, the merest whisper would reverberate through the corridors of Capitol Hill.

But this potential has never been fully realized.

Throughout most of the 76 years of the civil service, a majority of employees have been content to let a comparative handful of their colleagues carry the ball for them in campaigns for improved working conditions. Some were too timid to join a union. Some considered themselves above the fray, and some naively believed that improvements in their benefits somehow just happened.

It may be wishful thinking, but I am encouraged by signs that the civil service—this slumbering Goliath—is beginning to stir.

The signs of life became apparent last year during the pay raise campaign. At first it seemed to be merely hunger pains. The rumblings which followed the veto of the

1957 pay bill appeared to be merely the growling of an empty stomach which would subside when the immediate objective had been won.

RESULT

Perhaps it was, but one result of the resentment against an inadequate pay structure was a greater degree of engagement by the ordinarily docile Government employee in the campaign which led to passage of the 10-percent pay raise.

We were amazed at the turnout when we asked our local unions to send delegations to Washington to call on Congressmen and Senators from their home districts. We found out that many of these delegates were able to make the trip through contributions by nonmembers to help meet expenses.

Everyone who wrote a letter, contributed a dollar, or attended a rally felt a sense of personal participation and victory in the success of the pay campaign. The logical conclusion was: "If we did it once, we can do it again."

Thanks to John Cramer and his colleagues who cover the Government news beat, Federal workers are gradually getting disabused of the idea that these campaigns for improved conditions are the result of spontaneous combustion.

Through the newspapers, employees are in on the picture from the time a resolution is introduced at a union convention to the strategy sessions of the Government Employees Council, the introduction of bills, open hearings, and even the inevitable compromises which are hammered out behind closed doors.

There's another factor which is gradually penetrating the fitful slumber of the uncommitted majority of Federal employees.

Many of the most influential Members of Congress—including such leaders as Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and Representative JAMES MORRISON, ranking majority member of the House committee, have said in plain, forceful language that they favor organization of Government employees.

I have, perhaps, taken advantage of John Cramer's hospitality by devoting a "Civil Service Week" column to the problems of organization. But the Civil Service Act would never have been passed in the first place if it had not been for the organized protest of reform groups against the corruption of the spoils system.

Having been appointed to his job through open competitive examination and retained on the basis of merit, he was able to demand good wages and working conditions as a matter of right.

Considering how much has been accomplished by so few, the stirrings of the 2 million Government employees promise to make news for many years to come.

H. R. Gross Continues His Relentless Fight for Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know that my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is back at the old stand this year in his relentless battle for a return to fiscal sanity in the Federal bureaucracy. The gentleman is widely recognized as one of the staunchest advocates of economy in Government,

and I have been proud to join him in many of his fights to cut extravagant and unnecessary spending proposals.

It is appropriate that he would be assigned the number "H.R. 144"—one gross—to his bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed revenues except in time of war or grave national emergency, and in this regard I desire to include as part of my remarks the following article from the Washington Post of January 18, 1959:

GROSS PROFIT

Iowa's Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, whose charges up the hill against spending have become a part of Capitol Hill folklore, is back fighting the windmill again.

This year he's taken out a patent on a new bill "to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by Congress."

How did he apply his trademark? By numbering the bill "H.R. 144."

This, in case you hadn't heard, is a mathematical pun.

Gross's initials, of course, are H.R., the same as those on the bill. And it just so happens that the number coincides exactly with Webster's definition of "gross," which is: "The number of 12 dozen; 12 times 12."

Balancing the Budget Against Needs, We Are Hopeful, but Not Fearful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON C. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, which analyzes the so-called balanced budget submitted by President Eisenhower. I am hopeful that all Members will take time to read this excellent editorial:

BALANCING THE BUDGET AGAINST NEEDS, WE ARE HOPEFUL, BUT NOT FEARFUL

We hope the \$77 billion Federal budget President Eisenhower sent to Congress this week can be balanced. But if it is balanced, it will be through what now appears to be an unlikely combination of circumstances.

At least three major conditions would have to be fulfilled, if the amount the Government takes in and the amount it spends are to remain about equal, as the President proposes.

First, Congress would have to approve the President's new tax proposals or develop alternative tax measures to raise about \$1.3 billion in new revenue.

Mr. Eisenhower wants to (1) raise the gasoline tax by 1.5 cents a gallon; (2) raise postal rates again; (3) raise the tax on aviation gasoline and impose a tax on jet fuel; (4) increase the tax on life insurance companies; (5) close a "loophole" in the taxation of cooperatives, and (6) extend present rates of corporation and excise taxes.

If Congress balks at any of these proposals—and it has already shown signs of doing so—revenues will fall short of spending and the budget will be unbalanced.

Second, Congress would have to agree to abandon a number of proposed new pro-

grams and to impose cutbacks in a number of existing programs.

Budget Director Maurice H. Stans has acknowledged that the new Eisenhower budget contains fewer proposals for new programs than any budget in recent memory.

The President has asked for no new public housing starts; for an end after this year to the college housing program; for a sharp reduction in rural electrification loans through higher interest rates; for no new starts on reclamation and other public works; for reduced grants to the States for hospital construction, and for reduced military aid abroad.

On existing programs, the budget proposes a number of small reductions in areas ranging from the school-lunch program to the lending program of the Farmers Home Administration. No renewal is suggested on a number of spending programs due to expire automatically.

Congress is almost certain to insist on some of the new spending and to oppose some of the reductions. Any appreciable spending increase will quickly unbalance the budget.

Third, the American economy would have to follow the predictions of the President's economic advisers for the next year with a certain amount of precision.

If business doesn't continue to improve quite as fast as the Eisenhower economists think it will, then taxes will not produce the revenue the President expects. Again that would mean an unbalanced budget.

Unless all the contingencies are resolved in exactly the way the President would like them to be, the likelihood is that the Government will spend more money in the next fiscal year than it will take in and another deficit year is ahead.

The deficit will probably not exceed a few billion dollars, no small amount, but far less than the \$12.9 billion deficit in the current fiscal year.

The President has warned us, quite properly, that a deficit would increase the pressures of inflation.

At the same time, his economic report to Congress indicates that at least three counterinflationary forces have been at work and should be taken in consideration:

Business expenditures for new plant and equipment declined \$7 billion in 1958, net exports went down several billion and consumer credit failed to expand for the first time since World War II.

In general, the economy is experiencing a healthy recovery from the recession, perhaps in some measure related to the \$12.9 billion deficit.

Inflation, meanwhile, has not gotten out of hand, despite the big deficit.

Should we, then, let fear of inflationary pressure from a new, though much smaller deficit, distract us from making sound judgments on other equally important considerations of national policy?

Balancing the budget is a wise policy in prosperous times, but it is not an end in itself. It has to be weighed against the needs and perils of a free society in a tense and unstable world.

If balancing the budget means short-changing our missile program or allowing weaknesses to develop in the alliances that protect the world from Soviet aggression, then balancing the budget will have to be postponed.

If balancing the budget means neglecting the needs of our country for better schools and roads, decent housing, slum-free cities, and reasonable progress in the development of our natural resources, then it might well be better to do without a balanced budget.

In any case, if Congress decides to beef up the President's defense requests to some extent and to spend more than the President has asked on carefully considered education, housing, and reclamation measures, we won't look upon it as a tragedy.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 1221, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year the amount of outside income permitted without deductions from benefits, and to provide that all types of income shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual's benefits are subject to such deductions. I have now requested the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to ignore this bill and am today introducing another bill which would embody the first part only of H.R. 1221, that is, the increase of outside earnings or wages permitted without deducting from benefits.

As might be expected, Mr. Speaker, I have received a substantial volume of mail in protest against the second part of H.R. 1221 which would have included all forms of income, earned and unearned, for the purpose of determining outside income. Many of those who wrote me stated that I was in effect penalizing persons who by virtue of thrift have been able to invest in stocks, bonds, or various forms of rental income to supplement their social security benefits following retirement. I have replied to such persons that this was not at all my intent and that I did not actually seek to make this particular provision a part of title II of the Social Security Act. I rather intended to focus attention upon the entire question of limitations on outside income which, to me, completely destroy the insurance concept of the social security program. To my way of thinking, it is manifestly unfair to have the present low limitation of \$1,200 per annum on earned income and no limit at all on unearned income and my introduction of H.R. 1221 was merely intended to point up this inequity. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that an individual who has contributed to the social security program the required number of quarters should be permitted to draw his benefits without any regard to his earnings from other sources as is the case after he has passed age 72. What the present law does, however, is to force people to retire from gainful employment upon reaching their 65th birthday if they desire to avail themselves of social security benefits.

As a matter of fact, the entire concept of an arbitrary and fixed retirement age does not appear to me to be sound. I am sure every Member of the House knows many people who, both physically and mentally, are well qualified to continue gainful employment past the age of 65. I am equally certain that every Member of the House knows others who should be retired substantially in advance of that age. I must confess that at the moment I see no practical possibility of making the social security retirement age more flexible, but I do wish

to voice my objection to it in principle.

What is the position of the administration on the question of raising the limit on outside income? I think this is best set forth by the following texts of two reports, one from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated October 2, 1957, and one from the deputy to the Secretary of Treasury dated February 28, 1958, and both addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It will be noted that both Departments are opposed to the enactment of such legislation at this time:

DEPARTMENT OF

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Washington, October 2, 1957.

Hon. JERE COOPER,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your requests of May 8 and March 25, 1957, for a report on H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828, bills which would amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder.

H.R. 4636 would increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 and H.R. 4828 would increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 the amount a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. H.R. 4828 would leave unchanged the unit (\$80) by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings. H.R. 4636 would increase the unit to \$120.

The limitation on the amount of earnings a beneficiary may have and still receive benefits is necessary if the benefits are to be restricted to persons who have substantially retired from gainful work and to dependents of retired or deceased workers who do not themselves have substantial earned income. (For practical reasons, the same earnings test is used to determine whether the worker has retired and whether a dependent has substantial earned income.) Under present law a person can work enough to earn \$2,088 a year and still receive at least 1 month's benefit. If he does not earn more than \$1,200 in a year, he can receive all of his benefits for the year.

While it is difficult to determine the exact amount of earnings that most satisfactorily discriminates between retirement and non-retirement, the Department believes that the present exemption of \$1,200 is preferable to the higher exceptions proposed by H.R. 4636 and H.R. 4828.

Even with the present test, some people can continue to work full time at their usual level of earnings and still receive benefits. For example, workers who have been earning at the rate of \$2,000 a year can, after reaching retirement age, receive 2 months' benefits in the year without in any way changing their work activity. In 1955, 21 percent of the workers under old-age and survivors insurance with earnings credits in all calendar quarters had earnings of \$2,000 or less; many of these no doubt were full-time workers. Any increase in the amount of earnings exempt under the earnings test would increase the number of persons who could continue in their regular jobs and still receive benefits. If the exempt amount were increased to \$1,800 and the unit used to divide earnings in excess of the exempt amount were increased to \$120 as proposed in H.R. 4636, persons earning as much as \$3,120 a year could continue in their jobs and receive 1 month's benefit.

If H.R. 4636 or H.R. 4828 were enacted, the cost of the old-age and survivors insurance program would be increased. The estimated

level-premium cost of H.R. 4636, on an intermediate-cost basis, would be 0.53 percent of payroll. The cost of H.R. 4828 would be 0.50 percent. The additional cost resulting from an increase in the amount of earnings exempt from the earnings test would be incurred for the benefit of only a small percentage of the old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and these would be persons who already had substantial income from work. The great majority of beneficiaries do not have substantial earnings.

We therefore recommend that H.R. 4336 and H.R. 4828 not be enacted by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 28, 1958.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on H.R. 4636 to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions.

H.R. 4636 would increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year the amount of income a beneficiary under age 72 may earn without losing any old-age and survivors insurance benefits for the year. In addition, it would increase from \$80 to \$120 the unit by which the total yearly earnings in excess of the exempt amount are divided to determine the maximum number of monthly benefits which may be withheld by reason of earnings.

Two aspects of this bill are of particular concern to this Department.

If enacted, H.R. 4636 would increase present and prospective benefit payments substantially without at the same time increasing social security contributions. Responsibility for the payment of social security benefits is vested in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and that Department has estimated that on an intermediate-cost basis the increase in the cost of the program would approximate a level-premium cost of one-half percent of payrolls. This would result in a corresponding weakening of the financial soundness of the insurance program. We concur in the opposition of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to such increases in benefits and costs of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Moreover, a liberalization of the earnings test for social security benefit purposes would have important implications for the retirement income credit allowed under the individual income tax. As your committee is aware, discrepancies between the tax treatment of social security benefits and other forms of retirement income have been a concern for a number of years. In the Revenue Act of 1954, the tax credit for retirement income was adopted to equalize the treatment of individuals receiving taxable retirement incomes with those receiving exempt social security benefits. In that connection, a deliberate effort was made to parallel the provisions governing the tax credit, including the earnings test, in the income tax with provisions in the Social Security Act. The amount of income which retired individuals could earn without reducing their retired income credit was fixed at \$900 to parallel the annual earnings test of \$900 which insured workers could earn without reducing social security benefits. In 1956, the amount of income which could be earned without

reducing the credit was raised from \$900 to \$1,200 to parallel a corresponding increase in the earnings test provided under the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act.

Enactment of H.R. 4636 would again unbalance the social security and retirement income credit provisions and stimulate pressures for a corresponding adjustment in the provisions of the retirement income credit. Such adjustment would not only reduce income tax revenues but raise additional questions concerning the relative income tax treatment of retired workers and other groups in the population.

In view of these considerations, this Department recommends against enactment of H.R. 4636.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DAN THROOP SMITH,
Deputy to the Secretary.

The thing that both departments appear to overlook is the fact that over a period of time the steadily increasing cost of living has made many social security benefits completely inadequate to maintain a respectable standard of living. There are obviously two ways to solve this problem. One is to further increase the benefits and thereby incur the necessity of either higher payroll taxes or an additional increase in the income base for social security purposes. Having carefully studied the recent report of the advisory council on social security financing and the contemplated schedule increases in payroll taxes between now and 1969, I would hesitate to upset this balance. The other way seems to me to give a little more ability to those past 65 but not yet 72 to supplement their social security benefits with outside earnings of their own. This is what I am interested in accomplishing.

I can appreciate the objections on the part of both the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nevertheless, I regard this problem as an extremely serious one and it is my belief that the Ways and Means Committee should give it careful consideration. If hearings are held by that committee on amendments to the Social Security Act, I trust I will be given an opportunity to testify and further expound my views in this connection. But this time, however, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor for the purpose of reassuring those people who protested to me against H.R. 1221 that my sole purpose in originally introducing this bill was to call attention to this present inequity regarding the whole question of outside income under the social security program and not with any idea of penalizing those people who, through thrift, have been able to supplement their retirement income from unearned sources.

There follows the text of my letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee requesting that H.R. 1221 not be acted upon by that committee:

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to request that my bill, H.R. 1221, which was introduced

on January 7, 1959, be ignored and that no action be taken by your committee in connection therewith.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Teddy Roosevelt Centennial a Huge 1953 Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has just concluded a year-long observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Teddy Roosevelt. Millions of Americans paid homage to a great American who will never be forgotten.

Thousands traveled to his home at Oyster Bay in my district to pay their respects.

The many persons who participated in the nationwide observance are to be congratulated for what is probably the most outstanding job done in this field.

I would like to insert in the RECORD two articles of interest along this line. The first is from the Albany Knickerbocker News of Wednesday, January 14. The second is from the Public Relations News of December 29 which selects the outstanding public relations campaigns of the year as case histories. The Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission was chosen this year for this high honor: [From the Albany Knickerbocker News, Jan. 14, 1959]

TEDDY ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL A HUGE 1958 SUCCESS

WASHINGTON.—The centennial celebration of Theodore Roosevelt's birth in 1958 is considered a striking success by its sponsors.

The 49-year-old Theodore Roosevelt Association, headed by Leslie C. Stratton, who retired as national public relations director of the Boy Scouts of America, spearheaded the celebration.

It assisted the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, created by Congress in 1955, to honor a great American and to revitalize the principles of responsible citizenship by which Mr. Roosevelt lived and which he exemplified.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON was chairman of a bipartisan committee. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, was vice chairman.

Local State committees were formed to add strength to the centennial and many chairmen were State Governors. Literature was distributed, including two books.

Outside public relations counsel, including Standard Public Relations, Inc., of Washington and New York City, headed by L. Richard Guylay, were brought in.

Congress paid part of the bill and private citizens paid part.

On July 4, the Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River, was dedicated as a historical shrine.

A special family day was held at Teddy Roosevelt's former home on Long Island. There was a citizenship day in September. Sermons were preached on T.R.'s exemplary life. A commemorative stamp was issued by the Postmaster General. President Eisenhower issued a proclamation stressing Teddy Roosevelt's awareness that freedom also carries responsibilities.

The Department of Defense produced a 28-minute film depicting highlights of T.R.'s life. It was televised nationally.

Theodore Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medals were presented to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover with ceremonies and publicity.

The 129 mutual savings banks of New York State used coin banks, circulars, window and lobby displays, and essay contests to tell the T.R. story.

The U.S. Information Agency told the T.R. story through overseas posts. The Treasury Department, National Archives, and libraries set up displays.

The Theodore Roosevelt centennial year paid homage to a great American who will never be forgotten.

[From the Public Relations News, Dec. 29, 1958]

CASE STUDY No. 694

Few centennial celebrations have received such diverse, sustained, and widespread support as that of the year-long program, just ended, which commemorated the hundredth anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth.

Due to the efforts of the 49-year-old Theodore Roosevelt Association (a voluntary organization headquartered in New York and supported by members and contributors), the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission was created in 1955 by an act of Congress. Stated objectives were to honor the great American and to revitalize the principles of responsible citizenship by which he had lived and which he dramatically exemplified.

Vice President Nixon accepted the chairmanship of a bipartisan committee and Senator O'Mahoney, Democrat, was named vice chairman. The T.R. Association's Director (now director emeritus) Herman Hagedorn, became the committee's director and secretary and, with the aid of Assistant Director Sidney Wallach, energetically went to work.

One of the first steps was to organize a local subcommittee in each of the States; in many cases, the chairman of the committee was the Governor. To stimulate the efforts of these committees, a variety of literature was distributed. This included two substantial books (the print order for each was over 50,000 copies): "The Free Citizen," a selection from the actual writings of T.R. (edited by Hagedorn), and "A Theodore Roosevelt Roundup," a compendium of excerpts from T.R.'s writings, comments about him by his contemporaries, and political cartoons of his era (selected by Wallach) with a biography (by Hagedorn).

The team was strengthened in 1957 by the addition of Leslie C. Stratton when he retired from his post of national public relations director of Boy Scouts of America. He became the T.R. Associations' director, deputy director of the T.R. Commission and general coordinator of the centennial activities. Outside counsel, Standard Public Relations, Inc., of Washington and New York City, headed by L. Richard Guylay, was retained. Its specific function, in addition to helping with general planning, was to stimulate the medium to bring dramatically before the public the record of T.R.'s contributions to the Nation. A series of fortnightly meetings was begun, with Hagedorn, Stratton, Wallach, and Guylay and three of his assistants attending.

Expenses for the first half of the program had been met by a congressional appropriation; but the association, due to an economy wave which hit the country, decided to provide the rest of the money from its treasury and pledges of additional contributions from members. To limit expenditures, meetings were restricted largely to Washington and New York. Other contacts were maintained by mail.

The state committees were kept informed by means of regular bulletins. Full background information on the centennial was distributed to industrialists, educators, labor leaders, clergy, and other opinion leaders and to service organizations and libraries.

There were several warm-up events. On July 4, the Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River, given by the T.R. Association to the Nation some 25 years ago, was dedicated as a historical shrine. A special Family Day was held at T.R.'s former home on Long Island, N.Y. There was a Citizenship Day in September.

On the 99th anniversary, a wide variety of kick-off activities was staged. Sermons were preached on the subject of T.R.'s exemplary life. A commemorative stamp was issued. President Eisenhower issued a proclamation stressing T.R.'s awareness that the privilege of freedom carries with it responsibilities which cannot safely be avoided.

The Department of Defense produced a 28-minute film depicting highlights in T.R.'s life. It was viewed widely on network and local TV and by the Armed Forces, schools, and other organizations. The Department of the Interior, in commemoration of T.R.'s pioneer efforts to conserve wildlife and natural resources, held a Hemispheric Conference of conservation authorities. Because T.R. had been Assistant Secretary of the Navy, that branch served a commemorative birthday cake to a group of Police Athletic League children visiting the U.S.S. *Valcour* and made special awards in his name. Theodore Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medals were presented to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover with appropriate ceremonies and accompanying publicity.

The 129 mutual savings banks of New York State used coin banks, circulars, window and lobby displays, and essay contests to tell the T.R. story. Comic book publishers incorporated material on T.R. in their funnies. Teachers College of Columbia University prepared a 40-page handbook to help school teachers to develop centennial activities, and the presidents of more than 100 universities gave support to the program. (The T.R. Association has already awarded 1,000 certificates to schools for the excellence of essay programs and contests.)

Sinclair Oil Corp. included in its conservation series of ads (Public Relations News, March 11, 1957), a color photo of Theodore Roosevelt Memorial National Park (in North Dakota). There were special programs on the radio and TV networks pointing out that the principles laid down by T.R. are just as applicable to today's problems as they were to those of his time, and there were colorful interviews with surviving members of T.R.'s Rough Riders. The USIA told the T.R. story through its overseas posts. Displays were set up by the Treasury Department, the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration, and in libraries (the latter activity being stimulated by a committee headed by L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress). The Financial Public Relations Association and other influential groups distributed centennial material to members.

Media coverage was superb throughout the 12 months of the campaign. Highlights being a 10-page cover story in Time magazine, a full-page Life magazine editorial titled "A Man To Be Thankful For," a 26-page article in National Geographic magazine, and two editorials in the New York Daily News. (One, under the title "Americans To Remember," and accompanied by a cartoon, appeared in a Sunday edition reaching 3½ million readers.)

Stratton, who is continuing as director of the association, happily informs us that T.R. is now clearly recognized by the younger generation as well as oldsters as "America's fourth greatest President, overshadowed only

by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln." And he agrees with Guylay's recommendation that Public Relations executives should keep selling T.R.'s concept of responsible citizenship—a concept which can be extremely helpful in the area of economic education.

Anniston Star Says Washington Post Betrays Its Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, the Anniston (Ala.) Star, an outstanding daily newspaper in our State, ran an editorial which was highly critical of the Washington Post. The editorial referred to the action of the Washington Post in refusing to accept the Putnam letter, which has received considerable publicity and attention the past few weeks, as a paid advertisement. Previously the Washington Post had refused to run this excellent piece of writing as a news item and as a letter to the editor. This was their privilege, although their judgment is questioned and manifests a very appalling and disturbing lack of objectivity on their part. As you know, the Putnam letter, written by Mr. Carleton Putnam of Washington, D.C., stated in a very forthright manner the South's position on the segregation-integration controversy.

The refusal of the Washington Post to run the letter even as a paid advertisement has been the object of criticism by editors and other thinking people all over the country. In view of the importance of this matter and the threat which it presents to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression by the American people, I am happy to insert herewith a copy of the editorial from the Anniston Star. I urge that the Members give it their careful study and attention. There is far more involved in this instance than any citizen's particular views on segregation.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has agreed to run the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement and the advertisement will appear in this evening's Star (January 26, 1959).

The editorial follows:

POST BETRAYS ITS CREED

Possibly never before in recent history have honest newspaper editors been so disappointed in a member of their profession as they have had occasion to be more than once in the last few years with the Washington Post, which had been looked upon as the exemplar of freedom of expression and the right of the people to know.

But for some strange and inexplicable reason, that great morning daily has seemed to lean backward in its efforts to keep its subscribers in other regions from knowing all the facts about the battle of civil rights, which has become one of the foremost issues before the American people in every State of the Union.

It is well known that there has been a considerable increase in crime since the great Negro migration to the Capital City began. But the Post, as do some other newspapers in the North, refuses to identify Negro criminals by race. Thus they deny criminologists, ethnologists, etc., the right of access to essential information.

But its most unpardonable deviation from honest journalism came to light just a few days ago when the Post refused to print even as a paid advertisement a letter that has been written to the President of the United States by an eminent author, scholar and airline executive of the city in which the Post is published, Carleton Putnam.

The letter in question was never answered, so far as we know, by Mr. Eisenhower, although it is written in even tenor and is by no means offensive. It was published voluntarily by the Christian Science Monitor and as an advertisement in the New York Times, which also censors its news columns against Negro crimes.

But possibly because it sets forth an argument against integration of the white and colored races so convincingly that its truth and logic cannot be refuted, it was rejected summarily by the Post, although its sponsors was one of the most eminent citizens of Alabama, a leading Birmingham corporation lawyer and fore State senator.

And what makes the strange conduct of the Washington Post so deplorable in newspaper circles is the fact that members of its editorial staff have led the fight against censorship in the National's Capital. J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the post, has ably headed the committee on freedom of information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

But we hope that the editorial staff of the Washington morning daily had no voice in the denial of the subscribers of that honored paper the right to know the other side of the so-called civil rights battle. But be that as it may, the Post has betrayed the ethics of its profession, and that is something to be deplored.

The Late Thomas S. Gordon: Truly a Fine Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, through no fault of my own, I was unable to be on the floor last Thursday when several Members of this body paid tribute to the late Hon. Thomas S. Gordon, my friend and former colleague from our home State of Illinois. I would be remiss to my own deep sentiments if I did not take this moment to express my condolences and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks accordingly at this point in the RECORD.

From each friendship we cultivate in our many associations as Members of this Congress, we take something that we value as part of our own personal lives.

My colleagues paid fitting tribute to the late Thomas S. Gordon following his death last Thursday. What was said by those who knew him best is a fine and deserved memorial. I shall add only that in my 2 years' association with him,

I enjoyed the friendship of one who was a real gentleman by any definition of the word. Our society would benefit with many more men of his character and general mannerisms. Our world would be better for more of Tom Gordon's kind of understanding and attitude toward his fellow man.

He will be sorely missed, though his family should find rich solace in the human and material contributions which he made to so many during his lifetime.

A National Recreation Area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Resolution No. 19 adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as proposed by the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and to declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers national streams and to provide for the acquisition of the necessary land without exercising the power of eminent domain:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 19

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as proposed by the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and to declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers national streams and to provide for the acquisition of the necessary land without exercising the power of eminent domain.

Whereas there exists, in the valleys of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri, five springs of the first magnitude and many hundreds of smaller springs which provide a constant supply of clear, cold, sparkling water for these rivers; and

Whereas the phenomenon of such large volumes of clear, cold water issuing as springs amid rustic and picturesque surroundings, make places of wonder and rare natural beauty, which offer a lure and inspiration to those who come to view these extraordinary manifestations of nature, and to play, rest, and to refresh themselves in a peaceful and inspiring environment; and

Whereas these springs make a valuable contribution to fish-life in these streams by providing favorable sites for fish hatcheries, and by discharging large quantities of crystal clear water, they become the controlling factor favorable to the propagation and maintenance of game fish and other aquatic life natural to both streams; and

Whereas the State of Missouri and the U.S. Forest Service own vast acreage adjacent to these streams suitable for recreational development and other improvements for the public use; and

Whereas the Current and Eleven Point Rivers are nationally famous for their "John Boat" float fishing trips through this Ozark scenic wonderland; and

Whereas the Arkansas-White-Red Basins, interagency committee, recognizing the unique natural qualities of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and their

importance to present and future generations, recommended that appropriate State and Federal agencies prepare a plan to preserve and enhance the natural qualities of this region; and

Whereas a plan was prepared by the National Park Service in cooperation with Missouri State agencies, and was published by the Division of Resources and Development, to preserve and develop the Current and Eleven Point River country, without the exercise of the power of eminent domain; and

Whereas the U.S. Forest Service has indicated a similar interest in the preservation and development of lands adjacent to these streams by recommending the creation of a National Forest Recreation Area in a National Recreation Plan prepared and adopted in 1936: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Missouri House of Representatives, in its 70th General Assembly, request of the Congress of the United States, that it establish a National Recreation Area along the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and that it declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as national streams; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly request that the Congress enact the necessary legislation providing for the purchase and development of the National Recreation Area as heretofore described, lest the great scenic and recreational values of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri, be lost forever to public use by manmade encroachments; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Missouri Members of the House and Senate.

National YMCA Week, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the fact that the week just past was National YMCA Week.

During last week, millions of Americans affiliated with nearly 2,000 Young Men's Christian Associations across the country celebrated one more year of fine service to our youngsters, teen-agers, young men, and to our family groups also.

Since 1844, the YMCA has been a pioneer in the cause of brotherhood and development of our youth—the spirit and mind of youth as well as physical well-being. The Y has become also a unique and vital part of virtually every American community.

The YMCA has served our fighting men during every war since the Civil War. It has contributed mightily to health and physical fitness programs and has contributed much to American sports and athletics, creating such games as basketball and volleyball.

The Y has also sponsored organized camping, water-safety instruction, youth and government programs, and boys' work.

The YMCA has also pioneered in night-school education, short-term community finance campaigns, and many other advances.

I am certain that all of us will join in a sincere "well done" to this excellent and growing organization and, we might also add, "Please keep up the good work."

IMCO Cool to Panama and Liberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, a U.N. organization, refused to recognize Liberia and Panama as major shipping nations. The American Merchant Marine feels particularly bitter about this due to the fact that our foreign-aid program subsidizes, to a great extent, many major projects in those nations which opposed us. The story is ably reported by William J. Humphreys in the New York Herald Tribune Bureau: IMCO COOL TO PANAMA AND LIBERIA—NEITHER SEATED ON SECURITY UNIT

(By William J. Humphreys)

LONDON, January 15.—Overriding objections from the United States and Latin American countries, the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), an affiliate of the United Nations, refused today to recognize Liberia and Panama as leading shipping powers.

But Liberia, again with United States support, wants to test the legality of the decision, in which Britain was a spearhead, by referring it to the International Court of Justice. An important ballot on whether an appeal should be made to the court in The Hague is expected to be taken tomorrow.

Today's decision against Liberia and Panama in 28-nation IMCO was regarded as an important manifestation of growing resistance in Britain and elsewhere in Europe to the liberal ship registration laws of Liberia and Panama. These laws have attracted vast numbers of vessels to the Liberian and Panamanian flags.

On this account, the failure of Liberia and Panama to be elected to the IMCO's Maritime Safety Committee—today's issue—appeared to have implications ranging far beyond the scope and importance of the technical work that will be done by the committee.

IMCO turned its back on the flag-tonnage listings of the authoritative Lloyd's registry in denying that Liberia and Panama belonged among the world's eight largest ship-owning nations. To preserve Germany with a large number of its NATO allies on this matter, the United States had urged a decision be postponed until 1961.

The eight nations elected from a list prepared by the conference secretariat rather than chosen from Lloyd's Registry listing, were the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, Japan, Italy, the Netherlands, France, and West Germany.

Later six others were chosen from a list of nominees: Argentina, Canada, Greece, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, and the United Arab Republic.

Although nominated in this second group, Panama refused to be a candidate. Nation-

alist China and Israel, both nominated by the United States, received only 9 and 7 votes, respectively, when the minimum number required for election under the preferential system of voting was 15.

SHIPPING MEN HERE INDIGNANT

American shipping men indignantly described the defeat suffered by this Nation's delegation to IMCO as "another foreign attempt to scuttle the American merchant marine." They noted that Britain, Norway and other European nations that ganged up on the United States, Liberia and Panama are the same nations whose ship owners oppose the American subsidy program and the Cargo Preference Act which requires that at least 50 percent of all government financed relief cargoes be sent abroad in American flag ships.

"They would deny us subsidies, our share of aid cargoes and now our right to sail our ships under flags of necessity," one said. "Perhaps we should begin some denials of our own."

He suggested that one might properly take the forming of barring foreign aid cargoes to the ships of any nation which allows its merchant vessels to trade where American ships are not allowed to sail. This was obviously a reference to the fact that Britain and Norway permit their ships to trade with Red China.

Tom Kitayama—Union City Councilman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rapidly growing areas in California is southern Alameda County. In the last 5 years three areas have been incorporated into new cities. The last came into being early this month when the people of the Alvarado-Decoto district decided to incorporate into Union City.

Under California State law this can only be done by referendum. The proposition to incorporate Union City carried better than 4 to 1.

At the same election 15 citizens of the area submitted their qualifications to the voters by seeking 5 nonpartisan city council seats. The man who topped the ticket was Tom Kitayama, a 35-year-old prominent nurseryman.

Councilman Kitayama is probably the first northern California Nisei to seek an elective post as city councilman. His election is indicative of the respect with which Californians hold their fellow countrymen of Japanese ancestry.

Kitayama's younger brother, Kee, is the newly elected president of Eden Township Japanese-American Citizens League. Another brother, Ray, is a past president of the Freemont JACL.

The Kitayama brothers operate one of the largest carnation nurseries in the country. Tom is president and coowner of the firm and also director on both the northern California Carnation Growers Association and the American Carnation Society.

Tom is married to the former Hideko Horikawa, both Seattle-born Nisei, and they have four children.

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years the administration in Washington has been paying lip service to a liberal foreign trade policy.

Unfortunately, being all things to all men sooner or later comes home to haunt us. Last year I pointed out that many of the difficulties existing between our country and our nearest neighbors—Canada, Mexico, and the republics to the south of us—were the result of our vacillating trade policies.

The hostility generated against Vice President Nixon, in my opinion, could never have come about had it not been for many of our own stupid mistakes about trade matters with our friends in Latin America.

Now comes another episode involving a bid on a project in Arkansas. Despite the fact that the OCDM had ruled on several occasions that this type of machinery had no particular national defense implications, our Government has now decided to spend a quarter of a million dollars that it would not have to spend in order to give a contract to a bidder who was almost 20 percent higher than an English bidder.

This comes at a time when administration officials are pointing with alarm toward inflation and asserting the need for a balanced budget. It also comes at a time when responsible administration officials are saying each day that the free world must prepare itself for the continuing Soviet economic and trade offensive.

It is no wonder such such policies, or shall I say lack of policies, cause consternation among our friends.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on January 24, 1959, and also a reprint of a news story in the New York Times for January 25, 1959. I hope that Congress will soon have a full look at these developments.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1959]

DOUBLE STANDARD

A strong odor of fish emanates from the denial of a turbine contract to the English Electric Co. on national security grounds. English Electric's bid on machinery for the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas was 19 percent below that of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., which received the award. No matter how elaborately the rejection of the low bid is disguised, it still smells.

What smells the most is the prostitution of the country's trade policy for political reasons. On the eve of the election last fall, Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, announced that the White House had assured him that the contract would go to Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, which has a plant in Eddystone just outside Philadelphia. This was confirmed the other day when the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Leo A. Hoegh, announced that national security interests outweighed other considerations.

Under the Buy American Act, a governmental contract must be awarded to a foreign firm when its bid is more than 6 percent below the lowest domestic bid, except when domestic producers are in a situation of serious unemployment. In that circumstance, a domestic bid up to 12 percent higher than a foreign bid may be accepted. Clearly the English Electric bid qualified under either criterion.

That is what makes particularly interesting the finding of Mr. Hoegh—that unless Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton received the contract certain domestic production capacity would be irretrievably lost. Inasmuch as the machine tools involved—"elephant" tools, they are called—cost in the neighborhood of \$1 million each, it is hardly conceivable that they would be junked.

The incident arose at a time when the electrical manufacturing industry generally was pressing OEDM for a ban on turbine and generator imports for national security reasons. This request in itself was curious, for the market for heavy domestic electrical equipment has been extraordinarily stable, and the backlog of orders has expanded. The case of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton was taken out of context, however, before an interdepartmental committee has passed upon the larger issue.

Now, unquestionably Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton has been hard hit by the recession. The company has received only a very limited amount of defense business. Senator Scott cannot be blamed for wanting to help his State. But if it was desirable to throw a crumb to this employer, as a practical matter this could have been done through a negotiated defense contract without disrupting the country's good relations with Britain.

Philosophically the worst part of the situation is that it makes a sham of American trade policy and belies the Administration's word. English Electric went through the same disappointing procedure several years ago over its bid on the Chief Joseph Dam. The same excuses have been found on bicycles and other goods. In this instance the company was put to the expense of justifying its case for several months after the political decision had been made.

The time has long since passed when it was realistic to expect this administration to stand up for principle in this area. But in deference to the country's reputation for fair play at least it might end the double standard. If the intention is to wriggle out of foreign trade commitments in the face of political pressures, it would be far less damaging and more honest to say so frankly in advance.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]
HOUSE MAY STUDY CURBS ON IMPORTS—TRADE PANEL PLANS INQUIRY AFTER LOW BRITISH BIDDER LOSES TURBINE CONTRACT

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The House Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy may soon investigate the whole question of curbing imports on national grounds. The group will pay particular attention to this week's award of a turbine contract to a Philadelphia company despite a lower British bid.

Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, and chairman of the subcommittee, will propose an inquiry when the group is formally established in the new Congress.

Congress asked the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization last year to report by February 1 on its experience with the national security clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

That clause—inserted in the law 5 years ago in place of a proposed protectionist amendment on oil imports—authorizes the President to apply restrictions whenever he finds that the importation of an item is a threat to national security.

NATIONAL SECURITY INVOKED

The national security issue was raised this week by the Army Corps of Engineers selection of the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Co. of Philadelphia, to make two turbines for the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas.

In competitive bidding last summer, Baldwin offered to do the job for \$1,757,210. The English Electric Co., which has fought this issue before, bid \$1,450,700 but failed to get the contract on national security grounds. The Mobilization Office found that if Baldwin did not get the contract it could mean the loss of heavy machine tools and labor skills needed in a war emergency.

The finding was made under the Buy American Act, but the national security issue here is closely related to the issue in the trade law. Under the Buy American Act, the low English electric bid had to be rejected for being less than a certain amount lower than Baldwin's or the mobilization office found national security threatened.

Because Baldwin was in an area of high unemployment, the English electric had to bid at least 12 percent less than Baldwin. It bid 17 percent less, thus ruling out the unemployment issue.

"It looks to me as if it's some political thing to ball out some industry that's in trouble," Mr. Boggs said. Referring to Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, he said, "If Mr. SCOTT wants to testify we'll be glad to hear him."

On October 31, Senator SCOTT—then a Representative campaigning for the Senate—announced in Pittsburgh that he had information from the White House that Baldwin would get the contract. That was 6 weeks before the case was even referred to the mobilization office for a national security ruling, and almost 3 months before the ruling was made.

AGENCY DELAYED RULING

The agency tried to delay its Greer's Ferry ruling until it had decided a broader case it is pondering under the national security clause. In that case this country's electrical equipment industry is seeking restrictions on imports on a variety of items, including turbines.

After delays in the broader case dragged on—it was initiated last February—the agency felt forced to act on Greer's Ferry. The Agency insists that the Greer's Ferry opinion cannot be interpreted as an indication of how the broader case will turn out.

The essence of all national security cases, under either the reciprocal trade law or the Buy American Act, is whether a domestic industry that is deemed vital will wither or die if it does not get some business that is going to foreign suppliers.

The Eisenhower administration has consistently held that the non-Communist world's strength depend in part on liberalization of trade.

Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentlemen from Illinois and my other colleagues who have paid tribute to our beloved former colleague, Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois.

Our friend, Tom Gordon, was a man of great ability. He was sincere and

forthright. His integrity was such that his word was his bond. We admired him for these sterling qualities, but more than that we loved Tom Gordon because of his great capacity and friendship.

Tom Gordon was a success. He was a success because he was a man of solid integrity. He was a success, because he was willing to give unselfishly of his fine talents to help make a better world.

His life was one of inspiration and encouragement, for it was in the fine American tradition. He was a poor boy who achieved much and gained honor for what he did, through hard work and a constant reaching out for more knowledge and a lifelong striving to find ways to serve those less favored than he was in abilities and personal assets.

During his recent illness my prayers for the restoration of his health and strength were with him, but God, in His infinite wisdom has ruled otherwise, and now I join with my colleagues in a fervent prayer for the restful repose of his beautiful soul.

Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gordon and the children in the loss of their loved one.

Resolution 9, Senate of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to House Resolution 53, which would abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and transfer jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives was established some 20 years ago to expose and halt the infiltration of subversive elements in our country; and

Whereas, because of its great work in ferreting out the enemies of our American way of life, this great committee was given a permanent status by the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has worked closely with J. Edgar Hoover and all National and State agencies in fighting communism and other un-American activities; and

Whereas the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, was the author of the legislation that set up this great committee, was its first chairman and worked untiringly and unceasingly for over 20 years to expose and stop each and any form of un-American activity; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee through Martin Dies, its members and staff, has rendered permanent and invaluable services to our Nation; and

Whereas there has been introduced in this session of Congress, House Resolution 53 to abolish this great House Committee on Un-American Activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That the senate voice its opposition to House Resolution 53, and urge each Member of the U.S. Congress from Texas to oppose its passage; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Speaker SAM RAYBURN and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Texas.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on January 19, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Letter to Washington Publisher Criticizes Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a carbon copy of a letter which Mr. William F. Monogan, Sr., of 15-C Council Street, Charleston, S.C., addressed to Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, on January 23, 1959. Mr. Monogan, in his well-phrased letter, criticizes Mr. Graham and the editors of the Washington Post for their action in refusing to run the Putnam letter, which has received much publicity of late, as a paid advertisement in their newspaper. As you know, the letter, written by Mr. Carleton Putnam, of Washington, D.C., a prominent businessman of this city and presently a member of the board of directors of the Delta Air Lines, states the case for the South on segregation. The Washington Post, a few weeks ago, refused to run the letter as a news item or in the letters to the editor column.

This was their privilege, of course, but their action indicated an appalling and disturbing lack of objectivity on their part. However, a few days ago they refused to accept the letter as a paid advertisement and it was this development which caused Mr. Monogan to write Mr. Graham.

Because of the importance of this matter and the threat which the refusal of the Post to run the letter even as a paid advertisement presents to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression it is a privilege for me to insert Mr. Monogan's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith. I urge that every Member of Congress give it his careful study.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has stated that they will be pleased to run the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement and the letter is scheduled to appear in that paper this evening, January 26, 1959.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

PHILIP L. GRAHAM,
Publisher, Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: This letter is by way of an endorsement of the statements of the

Honorable GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr., U.S. Representative from Alabama, regarding the failure of the Washington Post to print the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

Regardless of your personal views or that of your editors, you could and should have given this letter space on a paid basis. You had the right to state in an editorial that the views as expressed by Mr. Putnam were not those views held by the paper you publish, and you could even have ignored the letter in your news items as not being newsworthy, but as long as an advertisement is not immoral or indecent you should have accorded it full respect as a business item, fully and honestly paid for. It will be a pretty pass in this world when men such as you can ignore your readers and the business public.

Just to set the record straight so that you will not think I am a dyed-in-the-wool southern rebel, completely blind and prejudiced to all the rights of the Negro, may I say that I was born in Massachusetts, the seat of the abolitionist movement, and cut my eye teeth on many false tales about the southern brutality toward the Negro. Now being past 65 years of age and having lived in the South since I was 25 years of age, I have found that the Negro is treated much better here than he is in the North. Until your NAACP became so active we had very friendly relations with our local Negroes. I had many of them I could call friend. Can you say that? Also, do you personally have Negro neighbors or are you doing as you do merely to court business for your paper?

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. MONOGAN, Sr.

Shining On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "Shining On," written by Capt. P. A. Horton, a resident of the 24th Congressional District of California, which I represent.

I know Captain Horton to be a sincere patriot and a true American, and feel the article he has written will be of interest to the Congress.

The article follows:

SHINING ON

(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

One of our national heroes who seemed to best represent the common man of America was Abraham Lincoln. His birth in a hand-hewn log house; his modest and frugal childhood; his guidance from a kind and understanding mother and his own determination to educate himself were character moulding factors that have always appealed to the American people. His life, more than any other American has given hope and inspiration to the youth of our land. That, regardless of social or economic station in life Americans all have equal opportunities to reach the highest position of trust in our land.

During Lincoln's day our people held a deep respect, loyalty, and gratitude for Washington and the knowledge that he was more responsible than any other person for the winning of our freedom, for the adoption of our Constitution and for the building of the first Nation on earth dedicated to the religious and political freedom of mankind.

Lincoln's reverence and respect for Washington are revealed in his statement, "To add brightness to the sun, or glory to the name of Washington, are alike impossible. Let none attempt it, and in its ageless, deathless splendor leave it, shining on."

The Nation was at that time less than a century old. Many were still alive whose fathers had been companions of Washington. Our people were proud, very proud of the accomplishment of both of these two noble Americans. Loyalty, integrity, patriotism, and faith were the guiding words, spirit and conduct of Americans. The most odious word in the English language was treason.

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Following World War I, the world was aflame with the hatreds built up by centuries of turmoil, strife, plottings, trickery, and ambitions of European politicians. New tyrants had arisen in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Each of these tyrants were determined to conquer the world or destroy it. Propaganda or brain-washing became an advanced art.

The old Grecian method of appeasing the masses was used under the banner of socialism and the false promises of equality, position and goods. Hitler called his socialism, Nazism; Mussolini called his socialism, Fascism; Stalin called his socialism communism. While the approach differed slightly, the objective was the same in every instance, to enforce conformity under the iron rule of dictatorship under the penalty of death or even worse.

Serene in our belief it could not happen here, our people were aroused by diligent members of patriotic societies and particularly the American Legion. One piece of evidence after another was furnished by patriots who found plottings, schemings, and propaganda of the agents of these foreign groups. Most of this material was received with a shrug. Veterans, patriots, Americans were crucified for daring to suggest that there were those among us that worked for our downfall. Treason is an ugly word.

Patriotic members of the American Legion and other groups realized that unless we could soon obtain an official Government body with its cloak of authority to investigate and expose these traitors in our midst it would soon be too late to save our beloved America.

The national Americanism commissioner, Homer Chaillaux, and the united efforts of the members of the Legion in every State in the Union, and including the writer in the State of California, pleaded with our Congress individually and collectively until we had at last obtained the appointment of a committee in Congress, known as the Un-American Activities Committee. Enemies of this committee have attempted to destroy it ever since its organization. But year after year patriots have risen to its defense.

History will write of the noble work it has done and how it has exposed the traitors in our midst. How it has exposed the machinations of the Remingtons, the Harry Dexter Whites, the Alger Hiss's, and those thousands of men and women of foreign ideals who have come to our shores determined to destroy all that those two noble men, Washington and Lincoln, had worked so diligently to obtain.

The need of this committee is greater now than any other time in our Nation's history. It is stated that the Civil Liberties Union and other organizations whose loyalty to our country has long been submerged by their sympathy for Communist causes intended to file a petition of 2 million names demanding a discontinuance of the Un-American Activities Committee.

We must all ask ourselves, are we less loyal than our fathers; is conformity and slavery a good substitute for liberty? Do we lack the energy to defend our country or protect it from the fanatics that would destroy it?

Our Congress is now in session; how deeply are you interested in your country's future? Write to your Congressmen. Write to your Senators and express your views on this matter.

When the shades of night have fallen and you are nestled in the bosom of your family secure in the rights guaranteed you under our Constitution, take time to pray to God that we may continue the America of Washington and Lincoln and that the light of liberty be kept shining on.

Fidel Castro and the New Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, whether Cuba's new climate of freedom lasts depends largely on Fidel Castro. Castro defends the necessity and fairness of the military trials of accused war criminals. Many important voices have been raised in the United States to protest the trials as drumhead court-martials and the executions as a blood bath. These procedures are far from ideal, but how significant are these shortcomings?

Many who loathed Batista are sickened by the thought that Fidel Castro, perhaps in spite of himself, may end up just another Latin American strong man ruling for an interval by terror and tribute. This is by no means impossible.

Because I had long admired Castro as a brave fighter against Batista and because I want to do whatever I can, however little, to help the new Cuba to be democratic, I accepted an invitation from Fidel Castro and the Cuban News Reporters Association last week to visit Havana. My distinguished colleague, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was also visiting Cuba at this time and will make his own report to the House of Representatives. His deep interest in the Caribbean area is well known.

I was there Wednesday and Thursday. I attended the mammoth rally. I spoke with Fidel Castro, with President Urrutia, whom I had previously known and respected as a determined and democratic anti-Batista man, with cabinet ministers whose merits I had read about in a State Department dossier I read on my way down to Habana; with our top embassy officials; with 26th of July leaders, with seasoned Latin American newspaper reporters, and with ordinary Cubans both rich and poor.

Of course it is conceded that some people feel they can fly through the stratosphere over any country and immediately become qualified as experts in all aspects of the country's political, economic, and social affairs. I confess that my 2 days on Cuban soil, though very busy days, may not have qualified me fully to advise Castro, our State Department, and United States citizens generally on this delicate, crucial period in Cuban history.

Whatever my credentials, here is my report:

It has been my good fortune to visit Colombia, Venezuela, Honduras, and now Cuba within the past 2 years in each instance after the ousting of a dictator. My interest in hemispheric affairs no doubt exceeds my information. I am still learning and there still are several countries in this hemisphere for me to visit.

WARM ABRASO, OR FORMAL HANDSHAKE?

If Castro's Cuba is in fact an emerging democracy, then the newly adopted policy of our Government requires our rendering a warm abrazo. If this is not true, then a cool, formal handshake only should be proffered in our relationships. This follows Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent proposals which the President has endorsed.

My good friend and respected mentor, the senior Senator from my State, is deeply respected in Cuba as elsewhere in the world for his unflinching and aggressive liberalism. Senator WAYNE MORSE has referred to the executions in Cuba as a "blood bath" and has stated that "the Castro regime shot many Batista people without a semblance of a fair trial," although he adds, "I haven't any doubt that a fair trial would have found them guilty."

Senator MORSE is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He has always been an outspoken foe of dictators.

Another friend whose qualifications and motives are above question is John O'Rourke, distinguished editor of the Washington Daily News and immediate past president of the Inter-American Press Association. On January 23, 1959, he editorialized in his paper as follows:

Few will deny that Batista was an evil man—and good riddance. But Fidel Castro's determination to proceed with "rebel justice"—drumhead trials, mob juries, and arbitrary executions—cannot avoid stirring second thoughts among those who hoped the revolution signaled the end of tyranny.

Here also is a friendly voice which cannot be ignored.

Another hardworking and sincere friend of Latin America, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has urged his colleagues and the public to reserve judgment on the Cuban revolution until events more clearly show what has happened there. He believes it is too early to tell whether the revolution was a victory for freedom or simply a change in dictatorships.

WIDE EDITORIAL CRITICISM

Editorial comment in Oregon and throughout the Nation has been adversely critical for the most part. An article by S. L. A. Marshall, January 21, 1959, on the editorial page of the New York Herald-Tribune refers to "Cuba's new strong man harvesting vengeance in the name of the revolution" and to "swift, farcical trials and firing squads working as callously as if they were slaughtering bees."

The Louisville Courier-Journal recently made an editorial comment that "the demand for vengeance is still short-circuiting the orderly processes of democratic justice."

My own hometown newspaper, the Eugene Register-Guard, approved Sen-

ator MORSE's words "blood bath" as accurate and states that the world wishes Castro well but that "he cannot keep the favor of decent people around the globe if he sanctions the same terrorist tactics that the world deplored in the deposed dictator, Batista."

What about these charges?

Are they true?

Are Fidel Castro and the new Cuba fast returning to the same old "strong man" situation?

No, I do not believe that there has been any blood bath in Cuba nor do I believe that Castro and his 26th of July movement are denying fair trial to accused war criminals, although I believe their procedures should be much improved.

My opinion is based on 2 years of observing the Cuban situation.

What is a blood bath?

I would say it was irresponsible, indiscriminate killing of persons. As for drumhead trials or lack of elementary due process, I suppose that means the accused not knowing exactly the charges against him, not being confronted with the witnesses against him, and not having a proper opportunity to defend himself.

Persons critical of the trials and executions are not, in my judgment, fully informed, often through no fault of their own. They do not realize the magnitude and high morality of the revolution.

Before Batista's frantic flight to Trujillo's haven for defeated dictators, I had met many Cuban revolutionaries in the United States and elsewhere in the hemisphere. Manuel Urrutia, the provisional President, Ernesto Betancourt, the Washington representative of the movement, Tony Varona, former president of the Cuban Senate, Dr. and Mrs. Santos Buch, and many others were well known to me.

NOT A RABBLE IN ARMS

These revolutionaries were devout, not fanatic; humble, not arrogant; angry, but not bloodthirsty. Last week I met many who served in the ranks. My impressions square with those of impartial observers who lived with them in the mountains. The Castro men are restrained, disciplined, and dedicated to their task. They are not a rabble in arms.

The rebels tortured no one. They shot no prisoners. Even after victory there is no report of looting or violence by them. There is a crusade for an honest and terror-free Cuba, not a conquest drive for wealth and power. Priests and protestant ministers were attached to the rebel forces. Batista's army had no chaplains at all.

In short, and I invite you to ask anyone who knows Castro and his men, the 26th of July movement is not made up of men who would indulge in or allow irresponsible, indiscriminate killing or, if you will, a blood bath.

Since Castro took over in Cuba there has been respect for civil liberties. The press has been entirely free. Many journalists have roamed all over the island with notebook, taperecorder, and movie camera. Whatever else the revolution may or may not be, it is newsworthy.

I have followed these reports closely and I have yet to see a specific allegation

that even one accused war criminal was denied elementary due process or that a particular one of them was unjustifiably executed. I asked veteran newspapermen in Habana if they knew of any such instance. They did not. They were convinced that the men executed deserved conviction and that they had had a fair opportunity to defend themselves at their trials.

During Batista's years of terror there was censorship. "Official" acts of cruelty and murder were kept out of print. Huge sums of money were spent by the Government to bribe both publishers and reporters. It is no wonder that many persons in the United States thought Castro's insistence on the continuance of these trials harsh and ominous.

"There is hardly a family which has not felt the brutality of the Batista police," a Life correspondent reported—Life, January 26, 1959. Time magazine for the same date reports:

Many of the Batista cops who faced the firing squads last week were proved killers whose twisted minds drew pleasure from pain. To extract secrets from captured rebels, they yanked out fingernails, carbonized hands and feet in red-hot vices. Castigation was a major police weapon.

Bodles were left in sun-speckled streets as police warnings. One Santiago cop of the Batista regime, trying to break down a rebel woman, brought one of her brother's eyeballs on a platter to her cell. Other rebels were forced to watch their wives raped by cops. A U.S. resident of Santiago, who chanced upon Police Chief Rafael Salas Canizares shooting 4 young rebels dead in the street, reported:

"He was in a state of maniacal ecstasy—face flushed, eyes bright, breathing hard."

CASES CAREFULLY PREPARED

The cases against the accused war criminals were not hastily concocted on the say-so of some hysterical woman who might or might not be telling the truth. The movement had many spies. Almost every Cuban was against Batista.

Vehicle movements of Batista men were carefully checked. Pictures were taken. Batista's policy was to allow pictures of torture victims to become available widely. He wanted to terrorize the rebels and their friends.

Dossiers were prepared by the rebels. Many of Batista's murderers and torturers escaped when the Government fell. Those who did not are being tried by military courts under war criminal laws similar to those the Allies employed in Germany after World War II.

"If I allow just one man to be killed unjustly, I destroy my whole movement," Castro told me very seriously when I first talked with him. We were jammed together with his chiefs and with journalists from all over the hemisphere on the speakers' platform at the rally last Wednesday.

This was the rally where he asked those who supported the continuance of the trials to raise their hands. Of course I deplore such tactics and others he has used. Let me make it clear, however, that I believe in the good faith of Fidel Castro and the new Cuban Government. These men are not vengefully killing people, nor are they harvesting vengeance or giving swift, farcical trials, or

allowing firing squads to work callously as if they were slaughtering bees.

If wanton murder and inhuman torture are capital crimes, and they are in the rebel war criminal code, those executed deserved to die and were permitted to do so far less painfully than their victims.

We fought a war to make the world safe for democracy but the fact is that a Democrat in Latin America in the past several decades has lived a precarious life and often died a painful death. The recent overthrow of a number of dictators gives reason to hope that the hemisphere may become unsafe for tyrants and their menials.

CASTRO, NOT THE MOB, RULES

At his gigantic press conference last Wednesday, which included almost 400 newsmen and lasted 5 hours, Castro said that a public opinion poll showed that 93 percent of the Cubans wanted all the imprisoned accused war criminals executed. "But they will receive fair trials," he said. "I am not so radical as the people."

Senator MORSE's suggestion to Castro that he invite a United Nations observation team to Cuba to investigate the war crimes procedures is of course a good one. I strongly recommended its careful consideration when I spoke with the highest officials in the new government and with Castro. A committee from the Organization of American States or from the Inter-American Bar Association could serve the same purpose.

I personally do not need convincing as to the motives of Castro and the new government, but an outside group of ability and prestige could do much to reassure many Cubans and their apprehensive friends elsewhere. A minister of the new government assured me that these suggestions were being explored and considered.

When I sat next to Fidel Castro at dinner last Thursday evening I told him that I thought it was wrong to hold war crimes trials in the Sports Palace and to allow unrestrained press, radio, and TV coverage. A man's trial for his life, I said, should not be made a spectacle. The first—and I hope last—such trial was barely 2 hours old when I said this.

TOO LITTLE AND TOO MUCH

As I spoke I felt the irony of my words because a few days earlier I had been urging the new Cuban Government to invite newsmen and various opinion leaders to observe for themselves the war-crimes procedures. I cabled President Urrutia that the new Cuba had nothing to hide. Castro had a right to feel baffled about an outside world that apparently did not know its own mind.

I pointed out the middle way: A small courtroom, spectators and journalists limited in numbers; dignity yet no hint of star-chamber proceedings.

I predicted the outcry that did in fact ensue. The following day he radioed from Caracas to stop the trials in the Sports Palace and take away the TV and radio coverage.

I shall refrain from claiming credit for this move. Many others no doubt were saying the same thing to him. It does

demonstrate, however, his ability to learn and his wish to do what is right.

Castro is not infallible. He is 32 years old and without broad experience. He makes mistakes. I think he is entitled to a few mistakes considering his accomplishments and his great responsibilities.

Operation Truth brought almost 400 newsmen from every country in the Hemisphere except the Dominican Republic. They came at the expense of the new Cuban Government and were in addition to the journalists already there. They rightly criticized the circus quality of the trial in the Sports Palace but they also agreed that the legal procedures used were fair.

"Better understanding abroad of the provisional government's aims was foreseen as a result of the public trials," said an Associated Press story, January 24, 1959, in the Washington Evening Star. Better understanding can come without boisterous public spectators, TV and radio coverage. Press coverage, on a pool basis if need be, is of course essential.

If Castro had been after power and money he could have much of both firmly in his grasp by now. Instead he set up the Provisional Government under President Manuel Urrutia. Neither Urrutia nor his Ministers are men who would act as puppets for Castro or anyone else. The State Department prepared a notebook with their biographies for me to read on my way down to Habana. I was impressed by the fine qualifications of these men.

AMATEURS IN POLITICS

Of course, like Castro himself, many of them are amateurs in politics. They will need help and forbearance until they learn how Cuba can be governed effectively in conditions of honesty and human freedom.

Castro now governs Cuba but the signs are that he will soon turn over his great powers to the new government. He drives himself relentlessly but manages to keep his sense of humor and humility. His remark about 200,000 gringos dying was a flippant sally in answer to a newsman's flippant query as to what would happen if the United States sent the Marines to Cuba. The U.S. press solemnly printed this as a bragging threat and called him a demagogue. He is wryly rueful about the incident, but I think certain reporters have more to answer for than Castro. I am certain that he is not anti-United States at all.

Fidel Castro can mean democracy at long last for Cuba or he can mean disillusionment and another strong man government. His present reign is characterized by confused disorganization but much good will and dedication in preparing for a democratic Cuba. One of his young bodyguards, a U.S. citizen from Brooklyn, told me, "Fidel uses C.S.T. Castro Standard Time—6 hours late."

He needs counsel from experienced Latin American democrats like Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, Costa Rican ex-President Jose (Pepe) Figueres, Colombian President Alberto Lleras Camargo and Venezuelan President-elect Romulo Betancourt.

These men can tell him much he needs to know about relationships with Cuba's immediate neighbors, the United States, and Soviet Russia. Fidel Castro has it within his power to win a place in the history books as a great builder of Latin American democracy as well as a guerrilla leader of a highly popular revolution.

TIME TO SHAVE THE BEARDS

If this is to come about, he will have to seek solitude and to allow the provisional government to rule Cuba and to set the stage for free elections in 18 months. This will be hard to do, but it must be done.

I told him, with my usual tact and omniscience, that he and his followers should now shave or trim their beards and that they should discard their characteristic fatigue uniforms for the regular Cuban military uniforms. Nothing would mark more dramatically the passing of the combat phase to the civilian phase of the fight for a democratic Cuba.

Castro made a mistake in naming his brother Raul as his successor in case of death. Successor to what? This is the move of a strong man, not a man who wants an orderly lawful government to rule in Cuba. Upon reflection I think he will want to remove the mantle of succession from Raul's shoulders—and then destroy the mantle.

His demand that the United States return Cuban war criminals and the money they stole is another indication of his incomplete education in public affairs. It is up to Cuba to indict these men and to invoke reciprocal treaties providing for extradition.

The trials should be slowed down. Cuba is at peace, and civil judges, not military judges, should sit on the bench. More time should be allowed for the preparation of defense cases, although I have yet to hear or read of any protest on these grounds made by an accused war criminal or on his account. I urged these changes in policy in writing before I went to Cuba and personally when I was there to President Urrutia, Castro, and Secretary of Justice Angel Fernandez.

SENATOR MORSE'S FRIENDLY ATTITUDE

I agree entirely with Senator MORSE's statement:

It is not too late. We want to be friends of the new leadership of Cuba. I believe the leaders are democratically motivated. When a wrong develops, steps should be taken to correct the wrong.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, speaking in the other body January 20, 1959, and commending Senator MORSE's stand for better judicial processes in the war criminal trials, said that Senator MORSE "has been principled in his comment and stand and, at the same time, considerate and tolerant."

Senator HUMPHREY continued:

I hope the people of Cuba realize that the remarks which have been made by Members of the Senate, and in particular by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs [Mr. MORSE], were made not in a spirit of hostility, bitterness, or antagonism, but rather in a spirit of understanding, friendship, advice, and kindly admonition. They were made in a sincere effort to maintain whole-

some, respectful, and cordial relationships between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States.

Castro needs rest. He needs time to ruminate, time for contemplation and study, then consultation with others and travels in Cuba and elsewhere. If he does not withdraw, he will inevitably diminish, then destroy, the authority of the new government. This will make the transition period difficult and perhaps impossible.

Many Cubans will protest his withdrawal into the wings at this time. They will cry, with understandable concern, that Cuba needs him. More than Castro, Cuba needs a functioning government, honest and mindful of human freedoms. Castro has no desk, no organization for government, and no time or ability to decide the many and often complex issues brought to him. Most important of all, he has no business trying to do what the provisional government was established to do.

"NOT UNDER MAN"

As a thoughtful lawyer Castro can recall Coke's famous proposition, inscribed in Latin on the pediments of Langdell Hall at Harvard Law School, "Not under man, but under God and the law." This proposition, in addition to being right and just, is the only feasible way to run a government today and to maintain human freedoms.

As I said goodbye to him Wednesday evening he said I had given him things to think about. My bet is that he will find time to think. Cuba's emerging democracy will be realized without still another bloody detour.

What about our Government's policies now?

In my opinion they are excellent, both in theory and practice. Last Wednesday morning in Habana I conferred with the Chargé d'Affaires, First Secretary Dan Braddock, and the top Embassy staff people for about an hour. Our various programs are all set to resume operations, awaiting only necessary organizational moves of the new Cuban Government. Our men there have the right attitude about extending the warm abrazo to this Government of honorable and democracy-minded men.

After two sorry experiences with amateurs, we are now sending a first-rate career Ambassador to Cuba, Philip Wilson Bonsal, a man who, according to the New York Times, January 22, 1959, "does not strive to conceal his strong preference for democratic governments."

In my opinion much credit must be accorded to William Wieland, the State Department's director for Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. He is highly competent and conscientious. Mr. Wieland was a United Press reporter at the time of the dictator Machado in Cuba. He was jailed for his activities against that tyrant. His sympathies are unchanged. However, he dealt honorably and correctly with all Cuban factions, winning the respect of all those who themselves were respectable.

ADDITIONAL AID IS AVAILABLE

We have further aid available for Cuba. All the new government has to do is ask. The request will receive care-

ful and favorable consideration. This is also a bit ironic, for our official governmental policy is far more friendly to the new Cuba than are many vocal opinion leaders and many editorial writers.

Often the reverse has been true.

My explanation is that in this case the Government is better informed as to the character of the men who threw Batista out and as to the nature and extent of the crimes of the accused war criminals and as to the procedures by which these men are being tried.

Fidel Castro and his friends who seek to bring democracy to Cuba need and deserve our sympathy, our forbearance, and support. Our condonation for acts of cruelty is not solicited because, so far as I have read the record made by the free and active press, they are not guilty of any such acts.

Democracy is not won by vanquishing a tyrant. It is won by fostering human freedoms and basing the government on the results of free elections. Democracy is an equilibrium. Once attained, it has to be retained.

Expediency and indifference can destroy democracy. This is why the United States must concern itself with the development of democracies in other lands, and particularly with respect to a close neighbor like Cuba. To the extent we encourage democracy elsewhere we help maintain and strengthen our own standards of human freedom.

Faith without works will fade. The more faith in democracy we export, the more we have.

I hope that many of my colleagues and other fellow citizens will have occasion soon to visit Cuba and to see for themselves what a tremendously significant revolution has taken place.

This, then, is the report of a recent tourist about his 2-day trip to Cuba, a freed and freedom-loving Cuba, a pro-American Cuba, a peaceful and law-abiding Cuba, a Cuba that needs and deserves our help in its historic opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following items: A letter to the editor of the New York Times of January 25, 1959, from my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. BOWLES); an editorial from the Times for January 23; and a column by Drew Pearson as it appeared in the Miami Herald for January 23:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1959]
OUR CUBAN POLICY QUERIED—PRESENT ANTI-AMERICANISM DECLARED RESULT OF OUR SUPPORT OF BATISTA

(The writer of the following letter, formerly Governor of Connecticut, was U.S. Ambassador to India from 1951 to 1953. He is now a Member of Congress.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Millions of Americans have been shocked at the brutal manner in which the new Cuban Government has been disposing of many of its adversaries and the bitterness of its attacks on the United States.

Although our disappointment and resentment are understandable, it is important that we appreciate the extent to which our own policies have helped create the antagonism with which we must now contend.

According to the narrow view of many of our policymakers, any dictator who tells us he is against communism, regardless of how hated or corrupt he may be, deserves American support. This has led us time and again

to place American dollars and American prestige behind reactionary, rightwing governments which ruthlessly exploit their people and which sooner or later are doomed to fail.

SOURCE OF ARMS

For nearly 3 years the now victorious Cuban revolutionaries were hunted like animals through the mountains and jungles by Batista's armed forces. Many of the Government tanks, planes and small arms which brought death to their families were manufactured in American factories, paid for by American taxpayers and shipped to Cuba by the American Government.

Our Government cannot be held responsible for the brutal behavior of the fallen Cuban dictator. But it can and should be held responsible for the damaging effect which some of our policies and personnel have had in producing the anti-American resentments unleashed by the Cuban revolution.

Our last arms shipment was landed in Cuba scarcely 9 months ago. If the victorious leaders of the new government did not now resent the official support and comfort we gave the vanquished Batista, they would be less than human.

Although this experience has cost us heavily, not only in the respect of Cubans but in that of other non-Communist peoples in all parts of the world, there is scant evidence that we have taken it to heart. On the very day that Castro's revolutionary forces were entering Havana through cheering crowds we announced that a Marine Corps training mission would be sent to Haiti to bolster a government that since last summer has been forced by public opposition to rule by decree.

REVOLUTIONARY PRACTICES

All thoughtful observers regret General Castro's drumhead courts, mass shootings, and his demagogic raving about a "gringo" invasion. But our disappointment should not blind us to the implications of our own failure to live up to what the world expects of us.

The truths which our Declaration of Independence held to be self-evident are still providing the inspiration for non-Communist revolutionary leaders who are challenging dictators in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Whether the Cuban revolution succeeds or fails in its effort to provide freedom and dignity for the Cuban people will depend largely on what Castro does with his victory in these first few weeks. But this and much more will also depend on our capacity to remember our own revolutionary origins and to bring our policies into focus in a world of revolutionary change.

CHESTER BOWLES.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1959.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1959]

HABANA AND WASHINGTON

A new and what must be a happier chapter in Cuban-American relations is about to begin. Our Ambassador, Philip W. Bonsal, is a splendid choice and Cuba's new Ambassador to Washington, Prof. Ernesto Dihigo, an educator and diplomat of the highest caliber, is certain to represent the revolutionary regime with distinction.

It is time to put aside arguments and recriminations on both sides. There is much constructive work to be done. Cuba has to get her sugar crop going, her roads and railways repaired, and her governmental structure reorganized all the way up from municipalities to the capital of Habana.

Cuba is being reborn. She has the greatest opportunity ever offered in her history to construct a new, free, honest, democratic government. The men now in control have fought, and many of their fellow Cubans suffered torture and death, just for that.

There is a major work of repair to be done in Cuban-American relations. The harsh fact has to be faced that the resentment and bitterness of Cubans against the State Department and American policies rose to a crescendo under the ambassadorships of Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith. Now a distinguished career diplomat with a splendid record is to take over. Philip Bonsal has every qualification that could be asked for the difficult and gratifying task he is taking on.

Dr. Dihigo, the Cuban Ambassador, is professor of Roman law at the University of Habana, the author of a number of books on international law, a jurist, a former Ambassador to the United Nations, and a former Minister of State. In addition he knows the United States and likes Americans. It is to be hoped that both Ambassadors will get to their posts as soon as possible.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 23, 1959]
EXECUTION OF TERRORISTS NECESSARY ACT
BY CASTRO

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Though not condoning kangaroo courts and quickie firing squads, Latin American diplomats returning from Cuba report that if Fidel Castro had not proceeded at once with the trial and execution of Batista's chief terrorists, he would not have been able to maintain order in the country.

Continuous censorship during the last year of Batista's reign kept newsmen living there from giving even an approximate picture of the slaughter that was taking place.

As a result, U.S. readers got no real idea how Batista's agents—military and police—operated against suspected civilian sympathizers of Castro's July 26th movement.

On one occasion, for instance, the bodies of 17 university students were thrown on the capital's streets from speeding police cars.

One of the first common graves located in Oriente Province on January 6 contained 183 half-burned corpses.

Impartial medical inspection showed that the majority had been pushed into the hole alive, gasoline poured over all, and the torch applied. There have been half a dozen other similar graves discovered.

As one observer put it: "Castro landed from Mexico on December 2, 1956, with 81 followers. Four months later, after the first skirmishes with Batista's forces, only 12 of that original group were still alive.

"If he hadn't had volunteers flocking to him from the farms and small towns all over Oriente, he would have been finished.

"Relatives of those volunteers—especially brothers and sisters—paid for that support by the thousands, with their lives, their sight, their fingers, or toes, or genital organs, their virginity.

"By the time Castro was ready to start his final big push, early in December, he had 8,000 men and women fighting for him, and one family in three all over Cuba was giving active aid to the rebels.

"There are only a little over 6 million people in Cuba. In every town and city, all the people—whether they were helping Castro or just keeping out of it—knew the names and faces of the Batista men in their areas who were carrying out the torture, rape, and murder.

"In order to hold his army together and maintain its morale, Castro had to promise that every such agent who was positively identified would be tried by the revolutionary forces, as soon as they won, and shot if convicted.

"If he had reneged on that—failed to seize the terrorist, or held them indefinitely for civilian courts to be reorganized—there would have been a wave of mob lynchings all over Cuba, with at least 2,000 or 3,000 dead by now, instead of 200 or 300, without trial of any kind.

"It's a grim, bloody business, of course, but this was a real civil war, with practically every Cuban involved on one side or the other—not just another one of the palace guard coups that so often pass for revolutions in Latin America."

They're Stealing My Dollars, Robbing My Children, Grandchildren, and Great Grandchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my parents and my grandparents never had a dollar they did not earn through manual labor—except what the latter left to the former.

Whatever the grandparents, by practicing thrift, were able to save, they gave to my parents. My parents lived simply, frugally, and one of the principal objectives of their toil and their thrift was to give my sister and me a better start in life than they enjoyed.

The wife and I have been endeavoring, throughout our 59 years of married life, to follow along the same path. From time to time, out of my earnings as a lawyer and because of our frugal living, we were able to purchase a little life insurance, a few securities, put a little money in the bank, buy a home and a little additional real estate; but, for the last 20 years, the purchasing power of our investments—except those in real estate—has been shrinking. And the taxes on the real estate have become so high that it no longer pays its way, returns a profit. Nor has the actual purchasing value of real estate—except in development instances—increased.

The result is that, because—as the days roll by—the purchasing power of his resources is less than when he denied himself, attempted to securely invest any surplus, there is today little inducement for the average citizen to work, attempt to practice thrift, to accumulate property or a bank account.

The present situation is learnedly, factually set forth in an article printed in the January 1959 Reader's Digest, which was condensed from the Saturday Evening Post of November 22, 1958. It reads:

DO YOU WANT A 10-CENT DOLLAR?

The United States presents a curious spectacle today. Here is the richest country in the world either unwilling or unable to raise enough money in taxes to pay its current governmental costs. Our Federal deficit this year is expected to be about \$12 billion—considerably more than the total expenditures of the Federal Government 20 years ago.

For the first time in our history, and just when we are trying to prove that our economy will outperform that of the Communist states, Congress has had to raise the total debt limit twice in the same year: first to \$280 billion, then to \$283 billion. Senator HARRY F. BYRD has estimated that in 5 years, at expected spending levels, the debt will reach \$350 billion. This is a fantastic \$6,250

for every American family—more than the average family's annual income. Are we headed downhill on the slippery road to disastrous inflation that so many countries have traveled before: the road that leads to a 25-cent, 10-cent, 1-cent dollar?

In 20 years the value of the dollar has been cut in half. Just since the end of World War II the dollar's purchasing power has been reduced by 23 cents. If fumbling governmental fiscal policy should encourage that deterioration to continue, in 25 or 30 years our present 48-cent dollar might be worth only a dime.

What can be done to get the Government back on an even fiscal keel?

1. Should we increase taxes?

Many citizens, convinced that they are overtaxed already, cry for tax reduction. The present tax burden, including all hidden and direct taxes, takes about one-third of the average person's income. He works 12½ hours of his 40-hour week just to pay for Government. On a daily basis, the tax burden is even more depressing. The Tax Foundation has shown that in an 8-hour day the average \$4,500-a-year man must work for the Government 2 hours and 29 minutes. By contrast, to pay for food he works 1 hour and 39 minutes; for housing, 1 hour and 25 minutes; for clothing, 37 minutes.

A major difficulty is that our principal taxes cannot be raised to produce much more revenue without wrecking the economy. Our tax system is like an old rubber band, which has been stretched so long and so often that there is no stretch left in it. Since enactment of the income tax in 1913, our system has consisted fundamentally of: The income tax, which now produces 79 percent of total Federal revenue; a series of special excise taxes, producing 6 percent of total revenue; taxes at very high rates on sales of liquor and tobacco, producing 7 percent; and taxes on transfers of property by gift during life, or at death, producing 2 percent.

To raise an additional \$12 billion (the amount of this year's deficit) from the present Federal income tax would require the confiscation of everyone's taxable income in excess of \$4,000, or an increase in the corporate rate from the present 52 percent to 82 percent. The result of income taxes of that magnitude would be economic chaos. They would destroy all stimulus to risk-taking, new investment and business expansion—the most potent forces in the economic development of our country.

A few hundred million dollars could be raised by increasing gift and estate taxes. Since the taxes on liquor and tobacco already approximately equal the cost of the product, they cannot be used effectively to produce much more revenue. The rates of our existing special excises could be raised a little, but we have found that some excises, such as the taxes on freight and passenger transportation, so discourage activities we want to foster that Congress has had to repeal them. The latest revision of the excise tax laws resulted in an estimated loss, not a gain, in revenue.

So, raising taxes is not a very acceptable solution.

2. Can we solve the problems by reducing governmental expenditures? Just what expenditures can be cut?

In the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Federal Government will spend almost \$80 billion. Although defense spending, estimated at \$46.8 billion, is obviously the largest part of the budget, it is by no means responsible for the recent big increases. In the last 5 years nondefense spending has jumped by a startling \$12½ billion—from \$20 billion to more than \$32 billion. The biggest increase in this area has been in the farm programs, which have risen \$3½ billion and now amount to \$6½ billion per year. Federal spending on housing and commerce has gone up \$3 billion;

labor and welfare expenditures, up nearly \$2 billion; veterans' services and benefits, up \$900 million.

Now these civil expenditures do not represent pure congressional wastefulness. When, for example, Congress increased the social security payments (and the taxes to pay for them), Congressmen had an eye on the forthcoming elections; they calculated that the number of citizens who wanted to see larger payments was greater than the number who would resent the increased taxes. We are a big Nation of enormous wealth; why shouldn't we live the good life? Let's have guns and rockets, but let's have butter, too—lots of it.

And let's have lots of roads. The cost of the Federal highway program, not now included in the budget, jumped from \$586 million in fiscal 1954 to an estimated \$2½ billion this year. Last year Congress suspended the pay-as-we-go feature of this program, ensuring even greater costs in the future. We all want good roads; but do we have to have them so quickly that we must pile up more debt to get them?

Furthermore, is it essential that we have some 2,250,000 civilians on the Federal payroll at a monthly cost of about \$1 billion? Is it necessary to pay Federal employees an average of \$30 a week while the average in private industry is \$78? This kind of spending has increased the cost of Federal payrolls in the past 10 years from \$162 per American family per year to \$255 per family. Isn't it time for us to distinguish essential expenditures from desirable?

Under present world conditions, it is hard to justify a reduction in military spending. But we might be able to hold national security costs at the present level. This would require that money for new programs and weapons should come from cutbacks in expenditures for other military projects. A sizable sum was saved this way in the present budget.

It is primarily in the area of nondefense spending that Congress might make real cuts. There is nothing inevitable about the \$6½ billion to be spent for agriculture this year, nor the nearly \$4 billion for housing and commerce. The farm price-support program (changed for the better in 1958) has piled up unnecessary surpluses at the taxpayers' expense. There are now in storage, government-owned, for every American family, 24 bushels of corn, 19 bushels of wheat, 4½ pounds of dried milk, 3½ pounds of cheese and 2½ pounds of butter.

This is just not reasonable. Nor is it reasonable that more than half the patients in veterans' hospitals are being treated for non-service-connected disabilities. Nor is it reasonable that the Federal Government should continue to add to the 100-odd Federal-aid programs to States that can better finance and administer their needs locally.

The President in his budget for the current year made a series of recommendations which held hope for lower expenditures. Mainly, his proposals were of three types: reduction in some of the Federal-aid programs, largely by the transfer of entire programs to the States; limitations on the extent of Federal loans and loan guarantees; curtailment of direct-spending programs.

In general, Congress ignored these proposals. In some instances it moved in the direction of greater Federal participation in local projects. Thus, instead of eliminating a program of Federal aid for local sewer systems—certainly a subject of local rather than national concern—Congress voted to enlarge it.

By accepting the President's proposals for cutbacks, and adding some of its own, an economically minded Congress could bring expenditures down to \$70 billion. That is probably a spending minimum. It is not impossible to attain. In fact, repudnik, it was the administration's target.

3. Do we really want to continue as we have been doing: borrowing what is needed and passing along the cost of today's government to our children to pay tomorrow with, say, a 10-cent dollar?

The Federal Government has paid much of its way by borrowing ever since 1931. In 7 of the past 11 years we have had to pay for a budget deficit by borrowing. Have we found this to be a satisfactory way of life? We have not.

When the Government does not collect enough taxes to pay current expenses, it issues governmental promises-to-pay to cover the difference. Such promises may be called savings bonds or certificates of indebtedness or long-term bonds. Whatever the name, we accept them at their face value so long as we believe that the Government will live up to its promises.

Since the Treasury has issued so many, however, and since Congress is obviously reluctant to levy enough taxes to pay currently for the steadily increasing governmental costs, the value of these obligations has gradually declined. This is what is behind the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar over the past 25 years.

The resulting inflation has rightly been called the cruellest tax of all. Just because of taxes and inflation the person who earned \$5,000 in 1946 would have to earn \$7,343 today—nearly 50 percent more—simply to be as well off as he was before. It is plain to see what happens to the retired man, the widow on a fixed income, the insurance policy or annuity payable in a fixed number of dollars.

The best way to weaken America as a nation is to convince our citizens that our governmental promise to pay, our currency, has lost its integrity. There would not be much use in saving if we suspect that the dollars which we put aside with such difficulty won't be worth a dime in purchasing power at the time we need them—to raise a family, to send our children to school, to pay our own way when we retire.

Hence, it looks as if the Government had better take the other fork of the road, uphill and stony as it may be: reduce expenditures, and levy such taxes as are needed to pay for current costs.

An immediate objective might be a \$75 billion budget for the next fiscal year. This \$5 billion reduction of the present budget would require the utmost effort of both the President and Congress. It would also require strong support from the individual citizen, who might keep in mind that every reduction of \$1 billion in Federal spending is the equivalent of a \$20 bill in the pocket of the average family.

Since Federal, State, and local taxes are all so high, Congress will need to make an extraordinary endeavor, in levying any further taxes, to damage our economy as little as possible. It is vital to permit and if possible to encourage our economy to grow. If private enterprise flourishes in this country, if plants are steadily renewed and improved through investment, "plowing in," of profits, the U.S. Treasury, now more heavily interested in corporate profits than all private stockholders put together, will reap increasing revenues, even though tax rates remain constant.

Finally, Congress must face the tremendous task of looking deeply into the problems of tax structure and fiscal policy. The most promising solution might be the creation of a Commission on Federal Tax and Fiscal Policy, organized along the lines of the Hoover Commission, whose recommendations have led to savings of billions of dollars through improved efficiency and reorganization of the executive branch. Proposals to set up such a special nonpartisan group of the highest distinction have already been made in Congress. They deserve careful attention.

A nation such as ours cannot concede that its fiscal problems are insoluble. We must

apply our best brains to the project and stop trying to patch up an inadequate, archaic system. Surely American intelligence can be mustered to provide the Government with a sound fiscal system, to match a sound economy and a sound defense organization.

Willford I. King, long an active opponent of overspending, points out that at the end of 1957 there was \$725.8 billion of public and private debt in the United States. Since then, the Federal debt has grown by some \$8 billion. Probably, therefore, the total net debt at the end of 1958 was \$734 billion, plus paper currency and demand deposits held by Americans amounting to \$230 billion. If inflation reduces the value of the dollar by three-fourths, American creditors—as a rule the older and thriftier of our citizens—may be fleeced out of some \$723 billion.

The real cause of our present trouble is not the inability of the people to pay any reasonable justifiable tax, but the insistent demand of pressure groups that the Government do for them the things they might well do for themselves, and that it adopt and follow a paternalistic policy under which the Federal Government attempts to treat the healthy, strong individual, able to care for himself, like a nursing baby.

The net result is that, as individuals and as a Nation, we are becoming soft, dependent, too shameless to take care of ourselves, bear our just burden.

We are becoming a bunch of softies, as far from the courageous, independent, industrious, thrifty individuals—as were our forefathers—yes; even our own parents—as it is possible for us to be.

About the only decoration we merit is one for shameless lack of willingness to carry our every day burdens. To our everlasting shame it can be said that those burdens we are passing on to our descendants.

Listening, one is forced to the conclusion that everyone desires that the Government live within its income. Watching, one realizes that the people back home, as well as the Members of Congress and of the State legislatures, are willing to drift along, continually spending more than is received.

If you are interested in the viewpoint of Roswell Magill ask for up to 10 free copies of this statement. Send one copy to each of your Senators and to your Congressmen expressing your viewpoint regarding the Roswell Magill article.

Every Peter, robbing some Paul, through appropriations and taxation, ignores the fact that his turn to be robbed is at hand.

Poison in Your Water—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 16, 1959, had an article "Waterway Woes:

The Pollution Problem Grows, Bringing Public Clamor for Stiffer Laws." That article by Mr. Cal Brumley told about some of the problems created by pollution, characterized by these words from Mr. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the U.S. Water Pollution Control Division of the U.S. Public Health Service: "Pollution is costing us at least a billion dollars a year."

I hope this article and the others I intend to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will serve as a basis for understanding the need for Federal action and for full Federal water pollution control and construction grant appropriations in the amount of \$50 million rather than \$20 million, as included in the administration's budget:

WATERWAY WOES: THE POLLUTION PROBLEM GROWS, BRINGING PUBLIC CLAMOR FOR STIFFER LAWS—INDUSTRY LIFTS SPENDING ON WASTE CONTROL, BUT SOME TOWNS REJECT NEW PLANTS—TOP TROUBLE SPOT, THE SOUTH (By Cal Brumley)

DEMOPOLIS, ALA.—When Gulf States Paper Corp. opened its big new \$25 million pulp mill here on the banks of the Tombigbee River a little more than a year ago, the people of west central Alabama couldn't say enough nice things about the company.

Public officials expounded lengthily on the significance of the new plant: What it would mean to the community in added payrolls, growing bank deposits and new jobs.

Today, this warm regard has cooled. Not long ago, a valve stuck at the mill. Within 4 hours, 5 million gallons of blackish sodium lignite and other wastes poured unchecked into the Tombigbee. For 13 miles downriver, fish—bass, bream, buffalo, spoonbill, drum and catfish—died almost instantly. In all, more than 200,000 pounds of fish perished.

A COSTLY BLOW

Gulf States' president, youthful-looking, dark-haired Jack Warner, winces as he recalls the incident. "People get pretty emotional when fish are killed," he says. What ensued after the mishap not only was a mighty embarrassing public relations problem for the company but a financial blow as well. State water officials moved in immediately and closed down the plant for a week—costing \$235,000 in lost production. Then the State wouldn't let the mill reopen until it promised to install new precautionary equipment—another \$200,000 item. These extra expenses come on top of \$250,000 the company spent originally on waste control equipment, which up to the accident had cut waste flow to 40 percent of normal for a mill of this size.

The Tombigbee incident points up growing pollution problems along the Nation's waterways—and the mounting public clamor for stiffer antipollution laws. Fearful communities, in some cases, are beginning to cold-shoulder prospective new factories because of the amount of wastes they discharge. Private companies, in turn, are installing millions of dollars of waste-control equipment in an effort to ward off public criticism.

"Our people want to clip the coupons of industrialization during the week, but when they go fishing or boating on Saturday or Sunday, they want their rivers clean," says William Weir of Georgia's Department of Public Health.

A BILLION-DOLLAR LOSS

These two desires aren't always compatible. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the Water Pollution Control Division of the U.S. Public Health Service, estimates: "Pollution is costing us at least a billion dollars a year." Untreated industrial wastes now pouring daily into streams are equal to the sewage produced by 110 million people, double the 1920 rate.

And although many municipal sewage systems have installed elaborate waste-treatment equipment, such equipment has not kept pace with pollution growth. Those systems which still do not treat wastes now serve areas with a total population of 55 million, an increase of 37 percent over the 1920 total.

It's not just a question of fish welfare, either. "Along many miles of river frontage in Tennessee it is impossible for industries to locate because of the amount of pollution entering these streams from the headwaters in other States," says Harold V. Miller, executive director of the Tennessee State Planning Commission. He ticks off four textile firms, a paper plant and a chemical company which turned down eastern Tennessee sites because of a lack of the fresh, pure water needed in their operations.

Few areas of the country are completely free of the problem. Regional conferences in the last 2 years have been called concerning pollution in the Big Blue River in Nebraska and Kansas; the Potomac at Washington, D.C.; the Lower Columbia at Portland, Oreg., and the Bear River in Idaho and Utah. The Missouri is plagued with pollution at St. Joseph, Mo., at Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs and Sioux City in Iowa.

These regional meetings were held under the rules of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act passed in 1956, which gives the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the authority to force waste-control action if voluntary efforts fail.

TROUBLE AT CORNEY CREEK

What might be termed "the trouble at Corney Creek" has given the Department its worst moments so far. The stream, running from Arkansas into Louisiana has served as a dump for oil-well wastes. Corney Creek, in turn, carries impurities into the much larger Ouachita River, which serves as a source of drinking water for fairly sizable Louisiana towns. It took the threat of Federal prosecution to get some of the oil-well operators to clean up their operations, and even today, mayors of some of the Ouachita River cities aren't entirely satisfied with its purity.

Concern about pollution has been growing faster in the South than in other parts of the United States. For one thing, the region's industrial growth in the past 10 years has outpaced the rest of the Nation. Also, one of its key industries—paper production—is subject to more than its share of waste-control problems.

"Most of the early paper mills in the South located near the seacoast so pollutants could be dumped into large bodies of water. Now, new mills have to go inland and their pollution problems are much greater," comments an official of St. Regis Paper Co. Moreover, southern paper output has nearly doubled in the last 5 years.

Other industries which have been accused of fouling the streams of the South are the phosphate mines and citrus-processing plants of Florida, the chicken-processing plants in northwestern Georgia, the coal mines of Alabama, and textile mills and chemical plants throughout Dixie.

According to the Isaac Walton League, a national conservation group, severe problems also exist in the North in New York and Wisconsin, where dairy processors have dumped wastes into streams, and in the West and Southwest, where sugar-beet factories have been offenders. The Government, itself, has not been completely blameless in the handling of radioactive wastes at atomic plants, according to the league. Even steel companies and other industries which add nothing to water but use it solely for cooling cause trouble.

"Every industry which uses water from a stream and returns any portion of that water changes the character of the stream. For example, water that is heated is altered, usually

becoming unfit for fish life," says Frank Gregg, executive director of the league.

THE BRUSHOFF

Fear of pollution has caused some communities to have second thoughts about greater industrialization. Frontier Refining Co., an oil firm with a yen to build a new refinery on Florida's east coast, has tried unsuccessfully for 5 years to find a welcome at a spot the company considers suitable. It got a not-so-polite "no thanks" from Fort Lauderdale, Fort Pierce, and West Palm Beach.

Currently, Frontier hopes to build on Merritt Island, near the town of Cocoa on Cape Canaveral where it has acquired a 160-acre tract. But even there, in the heart of missile land, the company is meeting opposition. Bird and fish lovers, property owners and conservationists have organized "the Committee Opposing an Oil Refinery on Merritt Island," with Gary Bennett, mayor of Cocoa, whose business is fish bait and fishing tackle, as chairman.

"The fishing industry on our marine estuaries (Banana River and Indian River) is worth \$7 million a year to Brevard County," says Mr. Bennett. "I'm very jealous of what we have and I don't want to see an objectionable industry, such as a refinery, pollute, contaminate, and destroy it."

M. H. Robineau, Frontier's president, says the company is embarking on a campaign to convince Floridians that refinery wastes are not harmful. In fact, he says, Frontier dumped wastes into oyster beds as an experiment; not a single one of the sensitive bivalves suffered any ill effects.

More trouble for industry looms. Sportsmen in Florida, detecting what they consider an overlarge decline in fishermen's luck recently, are planning to ask the legislature for a full-scale investigation. "We want to find out how many spawning beds are disrupted, how many shell fish are poisoned, and how many fish are killed by pollution," says Dr. H. R. Wilber, president of the Florida Wildlife Federation, a highly vocal group with some 20,000 members.

Georgia passed new laws last year and Alabama has begun to enforce its existing antipollution laws for the first time. North Carolina is surveying pollution in all its river basins, and dozens of plants located in the eastern part of the State already have been ordered to clean up wastes which flow downriver into Tennessee.

DAM JUMPING GULLY CREEK

Private companies, of course, are going to enormous expense in an effort to solve the problem on their own. National Container Corp., a division of Owens-Illinois Glass Co., has spent \$450,000 damming up Jumping Gully Creek into a series of ponds for its paper mill at Valdosta, Ga. These ponds, which cover nearly 450 acres, hold mill waste (or effluent, the more elegant name preferred by engineers) for up to 5 months before allowing it to trickle into the Withlacoochee River.

Champion Paper & Fibre Co., too, is getting ready to spend several million dollars to wrestle with the waste now pouring out of its mill in Canton, N.C. The goal: To purge the Pigeon River of pollution. "We feel a moral obligation to do the job," says a Champion official.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that 5,700 new waste control systems are needed urgently to treat industrial plant outpourings throughout the country. The price tag: About \$2 billion. Cities, the Government agency adds, need to spend about the same amount improving their sewerage systems.

Contributing to the pressure on many companies to clean up is the loud hollering of downriver communities. "We have to deal with fanatical fishermen, pompous politicians, water skiers, boatmen, health officials and nature lovers who don't want the smell

or looks of their favorite stream changed," says the harassed manager of one southern pulp mill.

MISPLACED BLAME

Sometimes a company gets blamed publicly when it isn't at fault at all. In the uproar over a fish kill on the Altamaha River in Georgia, Rayonier, Inc., wound up with a consent injunction providing that Rayonier will shut down its mill at Doctortown if its waste kills any more fish. Later, it was established that the fish really were killed by an unknown source upstream from the mill's effluent discharge pipe.

Nevertheless, a Rayonier spokesman observes, "We have this injunction hanging over our heads."

(Pollutants seldom actually poison the water. Usually their decay uses up the stream's dissolved oxygen, causing fish and other aquatic life to suffocate.)

Rayonier has another public relations problem at its Doctortown mill. Two suits were brought against the company because of a grayish, slimy river growth—with the tongue-twisting name of "sphaerotilus"—which seems to thrive on Rayonier mill waste. The slime floats downriver, fouling the nets of shad fishermen and frightening away the prized roe fish.

Although both suits were dropped when the company showed good faith trying to control the slime, Rayonier isn't out of the woods yet. "We've spent \$45,000, but so far we still don't have the answer," says a company spokesman.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Rivers that flow through several States pose difficult control problems. Currently seven States—Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Virginia, Kentucky, and Georgia—are working to establish an interstate regulatory commission.

The model for such a body is the Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission which was organized about 10 years ago with the backing of industry as well as public health and conservation officials. In this year's annual report, the commission claims that 8,095,000 people, or 79 percent of the population of the valley, are now served by sewage treatment plants either operating or under construction. Ten years ago less than 1 percent had such service. Also, 70 percent of the 1,459 industries discharging wastes directly into streams in the Ohio Valley are complying with minimum requirements established by the agency, compared with only 30 percent a decade ago.

However, the river that has made the most progress, according to conservationists, is the Schuylkill, which flows through the heart of downtown Philadelphia.

"It was nothing but a flowing sewer a few years ago, but today residents can swim in it or fish for bass," a leading conservationist says.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a high privilege and great honor to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inaugural address of His Excellency Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, delivered at Columbia on January 20, 1959:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS AS GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, JANUARY 20, 1959

This, the most honored day of my life, I want to speak to you not of parties or politics, but of governments and men. I want to speak of the future.

I have just sworn before God and before you, my people, that I will preserve and defend the constitution of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States. The constitution of the State has been amended so many times that it is difficult to recognize the original—but it has been amended legally. The Constitution of the United States has been amended illegally by the Supreme Court and today we struggle to recognize the original. This "noblest document ever penned" has been defiled by careless men of less nobility. Our United States Constitution, like all great things, finds its greatest strength in its permanency—and when that permanency is casually handled, its greatest strength suffers, and weakens, and perishes.

I feel particularly solemn this day as I take the highest office in our State, which is one of the few remaining citadels of belief in the traditions and principles upon which our Nation was founded. With clear conscience, and clear convictions, I reaffirm to the world that we are a government of laws and not of whim—that our deep sense of civic responsibility demands a respect for the law—that if the slightest law is to be respected, then the greatest law is to be hallowed. We recognize that the United States Constitution is an inspired document and a great gift and hope to mankind—but when the form and letter and spirit of that Constitution is ignored, a gestation period of chaos erupts into a miscarriage of conscience and propriety. We find a U.S. Attorney General pledging economic blackmail against our Southland. We see both political parties competing to hurl the greatest insult and defamation at our door. And worse, we find a confused and petulant Chief Executive assuming command of a marching army, this time not against Berlin, but against Little Rock. This same commander admonishes the southern governors that in taking the oath to support the United States Constitution, they swear allegiance to the Supreme Court and the Court's version of "the law of the land." Or to be specific, he and others insist that the governors are sworn to integrate the public schools.

The law of the land, my friends, is the same today as it was the day this Nation was founded in 1787—that is the Constitution of the United States. As Mr. Charles Warren, eminent historian of the Supreme Court, stated: "However the Court may interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decision of the Court."

The men who assembled and drafted our Constitution and those who have subsequently lawfully amended it made it apparent and definite that the individual, the State, and the Nation, were all to have rights. As a matter of course the rights must be different in scope since the needs are different in scope. Note carefully, I have emphasized "in scope"—they are not different in degree, for the National Government can no more take away a man's life or property without due process of law than can that same individual refuse to serve in our Armed Forces. Equally true is this with regard to the powers of a sovereign State over the individual. While some States allow 18-year-olds to vote, other States forbid it, and the individual citizen of 18 in a forbidding State is not denied equal protection of the laws because he can't vote.

Paramount among these powers reserved to the States, therefore, is that of regulating elections, and equally paramount is the power of providing and regulating public

education. Both of these powers remained undisturbed by the 14th amendment. The right to vote without regard to race was not guaranteed until 2 years later by the 15th amendment. It is clear both by law and intent that the 14th amendment did not disturb the fixed boundary between the right of the individual and the power of the State in providing public education. Both the Congress that framed the amendment and the States that ratified it continued to operate segregated schools. When the doctrine of "separate but equal" was sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1896, neither Congress nor any court or State protested. On the contrary, everyone understood this doctrine as the basis upon which the States could conduct public education. The correctness of this understanding was confirmed repeatedly by the highest State and Federal courts in an unbroken line of decisions. The boundary line remained fixed. There is today no law and no provision of the Constitution requiring racially integrated schools. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended and the boundary line changed, the South stands on this boundary and on this principle. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended, my refusal to integrate our people during the next 4 years will not conflict with the oath just taken.

In fact, the contrary is true. I cannot conscientiously take this oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and not object to the Supreme Court usurping the amendatory power that constitutionally is vested in three-fourths of the States. To do so would give us a government of men and not of laws. This danger was foreseen by our forefather in the founding days of this republic, for it was George Washington who said in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Nevertheless, the danger grows and members of the Court claim for it the function, and even the duty, of amending the Constitution at will. In his dissenting opinion in *Green v. United States* in March 1958, Justice Hugo Black, with the concurrence of Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice William O. Douglas, said this:

"Indeed, the Court has a special responsibility where questions of constitutional law are involved to review its decisions from time to time and where compelling reasons present themselves to refuse to follow erroneous precedents; otherwise its mistakes in interpreting the Constitution are extremely difficult to alleviate and needlessly so."

In other words, when these Justices disagree with earlier and longstanding interpretations of the Constitution, such interpretations are mistakes and should be corrected by the Court, because the amending process is extremely difficult, and needlessly so when the Justices can so easily take the place of the constitutional three-fourths of the States.

The Supreme Court of our land was established to decide litigation in the light of past decisions and not in spite of past decisions. It is not the Court's function to lay down the law of the land by judicial fiat. It is the Congress under the American system that makes law. Flagrantly, baldly usurping the amendatory power of three-fourths of the States, the Justices of the Supreme Court apparently take their gospel from Richard III, whom Shakespeare caused to say:

"Strong arms shall be our conscience, swords our law."

March on, join together to pell mell,
If not to Heaven, then hand in hand to Hell."

It is distressing that the Justices are trying to force us, but it is even more distressing that they, like Richard, apparently don't care.

I shall not dwell on the subject of segregation as it affects race relations. We all have heard too much on this subject and there is too much to be done in the days ahead for us to waste our energies and arouse our tempers over a subject upon which we in South Carolina are in essential agreement. We are fortunate in having a well nigh boundless store of good will and understanding among all races and beliefs in South Carolina. In South Carolina, in our schools, peace patrols the school corridors; unlike New York, we do not need armed guards. The Negroes of our State feel as all of us feel, that schools are intended for education. They feel that their Governor and general assembly are doing everything possible to provide them the best educational program and the best opportunity to succeed on an individual basis. Let alone, we shall continue to do this. As a practical matter, this can only be done in the segregated pattern, and for those who would by integration destroy the education, culture, opportunity, and friendship of both races, I simply state that our position of determined resistance remains unchanged.

The segregation stand of the South is symbolic of the stand of our forefathers against the oppression of government when this great Republic was founded. This Nation was founded on a desire to avoid government. The unconditional surrender making possible the Constitution, the Supreme Court, and the Government in Washington, was obtained by an army of the Colonies or States, and are not of a national government. The difficulty of establishing and maintaining such an army gave the basis for the primary need and function of our Federal Government—that of national defense. While today this fiscally remains the primary function, all powers for all purposes have been preemptorily assumed so that rather than the Government defending the citizen, the citizen feels a need for being defended from the Government.

While everyone cites segregation as a point of argument with respect to race relations, I cite it as a challenge which faces South Carolina—and all of the other 48 States. South Carolina and the South stand in the critical role of fighting against a tide which would sweep us into national mediocrity, crush the States and their citizens into national molds, stifle the views and rights of minorities, and destroy the original constitutional balance of power among the individual States and the Federal Government.

This is a continuing threat, and it runs deeper than most persons realize. Americans who live in other parts of the country and who are not presently faced, as we are in the South with an obvious and alarming onslaught against our rights, have no understanding of the fundamental at stake. The federal system of checks and balances, America's unique contribution to the science of government, is at stake.

South Carolina and the South are standing firm against this national attempt to wipe out the boundaries which were designed to preserve this system. Because we do so, we are labeled reactionaries by those so-called liberals who seek to force their own idea of the centralized state upon all of the United States. It must be admitted that we do react against their scheme to subvert the basis of American government as we have known it through the years. We also admit

that we are conservative, in the sense that we seek to conserve those principles of government, and of free enterprise, which have been tried and proved, and which have made this Nation what it is today. We in South Carolina see no conflict between such conservatism and progress; indeed, we think they go hand in hand toward bringing us a better life, and it is our mission to put forward a dynamic conservatism as an asset, not a liability.

When we speak of such conservatism and the free-enterprise system, we speak of the right to work and make a profit as compared to the power of the Government to interfere and to take the profit. The only reason free people on this earth work is to make a profit from their labor. If they work for other people, their reward is called a wage or salary. If they work for themselves, it is called a profit. If they work only for an oppressive central government, it is called communism. Without the hope of a wage or profit no person would ever work or no business would ever be established, except as slave or regimented labor. Without the realization of a profit no business could continue to live, and without an adequate profit no business would be able to grow. The opportunity to profit, to live, and to grow is fundamental to the American system of free enterprise. When the Federal Government through its taxing power and other policies kills this incentive to work and profit, to live and grow, then the boundary of the purpose for government as we know it is exceeded by the power of government and we are lost. History is well marked by civilizations which have collapsed following the loss of that basic strength inherent in the initiative of the individual citizen.

We make no apologies for this conservatism; indeed we proclaim it as evidence that we in South Carolina have resisted—and will continue to resist—the dictation of a powerful Federal Government. Both our State and our people have maintained their self-respect and are pledged to continue fighting to retain their self-government. We are susceptible neither to threats of Federal pressure nor to promises of Federal aid.

A great South Carolinian, Robert Y. Hayne, whose plaque appears at the entrance to our State Capitol, once had this to say to a colleague in the United States Senate:

"Sir, let me tell that gentleman that the South repudiates the idea that a pecuniary dependence on a Federal Government is one of the legitimate means of holding the States together. A moneyed interest in the Government is essentially a base interest; and just so far as it operates to bind the feelings of those who are subject to it to the Government—just so far as it operates in creating sympathies and interests that would not otherwise exist—it is opposed to all the principles of free government and at war with virtue and patriotism."

South Carolina no longer stands simply as the geographic center of a defeated South. We occupy the larger and more compelling role as the stronghold of traditional thought in America. Let it not be believed for a moment that we, or our southern neighbors, stand alone in our resistance to Federal encroachment on those rights which, by every rule of common sense and by every rational constitutional interpretation, should be exercisable by the States alone. In this respect, millions all over the Nation stand with us, realizing as we do that the last of our prerogatives in local self-government is imperiled.

The businessman of our country realizes that our free enterprise system is not founded on the excesses of northern pressure groups. He appreciates his heritage and seeks a region where the people are willing to defend that heritage. With all the charges of preju-

dice and bigotry, with all the talk of illiteracy and backwardness, with all the fears of school interruption and disorders, the American businessman continues to flow south. He comes not just for markets and climate, but because of the character of our people and State government. Public office is still a public trust. We are a stable people and we have a stable government. We believe in living within our means. We refuse to increase taxes unless absolutely necessary. Our legislature will not enact an appropriation bill and I, as Governor, will not sign such legislation except within the expected revenue. The people themselves believe in individual rights and individual responsibility. We believe that the freedom to work is as fundamental as freedom of speech or freedom of worship. We believe in a day's work for a day's pay. We do not look for security but for opportunity. South Carolina is a good place to live and provide opportunity for our children. We recognize the indisputable fact that ours is the only way that we can give to our young people of every walk of life and of every section of our State the efficient public education without which our children will not be able to achieve the economic, social, and political future that their parents would want them to have. We are a law-abiding people and will not stand for violence against our churches and schools. There is tolerance and understanding and good will among all of our peoples. This is our South Carolina today.

We are a State of hope and dedication—a State touched by destiny. The battle for the Republic is truly at hand. On our shoulders ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth. On my shoulders rests the burden of presenting the case for South Carolina, but it is you who have supplied the evidence, and it is you who are the witnesses. I will not desert your cause, nor will I fail you. I recognize the problems, but they only give me enthusiasm for the solutions. With a humble prayer for God's blessings and guidance I assume this task with a vigorous pride that while South Carolina and our Southland 25 years ago may have been the Nation's number one economic problem, today we are the Nation's number one hope for the survival of the free-enterprise system. Today we are the Nation's hope for the survival of constitutional government. Today we are the hope for the future.

Poison in Your Water—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a résumé of the effect of water pollution on fish and wildlife by Mr. William E. Towell, distinguished director of the Missouri State Conservation Commission:

A RÉSUMÉ OF THE EFFECT OF WATER POLLUTION ON FISH AND WILDLIFE¹ BY WILLIAM E. TOWELL, MISSOURI STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The objective of the conservation commission is to protect the fish and wildlife resources and under sound management to

provide for the greatest use of these resources by the people of Missouri. In pursuing this objective, we feel that water pollution is a serious obstacle and we believe that in future years it could become increasingly more difficult to overcome. We are reminded often of an increasing population and the need for added waste treatment which this alone brings with it. Beyond this, added industrial development is being vigorously encouraged. These advancements, which will increase the need for waste treatment, should carry with them a stern responsibility to maintain clean water. We feel that this is essential in providing for anticipated demands upon the fish and wildlife resources.

We know from records of permit sales now that one out of five persons in Missouri is interested in fishing and hunting. This does not include the thousands who are interested in the out of doors purely for the aesthetic value. Regardless of the particular interest, clean water is always a center of attraction in out-of-door enjoyment. Whether we admire it for its beauty or regard it as a producer of bass and ducks, we are invariably attracted to clean water. Our love for water in its natural state seems universal.

With this in mind, we remember that only about 1 percent of the total surface area of Missouri is in water. This means that we are entertaining one-fifth of the people on 1 percent of its area, and this includes only hunters and fishermen. We have no accurate record of the thousands who seek outdoor recreation who do not wield a rod nor shoulder a gun. Together all of these must reach an enormous total. This, in our opinion, is significant in demonstrating the need for maintaining clean water. The importance of out-of-door recreation is confirmed further by the fact that in Missouri expenditures related to hunting and fishing alone amount to an estimated \$69 million annually. We arrive at this estimate by the application of the Crosley formula for appraising the value of the hunting and fishing resources which was developed in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

We in wildlife conservation are grateful for the effort and interest of all who took part in creating this water pollution board. We feel that the function of this board is essential to us in fulfilling our commitment to the people of Missouri.

Water pollution (1) kills fish and other aquatic life, (2) lowers the fish supporting capacity of water for the more desirable fish species, and (3) renders water unfit for recreation. These effects and their severity depend upon the kind and extent of the pollution. All occur in Missouri every year.

The conservation commission conducted a statewide survey of pollution in 1949. This showed that over 900 miles of stream in 69 counties and the city of St. Louis were polluted, and by mid-1957 these values had increased to more than 1,200 miles of stream in 74, or, roughly, two-thirds, of Missouri's 114 counties and the city of St. Louis. This represents an increase of 300 miles of polluted stream in 8 years. We recognize the limitation in using stream mileage as a measure of pollution, but we feel that this is a graphic expression of its extent. We find that many sources of pollution are not always limited to a defined reach of stream in which they might be considered more or less chronic. One bad day can wipe out a fish population for miles, as it did in the James River following a freshet near Springfield in 1954. In that instance fish were killed for many miles down the James River, even though chronic or permanent contamination in Wilson Creek precluded a normal fish fauna for a relatively short distance. The same can be said of Cedar Creek in Boone and Callaway Counties. This stream is permanently contaminated and devoid of fish in its upper reach, but during heavy runoff the fish population is often destroyed in the en-

tire 40-mile length of the stream between the source of contamination and the confluence of this stream and the Missouri River. This is possible because this stream, as do others, tends to become repopulated with fish between the flushes of contamination. The source of pollution, therefore, is a potential which under appropriate conditions can be extended over many miles and can destroy great quantities of fish and other forms of wildlife.

Pollution is caused by many substances which vary in their effect upon fish and other aquatic life. Some pollutants which are lethal to fish directly include industrial chemicals, acid-mine wastes, lead, zinc, iron, brine, insecticides, lime, plating liquor, and water-treatment compounds. Others remove dissolved oxygen from water. These include sewage, dairy, corn products, canning, and meatpacking wastes. Some of those listed have both of these properties and still others impart off-flavors to water and fish.

Other kinds of pollutants blanket the bottom of streams, ruining them as spawning and feeding grounds for fish. These include sediments resulting from washing barite, iron ores and gravel, oil, sawdust, glass fiber, coal washings, trash, wood fiber, and varnish.

The extent of some pollutants is more widespread than others, and the effect differs with the type and volume of the pollutant. Thirteen streams in 16 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected by industrial chemical wastes. These consist mainly of the complex wastes of industries which include acids, alkalies, oil, ammonia, phenols, and others. A serious effect of this type of pollution is the foreign flavor imparted to fish. Although fish are not always killed, this condition renders them unfit for use. The commercial fishery in the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Cape Girardeau has been practically ruined by industrial wastes which enter the river in the bi-State area surrounding St. Louis, and their effect has been reported downstream for at least 300 miles. Industrial wastes from Kansas City area have a similar effect on the commercial fishery in the Missouri River in the 56-mile reach from Kansas City to Lexington, and during low flow, off-flavored fish have been reported at Booneville, about 180 river miles below Kansas City.

During the 10-year period from 1947 through 1956, the number of licensed Missouri River commercial fishermen operating below Kansas City in Clay, Jackson, Ray, and Lafayette Counties declined 62 percent, and in the Mississippi River below St. Louis the number of these fishermen declined by 64 percent in the reach of the river bordering Jefferson, St. Genevieve, Perry, and Cape Girardeau Counties. The reported commercial fish harvest in the latter 4 counties declined 71 percent during the same period.

More investigations have been made on pollution by coal mine waste than on any other kind. Forty streams in nine counties are contaminated by this waste. Acid water formed in coal mines probably kills more fish and aquatic life than any other single pollutant. This water contains sulfuric acid and iron compounds formed by the action of air and water upon coal exposed during the mining operations. Usually, there is some lag in time between the exposure of pyrites and the formation of the acid. Consequently, abandoned strip mines are serious potential sources of pollution. If corrective measures have not been followed, these mines cause trouble indefinitely, depending upon the amount of pyrite-bearing coal exposed. Although some pits whose spoil banks contain little or no sulfur are supporting fish life, many others are highly acid in character. A creek in north-central Missouri which was seriously polluted by acid coal-mine wastes in 1940 still flows acid water. Fish mortality resulting from this is

¹ Presented to Missouri Water Pollution Board, June 3, 1958.

most serious after heavy rains in the mined area which cause abandoned pits of acid water to overflow, and strong wastes are carried far downstream.

The harmful effects of coal-mine wastes are many. Not only do they kill fish, fish food organisms and plants, they also render the stream unfit for stock watering and other purposes. Acids kill fish by coagulating the mucus of the gills resulting in the complete stoppage of the flow of blood. Fish mortality from this source of contamination has been frequent and extensive. We are pleased, indeed, to note that some mines have adopted corrective measures, but pollution by coal mines remains a serious problem in the north central, west central, and the southwest portions of the State.

Raw or poorly treated sewage pollutes streams in many parts of the State. Thirty-eight streams in 30 counties and the city of St. Louis are affected. It affects fish in several ways, most importantly by using up the dissolved oxygen in the water. None but the most tolerant fish can live in water whose oxygen levels are subject to the demands of organic decay, and these fish are not the kinds preferred by the angler. Sewage also contributes to fish disease, and sludge is ruinous to spawning grounds and to fish foods used by the kinds of fish which occur in clean water. Heavy rains have carried decomposing sludge far downstream where reduction in dissolved oxygen has killed fish for many miles.

Increased public interest and the consistent effort of the division of health and cities throughout Missouri have resulted in the construction of numerous sewage treatment plants since World War II. This has reduced the pollution load considerably but an increasing population and the lack of efficient operation in some sewage treatment plants continue to be a problem.

The washing of clay from barite ore has caused sedimentation in 10 streams in 3 east-central Missouri counties. Heavy sedimentation and high turbidity result from this operation and the accumulated sediment is carried downstream with increased discharge following rainfall. Generally tiff mill operators construct settling basins to impound the silt, but often the banks are too low or too unstable to withstand water pressure during heavy runoff. Often this has resulted in overflow of silt-laden water, or complete breakthrough in settling basin dams. As a result, streams have been blanketed with sediment for miles. In one place a heavy layer of red-colored tiff silt was found 5 miles below the nearest tiff mill.

This causes the destruction or deterioration of fish habitat by destroying spawning grounds and fish food organisms and by reducing the transparency of the water to the extent that sight feeding fish are not able to feed properly. In some instances fish have been killed by the clogging of their gills.

Oil pollution is quite widespread, affecting 19 streams in 16 counties of the State. The sources are refineries, leakage from barges and tank cars, waste from industrial users of oil, aircraft overhaul bases, service stations and others. Refinery wastes contain phenols and other substances which impart an off-flavor to fish. Often oil kills fish by clogging the gills or it destroys eggs and kills fish food organisms. An oil film on the surface prevents normal aeration of the water and oil sometimes blankets the bottom of a stream for miles. This is particularly true of the Mississippi River below St. Louis where oil deposits are found on the bottom for 83 miles downstream from the source.

Pollution in this reach of the Mississippi also has an important influence on waterfowl movement. The conservation commission's waterfowl counts between 1936 and 1955 show that for many years there has not been a measurable number of migratory birds in the reach of river between St. Louis

and St. Genevieve. Repeated observations of oil slicks have been recorded, and waterfowl specialists have observed thick bubbly oil on the surface of the water. Contamination from oil has had a similar effect on waterfowl concentrations on the Missouri River. Pollution on this stream has been observed consistently in routine aerial censusing during the fall migration since 1937. After 1943 oil slicks became continuous in the Kansas City area and frequently were observed as far as 26 miles downstream. By 1954 oil was seen 50 miles downstream. Within the last 3 years it has been observed regularly as far as Napoleon which is 44 miles below Kansas City and occasionally as far as Waverly, 80 miles downstream. Over a 20-year span covered by the commission's observations, we believe that waterfowl habitat in the Missouri River has gradually deteriorated for a distance of 50 miles below Kansas City. Waterfowl specialists report few birds in this part of the river. Oil is particularly harmful to waterfowl because their feathers become saturated and the birds cannot fly. The effect of oil on migratory birds is highly significant because the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers lie within the midcontinent waterfowl flyway. In view of increased hunting pressure in recent years this is a matter of vital concern.

Salts of zinc, lead, and other heavy metals half caused fish kills in the east and southwest sections of the State. Six streams in four counties are affected. In southwest Missouri, this contamination resulted from pumping out inactive lead mines while in the eastern Lead Belt region it results from the escape of water used in processing ore. The salts of lead and zinc are directly toxic to fish and are lethal in low concentration.

Most organic wastes have an effect on fish similar to those described for raw or poorly treated sewage. These include dairy, meatpacking, canning, and corn products wastes. As they decompose, all have a high demand for oxygen which renders water unfit for all but the most tolerant species of fish. Dairy wastes alone contaminate 23 streams in 18 counties. These wastes have a particularly high demand for dissolved oxygen.

Wastes of the meatpacking industry affect seven streams in as many counties. This includes extensive contamination of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Decay of the organic matter in these wastes rapidly depletes the dissolved oxygen. This is also true for the 12 miles of 3 streams in 2 counties affected by canning wastes. The operation of canning factories is seasonal. Consequently pollution from this source is not continuous. The waste of an out-state corn-products industry affects 25 miles of the Mississippi River in a 3 Missouri counties. This has a high demand for dissolved oxygen and commercial fishermen report that it clogs their tackle.

Sawdust, glass fiber, mine, gravel, coal and iron ore washings, varnish, and wood fiber wastes are others which cover the bottom of the stream, ruining it as a spawning and feeding ground for fish. Some of these create intense water turbidity. Sawdust affects about 18 miles of 7 streams in 7 counties, mostly in the Ozarks. It also has the property of giving off organic acids and lowering dissolved oxygen. The washing of ore at several recently developed iron mines has caused sedimentation and high turbidity in a number of streams in southern Missouri. More contamination from this source is anticipated if means to prevent the escape of wash water are not used.

In recent years, insecticides have killed fish in several streams throughout the State. Toxaphene, DDT, aldrin, benzene hexachloride, chlordane, and others are extremely toxic to fish. Several of them kill fish in concentrations as low as 1 part insecticide in 100 million parts of water. The mere runoff from vegetation sprayed with aldrin re-

cently killed many fish in a nearby slough and some insecticides are believed to be toxic to warmblooded animals. The use of these preparations merits serious consideration by fishery and wildlife management authorities. Needless to say, great care should be used in handling and applying them.

This describes briefly the influence of water pollution on fish and wildlife and points out the value of recreation in the form of hunting and fishing. We often refer to pollution as the cancer of fresh water. I believe this is a reasonable analogy because pollution is the dark side in the future of fishing and other recreational uses in which the waters of Missouri are involved. If it were to continue to increase as it has in the past 10 years, pollution would soon make a serious inroad on fish and other forms of wildlife at a time when there is a greater demand for this resource than at any time in Missouri's history.

The Late Honorable Thomas S. Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I learned about the untimely death of my dear friend and distinguished former colleague from Illinois, the late Honorable Thomas S. Gordon.

His sudden death, which came so swiftly upon his retirement from his body after the completion of the legislative work of the 85th Congress, brought a deep sense of loss to his family and to all of his friends in various walks of life.

I had the privilege of serving with Tom Gordon on the Committee on Foreign Affairs since my first election to Congress in 1949. As a member, and later as chairman of that committee, he participated and presided over some of the most important deliberations that have come before us. His outstanding work in this and in other legislative fields has earned him a lasting place in the history of our Nation. He was a distinguished legislator, who always placed the interests of his District, and of our entire Nation, above all personal matters.

I respected Tom Gordon for his experience, his understanding of the issues, and for his integrity, and I had deep affection for him as a friend. His gentleness and consideration for his colleagues was one of his outstanding characteristics—and one that endeared him greatly to all of us who knew him, and who worked with him. He was patient and understanding in controversies, soft spoken in his counsel, and loyal to the principles which he held.

Certainly the district which he represented for so many years in this House had a faithful and devoted public servant. Even the failure of his health during his last years did not deter him from his unstinted service to his constituents. No request was too small; no interest was too obscure to escape his undivided attention.

Such a man was Tom Gordon. And in his death, his State and our Nation have lost a trusted and outstanding public servant.

My wife, Blanche, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, Cele, to his children and his grandchildren. May they derive some small measure of consolation from the knowledge that we share their grievous loss—and from the thought that our Lord has called Tom Gordon to be among his very own.

How Concerned Are You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including a sermon by Dr. Ewart G. Watts, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans. It is entitled "How Concerned Are You?" It is a forthright statement dealing with one of the difficult problems of our day. I believe Members of the House will be interested in reading it.

The sermon follows:

How Concerned Are You?

Today, we are to think together about one of the most delicate but desperate problems of our day. With 55 to 60 percent of the American people drinking beverage alcohol more or less regularly, it is obvious that anyone who questions the morality of this habit is in the minority. It is also clear that strong words of denunciation from the pulpit may create the impression that the minister is a fanatical bigot who has no real compassion for people who are struggling to control a habit which is wrecking their lives and their homes.

Another thing that makes a discussion of this subject difficult is the fact that there is no clear-cut and unequivocal stand for total abstinence in the Bible. Since the books of the Bible were written over a period of at least a thousand years and by many different authors, both the man who drinks and the one who does not can quote verses to support their positions. But when you consider basic issues, there is no doubt where the Bible stands. There should be no doubt where the Christian stands.

There are three basic axioms or standards of the Bible which should guide us on this question. First, the Bible proclaims the ultimate worth of the individual. It says that each person is of value in God's eyes. Anything which blocks or retards the physical, mental, or spiritual life of a person is wrong. From the primitive days when the prophet Elijah denounced King Ahab for killing Naboth in order to gain possession of his vineyard down to the time when Jesus drove the money changers out of the Temple for cheating the common people who came to worship, the books of the Bible magnify the importance and the worth of the individual. Jesus gave this principle a startling reality when he said: "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? And not one of them will fall to the ground without your Father's will. But even the hairs of your head are all numbered" (Matthew 10: 29).

A second principle which is clear throughout the Bible is that God expects us to have a sense of compassion and concern for the

weak and the afflicted. We are expected to be like the Good Samaritan. We are to love our neighbors as we do ourselves. We are to have the spirit of the Christ who said: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.'" For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matthew 9: 12, 13).

The third ethical standard the Bible gives is the insistence that God expects men to make a firm commitment to the right, no matter how many support the wrong. From the days when the prophet Amos, opposed by all the religious and political leaders of his nation, declared, "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" to the time when the Apostles said to the Jewish authorities who forbade them to preach, "We must obey God rather than man," the Bible makes it clear that right is not to be determined by a Gallup poll. And it calls men to see that one man on God's side is a majority.

Now, let's take these three basic standards of the Bible and see what help they can be in facing this difficult problem created by beverage alcohol. First of all, if each person is of ultimate worth in God's eyes, what do we find? Well, we find that many people's lives are being destroyed by beverage alcohol. Here in our country alcoholism is rapidly becoming our major health problem. With over 5 million confirmed alcoholics, this disease is five times more prevalent than cancer, three times more prevalent than tuberculosis, and 100 times more prevalent than polio, even before the Salk vaccine. Dr. Karl Menninger says that the alcoholics in the United States constitute our largest single mental health problems.¹ In 10 years, the number of alcoholics has almost doubled and there are 17 times more women alcoholics than there were 10 years ago. Throughout the country, judges, marriage counsellors, and ministers report that 3 out of 4 broken families have drinking as a major trouble source. And what is more, the National Safety Council reports that drinking drivers are involved in at least 30 percent of all fatal highway accidents; while during holiday periods, this climbs to at least 50 percent. This means that during the recent Thanksgiving holiday 227 people were killed because drivers were under the influence of liquor.

But figures are cold and impersonal. To understand what beverage alcohol does to destroy persons, you need to look beyond the figures. Think about the people you know whose life or home has been wrecked by beverage alcohol. A few years ago, Upton Sinclair set out to compile a list of the drinking people he had known. He recalled 40 or more geniuses he had known who, as he said, "went to their doom" as a result of this habit. Their story is graphically told by Sinclair in his book "The Cup of Fury." He tells of John Barrymore, Jack London, Eugene O'Neill, Sinclair Lewis, Edna St. Vincent Millay, and others. I wish this book could be required reading for the young people in our schools. It might help to counteract the deceitful and distorted picture which they get from the \$400 million advertising program of the liquor industry. And then, it would help if they—if all of you—could be with ministers, with psychiatrists, with judges as we struggle to help the victims of alcohol. Believe me, when week after week and month after month you see the terrible things that alcohol is doing to homes and to little children, it's hard to keep calm and objective.

But, this is the point where the second great standard of the Bible comes into the picture. There must be a genuine compassion and concern not only for the innocent

victims, but also for the alcoholics and the problem drinkers who are enslaved by alcohol. Dr. Caradine Hooten, who heads our Methodist board of temperance, says, "Until churchmen learn to love alcoholics as much as they hate alcohol, they can never fulfill a redemptive mission in this area of human need." Jesus said, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.'" "

This word should call us to our knees. It should make us see that as churches and as churchmen, we have too often allowed our self-righteous disgust to keep us from being a redemptive fellowship for those who desperately need our help and our understanding love. They must not feel that Alcoholics Anonymous is the only place they can go for understanding help. Recently, our Methodist board of temperance put it this way:

"Only abstinence can be the real answer and preventive to the problem of alcoholism. But we must try to understand the compulsive drinker and keep our communications open with him so that there will be no feeling on his part that he is rejected by the church."

The church is beginning to realize that it has much to learn from Alcoholics Anonymous and from psychiatrists about redemption. And if we can learn, there is so much we can do. Only 200,000 of the 5 million alcoholics belong to A.A. What a tremendous thing it would be if our churches could provide the strengthening fellowship and moral support which is so desperately needed by these alcoholics. This is one of the things that was done by the early Methodists through their class meetings. John Wesley's sermons may have converted many drunkards; but, in the long run, it was the prayer fellowship of the Methodist Class and the class leader meeting with them each week which really saved them. Wesley Memorial Church in Atlanta, Ga., is providing such a fellowship as it works with Municipal Judge James Webb and the Helping Hand Society which is provided for Alcoholics who are brought into his court. This group which meets 3 times every week there in the church has already helped to restore 50 of these men to their families and their jobs.

This does not mean that the church should try to compete with Alcoholics Anonymous. I agree with one counselor who says, "In all the dark history of the handling of the problem of alcoholism, the brightest ray of hope and help in Alcoholics Anonymous!"² But this group cannot do it all. There are about 142,000 new alcoholics each year and the total membership of A.A. is only 200,000. It is obvious that more help is needed. We can help because we represent the same principles that have proved so effective in the program of Alcoholics Anonymous. The 12 points of A.A. are so deeply spiritual that they might well be accepted as guides for new members of a Christian church.

Listen to some of them:

Believe that a power greater than ourselves can restore us to sanity.

Make a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God as we understand Him.

Admit to God, to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs.

Seek through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God.

Try to carry this message to alcoholics, and practice these principles in all our affairs.

You see, here is dependence upon God, confession of sins, giving oneself in service for others who need help. This is the very heart of Christian living. Now, if Alcoholics Anonymous can help men and women by bringing them to live by these principles, surely our churches should be able to do

¹ Clinebell, H. J., "Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic," p. 35.

² Clinebell, op. off., p. 110.

it, too. Let's be humble enough to admit that we have something to learn from this organization. Let's be concerned enough to become an ally and coworker in this great task of human redemption.

But the great principles of the Bible and of our faith call us to take one more step. We must not only be concerned to help and to redeem the alcoholic; we must also be committed to those individual habits and to those forces in society which stand against this evil thing that is wrecking so many lives. Trying to help and to redeem alcoholics without standing against the liquor traffic which does so much to create alcoholics would be like building a rescue station at the bottom of a cliff to help those who have fallen over, without working at the top of the cliff to keep others from falling.

Now, this is the point where it is up to each one of us to decide just how we are going to take our stand. As I have pointed out, the Bible makes it clear that God expects us to stand for the right, regardless of what others may think or say. Wendell Phillips, the great opponent of slavery, who stood out against this evil force when most of his contemporaries were simply closing their eyes and ignoring it, said: "We must each learn to feel, in determining a moral question, as if there was no one else in the universe but God and ourselves." This is the thing I would ask each of you to do this morning as you consider what stand you are going to take on this moral question of the drinking and distribution of beverage alcohol. Face it as if there was no one else in the universe but God and yourself.

As you know, I believe that total abstinence is the stand which God wants me to take. As I try to look at this question with the mind and the spirit of Christ, I cannot find a single good that can come from drinking beverage alcohol; but I can see innumerable dangers and evils. The one benefit which is usually argued is that moderate drinking relieves tensions and heightens sociability. But I am convinced that drinkers who are honest will admit that the ultimate tensions which are created are worse than the tensions which are relieved. One moderate drinker who decided to quit, wrote: "No doubt alcohol removed my tension. But it acted like a spot remover that takes the cloth with it. I came to see that I should do something more intelligent about the tension than to pour jiggers of rum over it."²

Briefly, then, let me tell you why I believe that total abstinence is the only way I can be true to the mind and the spirit of Christ.

First: even moderate drinking retards those parts of the brain which have to do with moral judgments and discrimination. In other words, it dulls the voice of conscience, and draws one just a little farther from God and a little closer to the animal. Dr. Robert Dovenmuehle, professor of psychiatry at Duke University Medical Center, writes: "The conscience is the latest and most highly complex of the developments in human personality, and it is the part of the organized personality that shows most markedly the effects of the depressive action of alcohol." Now, I don't know about you, but I believe that the voice of conscience is something sacred. And I cannot believe God would approve my doing anything that would dull or distort that voice.

Second: I do not drink because by so doing I would be placing my stamp of approval upon an industry which breeds crime, wrecks homes, pollutes government, and causes thousands of unnecessary highway accidents and deaths. And on this last point, let me say that safety engineers re-

port that moderate drinking causes more highway accidents than heavy drinking. Just this week, Mr. Claud McCommet, who heads the safety division of Kansas State Highway Department, told the Topeka Rotary Club that those who drink just enough to grow talkative and careless are the most dangerous drivers on our streets and highways.

Third: I do not drink because even my moderate drinking might bring me or someone influenced by me to become a problem drinker or an alcoholic. The doctors and scientists say there is no way to determine in advance whether a person might become an alcoholic or not. All we know is that of every hundred men who drink, nine and one-half become alcoholics; and of every hundred women who drink, two and one-half become alcoholics.³ So, there is always the danger that any moderate drinker, under proper conditions of stress, may change from the casual drinker to the compulsive drinker. And I would hate to feel that my example had led one of my children or one of my friends to become an alcoholic. Paul wrote: "Take care lest this liberty of yours somehow become a stumbling block to the weak. If food is a cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to fall." Bishop Hazen Werner somewhere in one of his books suggests that the moderate drinker is the most dangerous carrier of the terrible disease of alcoholism. He is like the boy with a slight case of scarlet fever who is not very sick and so he goes to school. He is not sick but he infects others, some of them fatally. I have seen it happen and I am sure you have too where a father who drank moderately infected his son who, in turn, drank fatally.

This is a desperate problem which confronts our Nation and our society. It is one which leaves no place for neutrality. Jesus said, "He that is not with Me is against Me"; and I know He must be calling on each of us to stand where He would stand on this problem. It may not be right where I stand. I would not argue that with you. All I ask is that you ask yourself as seriously and as honestly as you know how: "What would Christ want me to do on this matter?"

With that question in your mind, will you join me in looking at the commitment check list which you received as you came into the service today. Please notice that this is a secret ballot. There is no place for you to sign your name. No one but God will know how you vote.

² Clinebell, op. cit., p. 34.

A Letter From President Garcia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the text of a letter written by the President of the Philippines, Carlos P. Garcia, to my good friend Mr. Max Abelman, sometimes described as Brooklyn's ambassador of good will.

The text of President Garcia's letter to Mr. Abelman is as follows:

MALACAÑANG PALACE,
January 8, 1959.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: I am returning herewith the copy of our picture which you requested me to autograph. While writing

my personal greetings on it, I had in mind our cordial exchange of correspondence even before I had the opportunity of visiting the United States and meeting you in person.

You informed me in your letter that you were for some time confined in bed. I sincerely hope that your health has improved by now. After a festive holiday season, I also take this opportunity to convey to you and your family my best wishes for a prosperous and happy new year.

With warm regards and prayers for your good health, I am,

Truly yours,

CARLOS P. GARCIA.

Poison in Your Water—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the American Legion magazine for October 1953 by Robert and Leona Rienow telling how we are filling our waters with raw sewage, rotting vegetable matter; corrosive chemicals, industrial oil, dead fish and animal matter, acids, germs of a thousand kind, including viruses, dysentery, cholera, typhus—some authorities include polio—also deadly dyes, grits, canning filth, slaughterhouse leavings, the effluvia from hospitals and mortuaries and, of late, small amounts of radioactive wastes from atomic fission installations. This goes into the water that you and I and the citizens of this United States drink and bathe in. The article is as follows:

THEY CALL IT DRINKING WATER

(By Robert and Leona Rienow)

"The water that you drink today may once have quaffed Caesar's thirst." So reads the caption for a cast iron pipe ad picturing a Roman in war togs with a beaker to his lips. What a romantic thought. Yet a couple thousand years of nature's purifying water cycle—evaporation to rain to evaporation—take the curse off the secondhand drink. The pipe company has safely made its point that water is indestructible.

But when the Public Health Service points out that the "water you use may have been flushed down somebody else's bathroom" perhaps yesterday or the day before—the romantic thought loses its glitter. Of course, in this newly crowded country of ours, we are going to have to accustom ourselves to using rehabilitated water for household as well as for industrial purposes. Crowded people can't be squeamish.

The issue in America now is not how to get enough pure, nature cycle water—it is how to get enough potable water for all of us and our industry. The steadily mounting deluge of pollutants which we are discharging into our once clean streams, ponds, and lakes is doing more than adding an increasing menace to the public health. In many places it has become so bad that it is curtailing industry.

Unless we clamp down drastically on our present pollution rate, we won't even have enough of this secondhand, rejuvenated water. Already Wheeling, W. Va. is throwing its dry sponge on Ohio River water; it just can't purify it.

When our tap water becomes so rank that it affects the flavor of our coffee and our beer, then we shall have a home demonstration of the social crime of pollution. Yes, 90 million

² Brewster, Channing. "Why I Gave Up Liquor," reprinted from Reader's Digest by Methodist Board of Education.

³ "Alcohol and Personality," a folder published by TEM Press, Washington, D.C.

Americans depend on rivers and lakes to slake their thirst; so 90 million Americans can be wronged.

Ironically, this is the 10th anniversary of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which, presumably, was to be tried for 10 years before more drastic steps were taken.

How do we stack up after 10 years? Here are the facts: We have one-tenth more domestic sewage in our rivers than ever before. Why? We made a fair try, but it wasn't good enough to keep up with the increased population. Before the act, 82 percent of our municipal sewage poured untreated into our public waters; now only 58 percent spills into our streams raw. If we went in for Russian statistical methods, these percentages might satisfy us. But the truth is, we are falling behind.

Industry unloaded 81 percent of the wastes into streams untreated before the act; the figure has now come down to 40 percent. Again, that looks fine until you note that the smaller percentage represents twice the total industrial pollution of a quarter century ago.

Even good water is filled with life forms. We stopped in at the filtration plant for the city of Albany the other day to take a look at a drop of water under the microscope. With a roster of 64 kinds of algae and bacteria at our elbow we tried to take the roll of this teeming liquid. It was like trying to identify a friend at the Army-Navy game. But this was the finest water drawn from a woodland reservoir.

What are some of the less tasty items which are glutting our watercourses, poisoning our fish and waterfowl, befouling our sources of drinking water? There is raw sewage, rotting vegetable matter, corrosive chemicals, industrial oil, dead fish, and animal matter, acids, germs of a thousand kinds including viruses, dysentery, cholera, typhus (some authorities include polio); also deadly dyes, grits, canning filth, slaughterhouse leavings, the effluvia from hospitals and mortuaries and, of late, small amounts of radioactive wastes from atomic fission installations.

Altogether we have 22,000 sewage and industrial outlets into our once clear streams. Of these, 11,800 drain municipal sewage systems; they serve more than 92 million people. Now hold your hat (and perhaps your nose); the wastes from only 54,500,000 of these people have undergone any treatment at all.

When the Ohio River is low, 1 quart out of every gallon of water in the stream has been belched into it by a sewer. Go out to the South Platte River below Denver in the dry season and you will find four-fifths of its contents is effluent from the sewage treatment plant.

But in our highly industrial Nation 60 percent of the waste that burdens our creeks and rivers comes from industry's 10,400 outlets. The National Association of Manufacturers tells us that four out of five plants do nothing to their wastes.

Industry has increased by 700 percent since 1900. It will double again by 1975. Already the combined industrial and municipal discharge into the streams of America equals the raw sewage of 150 million people. It is going to be increasingly difficult for Tin Pan Alley to find a river to get romantic about.

Silt: American rivers were once deep, swift, and leaping with game fish. Today they are sluggish and much shallower, clogged not only with wastes but with huge cargoes of silt which eroded off the watersheds after the land was stripped of its thick tree and plant robe. Swift-flowing rivers decontaminate themselves by the purifying action of sun and air. These silt-choked water courses cannot begin to handle the overload of excreta, offal, bilge, and filth we pour into them.

Sewage: It is only in the last 200 years that municipal sewer systems have been constructed. Much of our sewage is concentrated at a few outlet points; more of it is inadequately treated. The need is for new sewage treatment plants at 6,600 places.

But these additional facilities are only the beginning of our needs. We must contend with the projected population figure of 200 million people by 1975, most of them urban. Nor should we overlook the little towns big enough to hang their houses on a sewer line but too small to buy a disposal plant.

Industrial wastes: If we had enough pride and wanted to spend the money, we could handle municipal sewage. We know how to treat it. But industrial wastes are increasing so fast disposal know-how can't keep up with them. A recent Merck index of chemicals lists 8,000; 2,900 of these did not appear in an edition only 12 years earlier. Since all chemical and most manufacturing plants have great quantities of wastes to get rid of, industry is alarmed. The Manufacturing Chemists Association is spending millions yearly on pollution research.

But paper mills, slaughterhouses, woolen mills, and all industrial and governmental installations have their pollution headaches. Our laughing waters are laughing no longer; they are in their death throes.

Oil dumping: Not only is our waterfowl poisoned by our evil inland waters, but many thousands of them succumb each year to the oil slick which oil-burning vessels continually pour out over the waters along our coasts. In spite of the law passed in 1924 which forbids jettisoning of oil in coastal areas, sea captains, barge captains, and even United States naval commanders defy the law with impunity. They rely on the snide provision in the statute which demands that the Coast Guard patrol must witness the actual dumping before making an arrest.

An observer for Audubon magazine (January-February 1957) counted, on Long Island, more than 400 oiled gannets, loons, grebes, Bonaparte's gulls, razor-billed auks, dovekeys, and ducks on the beaches between Montauk Point and Coney Island. * * * The worst offenders are the great aircraft carriers. * * * I have seen dead ducks by the hundreds washed up in the seaweed at high water mark."

Moreover, oil sludge dumped into the River Rouge at Detroit has been known to destroy thousands of ducks and other waterfowl. It is a grimy story all round.

We are already paying a big price in water scarcity. We will pay more. Water reclamation is much costlier than waste treatment at the source. Our growing water scarcity problems are directly related to our growing recklessness in waste disposal.

Living in the midst of a network of open sewers is hazardous enough. But the scientifically guarded border we have set up between sewer water and drinking water is a precarious one. We live on the edge of a human or mechanical failure that might bring pestilence down upon us. This danger becomes more imminent every year.

At the same time, as crowds increase and leisure time lengthens, spots for recreation—breathers from the crush—become more precious. But who dares swim in our rivers any more? Turgid and oil-begrimed, our once scintillating rivers slink past the dump heaps and around the back doors of our towns. Gone are the canoes, launches, and rowboats. For the hardy who insist on river recreation, speedboats, and yachts (no dangling of hands) are the only recourse.

Yet what delights we forgo at our doorstep because of the misuse of our waterways. Rather than spend the money and effort to retrieve them for the joys of boating, fishing, swimming, and picnics, we doggedly pack into the car and buck the traffic for 50 miles or more as we join the hordes

in feverish search of a clear lake. We fondly believe we are saving money; yet it is hardly economic to pollute the old swimming hole and then mortgage the community to build a chlorinated swimming pool for our children. Scarcely a community in the United States has not squandered its recreational heritage because of a penny-wise sanitation system.

Besides the loss of good water, of trout fishing, recreation, and fun—besides the constant menace to health—there are other disadvantages to our sewer-stream network. The shad and mackerel runs that once made our eastern rivers wriggle with life are now only a legend. Where once the salmon take in a western valley was \$5 million a year, the sewage cut it down to less than \$1 million.

But commercial fishing is only one industry that has paid the price. Today industrial water is at a premium. Once almost a free commodity, it has become an important item in production costs. Communities without supplies of acceptable water obviously cannot attract new industries. Their development is at a standstill.

Under the Pollution Control Act of 1948, the Federal Government: (a) Works out pollution programs, (b) underwrites research on industrial waste treatment, (c) gives technical aid to the States, industries and regions, (d) offers financial assistance to the States, to industries, and to the interstate bodies, (e) helps along the idea of interstate cooperation, and (f) disseminates information.

To date, the act may be called something of a failure. It was slow in getting off the ground. Congress, which had committed itself to a \$135 million outlay over a 5-year period, had coughed up but \$8.4 million in the first 4 years of the act, most of it for research. Only as the tenth disappointing anniversary approached, in 1956, did Congress unlatch its purse with a 10-year authorization of \$500 million for municipal sewage systems and treatment facilities. At length a little hard cash started to spill on the counter—\$38 million, in fact—and nearly 500 projects are underway. "A pittance," cried some. "Interference" snapped others.

But the truth is, the financial support offered by the Federal Government is little more than an incentive for local communities to pitch in themselves. The community itself must pick up the chit.

And the price is high. Roughly, the removal of 35 percent of the pollution effect of sewage costs about \$35 a person a year. Raise the removal percentage to 75, and the price doubles—to \$70 a person a year. Do the best possible job of 90 percent removal and the annual per capita cost zooms to \$110.

Of course, what is paid out to reduce the pollutant content of sewage is saved by the next user in treating the water supply. It is just that people are less likely to change oil in the car they are about to trade in.

Before 1956 we were spending \$230 million a year on abatement works. We spent in the vicinity of \$340 million in 1957. Yet the official estimate calls for an outlay of \$500 million a year for the next 10 years if we want to catch up with the backlog and meet the growing needs.

All this is only the story of municipal sewage. Add the industrial wastes to this municipal sewage and what is the price of cleaning up our streams? Say the experts with a sigh: "About \$10 billion over 10 years."

We will never begin to restore our inland and coastal waters—to experience again the healthful activities and delights of sparkling streams and clean, spring-fed lakes—until we arouse public opinion. It is true that the water scarcity—which will worsen every year—will jar some smug thinking out of the rut. But unless our thinkers and leaders—service organizations, town and city officials,

editors, and educators—raise the white flag of clean streams and start the parade, we are doomed to spend the rest of our lives in the stench of our open sewer network.

Some communities have fought through to victory. When the citizens of Cumberland, Md., were shocked by the withdrawal of a large glass company's proposal to build in their city because of the pollution in the Potomac River at their site, they acted—and fast. A \$1,500,000 appropriation for a new sewage treatment plant brought a lucrative new payroll to town.

The clogged and poisoned Schuylkill River of Pennsylvania has been redeemed. The Kansas River has been relieved of much of its sewage indigestion. Because of the fine teamwork among the cities of Athens, Lancaster, Logan, and Nelsonville, the Hocking River in Ohio again runs clean and sweet-smelling. With the facelifting of these rivers came a soul lifting of the people on the banks.

The cost of operating a treatment plant may run as high as \$90 per million gallons in a small plant. But this charge can be cut to \$15 per million gallons in a large installation, such as one of those built by Los Angeles. Unit construction costs are also reduced when many small communities band together on disposal. Most important advantage, of course, is that joint sewage disposal for a densely settled section imposes the same standards on all and gives the same protection to all in that area.

Seattle, Wash., offers an example of sectional cooperation. Greater Seattle had been spilling 20 million gallons of raw sewage and effluent into its beautiful Lake Washington every day. The lake is—or was—a major recreational attraction, not only for the natives but for tourists.

When, therefore, in 1957, the lake threatened to be a pestilence rather than a joy, the aroused citizens pushed an act through the State legislature, which, subject to approval by the citizenry at the polls, creates a general water council. This council, nicknamed "Metro," will not only build great sewage-treatment plants for the entire area of 200 local councils, but it will coordinate all area-wide problems of water supply, parkways, parks, and the like. The treated effluent will be piped far out into Puget Sound.

Sewage and treatment costs for the smaller areas will plummet, as will upkeep. And, best of all, a premium comes with the purchase—a clean and respectable Lake Washington.

What is more, pollution control by industry is bound to take its cue from aroused public opinion in a district, and fall in behind the band. Rochester, N.Y., recently witnessed the construction of a \$1,500,000 industrial waste treatment plant. Industries near Houston, Tex., are working at the pollution problem with organized fervor, and the Niagara River industries are spending millions on pollution research. Industry is in desperate need of more and more water—clean water. Foul water is not industrial water.

We have learned a good many things in our first 10 years of playing around with water pollution control. We have sheaves of blueprints of our sick river basins—blueprints which the Public Health Service has painstakingly drafted for every area in the Nation. They are waiting for communities to pick them up to study. We have the know-how when it comes to processing sewage for greatest river protection. We have Uncle Sam's promise of active help.

All that we need now is more pride in ourselves and in our communities as Americans. Once that pride gets its back up, we will find the cash.

Fair Workload for Douglas Aircraft Needed—Airlift Issue Points a Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial carried on January 20 by the Santa Monica Evening Outlook points out a lack of workload situation that should be high in the consideration of Air Force contracting officials:

A COMMUNITY APPEAL FOR DOUGLAS

In the last week an extraordinary thing has happened in the Santa Monica Bay-district, caused by an extraordinary situation. Labor organizations have joined with the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce in urging the Defense Department, and particularly the U.S. Air Force, to give more consideration to the Douglas Aircraft Co. in big defense contracts. Repeatedly in the last 18 months this great company, with a record of plane and missile building second to none in the United States, has been passed over in the award of such contracts.

Apparently the chief reason has been the success of other areas in claiming a local unemployment situation. To distribute defense contracts with a view to relieving unemployment has been an admittedly paramount concern of the Eisenhower administration, and a most proper one. On this ground, and because of its economic importance to Seattle and the State of Washington, the Boeing Co. has secured more than one big defense contract, which should rightfully have gone to Douglas. Had other factors been allowed to govern. As a result, Douglas now is threatened with a shortage of big defense orders which will work great hardship on its entire labor force, and on every community having a Douglas plant, unless it is soon remedied.

In the last week union members working at the Santa Monica and El Segundo plants have written nearly 3,000 letters to Congress, protesting the decline in work at the two facilities. And the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce has addressed a strong appeal to the U.S. Air Force, that the Douglas Co. be given favorable consideration in the forthcoming award of a big defense contract for early warning and interceptor aircraft. Representatives of southern California in Washington, notably Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON and Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE, are lending their efforts to convince Defense Department and Air Force officials that the Douglas Co. must no longer be slighted.

We call this an extraordinary situation, when the company which has led all others in developing and building both military and civilian aircraft is denied its rightful share of defense orders. Relieving unemployment in the aircraft industry is a most desirable purpose, but it should not be carried to the extent of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Not only is the Douglas Co. preeminent in the aircraft industry, but its contribution is essential to the success of our U.S. missile program, and to the ability of our civilian airlines to compete with rapidly growing and largely subsidized foreign lines. The threat to the Douglas Co. is a most serious one, and it is a threat to the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, partly responsible for the situation outlined in the editorial is an-

other factor which many feel should not have come into being. Some 18 months ago the Air Force canceled its contract with Douglas for development and production of the C-132 aircraft. This was to be a very large, fast, long-range airlift workhorse. It would provide massive mobility to our Armed Forces, particularly the Army, in limited war situations and the deterrence thereof.

Since this is a service-type operation performed by the Air Force for other branches of the military, some felt Air Force officials canceled the C-132 more in consideration of financing its own primary missions than in a regard for executing its service operations for other branches. This, of course, may not be the fact, and it is not my intention hereby to level criticism at the Air Force. I relate this only because it does illustrate that careful and intelligent thinking must be applied to determine what kind, how much and how fast and airlift capability is necessary for the proper protection of the Nation and to the problem of financing it and maintaining it in being.

The November 1958 issue of News Front magazine contained the following informative article and chart dealing with the airlift issue:

HOW MUCH AIRLIFT?

Three times in the past 6 months the U.S. Armed Forces have shown that they can "get there fustest."

In May, within 14 hours of President Eisenhower's decision to extend armed protection, if needed, to Vice President Nixon during the final stage of his South American tour, the Air Force had acted. It had flown 498 paratroopers with full equipment to Caribbean bases close to mob-threatened Caracas, Venezuela.

In July, on the very day the United States announced it was sending troops to Lebanon at the request of then President Camille Chamoun, a composite air strike force flew to Adana, Turkey, to back up marines landing south of Beirut.

In August when the Chinese Communist bombardment of Quemoy and its tiny neighbors seemed to presage an attempt to invade Formosa, another composite air strike force was flown across the Pacific to the Nationalist stronghold.

But inability to complete Confederate Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest's strategic formula, to get there by air not only "fustest" but "with the mostest" is perhaps the gravest of current United States military weaknesses.

The force flown to the Caribbean by the 314th and 63d Troop Carrier Wings at the time of the Nixon incident was intended—and strong enough—merely for police action.

The composite air strike force which flew to Adana was drawn from troops in Germany, not from Tactical Air Command units in the United States which had received special "brush-fire" training for just such eventualities.

The reason, it was reported at the time, was that enough airlift was not available in the United States—and thus the risk of temporarily weakening West Europe NATO forces had to be taken.

The Formosa flight was but the spearhead of a still continuing Formosa buildup and, like the Adana venture, was primarily important to show United States will and military capability.

Gen. O. P. Weyland, chief of the Tactical Air Command, recently stated that "we are

unable to transport and air support a force of much more than division size on a single lift."

The Army Information Digest said:

"The United States should be able to airlift a decisive limited war force to any place in the world in 4 or 5 days. . . ."

"But there is an alarming lack of modernization in our troop-and-supply carrying air fleet."

The first full bitter cost of airlift inadequacy was paid by Great Britain and France, not the United States.

Had the island-hopping Mediterranean airlift which brought their forces to Suez in the fall of 1956 been completed even 1 day faster, most experts believe, the entire canal area would have been occupied and Egypt's President Nasser toppled before the U.N., prodded by the Soviet Union and the United States, could have intervened.

But, for lack of transport planes, the Allied troops were late, the two nations were forced to beat an ignominious retreat—and Soviet prestige in the Middle East soared at the expense of the West.

Suez emphasized what was first demonstrated in Korea, when the airlines and commercial charter companies were pressed into service with the Military Air Transport Service to do the airlift job with planes which, mostly, were neither designed nor suited for it. As Donald Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., recently pointed out, "Korea was a lesson in the lack of proper airlift preparedness."

An airborne division contains 11,488 men; to move it, with supplies and equipment, means airlifting 7,000 tons. (A standard infantry division has 13,748 men, with more—and heavier—equipment.) By the 10-ton-per-plane estimate used as a working rule of thumb, 700 planes would be needed to airlift an airborne division.

To meet an airlift emergency, the Armed Forces can call immediately upon some 1,725

planes, more than 2½ times, on paper, the number needed for a division lift.

But many of these, including the 368 airliners of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, are primarily passenger planes, although the greatest need is for cargo capacity. Besides, abruptly pulling airliners out of civilian service would cripple vital domestic schedules.

The 600 planes of the Air Force Reserve, manned by "weekend warrior" crews, are slow C-119 transports with only 3 tons' capacity. Out of the 1,725 available planes, less than 200 are jet-prop powered, the rest have piston engines.

Ideal for transporting the streamlined pentomic division are the Lockheed Hercules C-130 and the Douglas Cargomaster C-133, both turbine-powered (jet-prop) aircraft.

The C-130 can carry 92 percent of the different items needed by an airborne division—and carry them 4,000 miles without refueling.

The Tactical Air Command estimates it can load 12½ tons into each C-130 for deployment to Europe or Africa, and 7½ for a Far East flight. (More space is needed for fuel.)

But the Air Force has only about 160 C-130's (96 in TAC), and to support for a month a Composite Air Strike Force Wing would require continuous use of 49. Sustaining a division would require some 150.

The Douglas Cargomaster C-133 has a capacity of almost 50 tons, but the Air Force has only a handful.

Why is U.S. airlift capacity low?

Primarily, because defense emphasis has been placed on nuclear deterrent rather than tactical potential, on a bigger bang for a buck.

Airlift, in comparison with such more glamorous and publicized military activities as the Strategic Air Command and missile development, has received very low budget priority.

But there is another problem: just how much airlift is enough? How many "brush-fire" crises will erupt on the free world periphery, and how far will they be from the

"continental United States? Will two or more occur at the same time?

Should the United States develop, now, airlift capacity for a full-scale, multifront global war?

There is, industry and the military agree, no perfect solution.

But the most practicable approach the experts also agree lies in combining modernization with flexibility and capacity for rapid expansion.

Douglas engineers assert that a fleet of 107 turboprops (such as the C-133) could, with more efficiency and economy, replace the entire present MATS fleet.

Dr. Allen R. Ferguson, research director of Northwestern University Transportation Center, proposes that the Air Force lease, not buy, its turbine-powered transports.

He claims that this would greatly increase flexibility, and that "it should be possible to compute a rental less than the cost of operating the existing (MATS) piston fleet and still be enough to provide an adequate return for the lessors."

For actual combat conditions, the Stroukoff Aircraft Co. is developing an attack transport, the YC-134, which can land almost anywhere. But it is still experimental.

Not only is flying troops abroad to trouble spots, as needed, cheaper than permanent garrisons, but world developments are making it more desirable. A leading authority writes:

"It is only a matter of time before we will find it better diplomacy to bring our troops home from West Germany, Italy, and South Korea than to leave them there. The ideal arrangement would be to have only token forces abroad and the bulk ready to fly in at short notice."

But as Maj. Gen. Robert F. Sink, commander of the 18th Corps (Airborne), stated recently:

"If we don't have the means of getting transportation . . . why, hell, we stay at home."

U.S. military airlift planes

Company	Type	Pounds	Capacity (cubic feet)	Troops	Cruising speed	Range (nonrefuel)
Lockheed	Hercules turboprop C-130	36,900-40,000	4,300	92	370 miles per hour	4,000 miles (maximum range); 1,750 miles (maximum payload).
Do.	Constellation C-121 or R-7V	40,000	5,500	58-94	334 miles per hour	4,447 miles (maximum range); 2,837 miles (maximum payload).
Douglas	Cargomaster turboprop C-133	41,700-95,000	13,500		315 miles per hour	4,000 miles (maximum range); 1,750 miles (maximum payload).
Do.	Globemaster C-124	74,000		200	250 miles per hour	4,000 miles.
Do.	Liftmaster C-118 or DC-6			54-89	315 miles per hour	5,000 miles.
Do.	C-54, R-5D5 or DC-4	6,300-13,000		50	177 miles per hour	2,415 miles (maximum range); 1,150 miles (maximum payload).
Do.	C-47, R-4D7 or DC-3	7,500		21-30	167 miles per hour	2,200 miles (maximum range); 1,440 miles (maximum payload).
Stroukoff Aircraft Co.	Assault transport YC-134	30,000			250 miles per hour	4,750 miles (maximum range); 600 miles (maximum payload).
Boeing	KC-135		6,660		Over 600 miles per hour	4,000 miles.
Do.	Stratocruiser C-97			130	Over 300 miles per hour	4,300 miles.
Convair Division, General Dynamics	C-131			48	200 miles per hour	2,150 miles.
Fairchild	Provider C-123B	16,000-18,000		60	188 miles per hour	3,450 miles (maximum range); 1,150 miles (maximum payload).
Do.	C-119	6,850	3,150	62	175 miles per hour	3,480 miles.

Putting Our Surpluses to Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my great desire and hope that this Congress take affirmative action toward finding a workable solution to our farm problem, I submit as an extension of my

remarks, the following editorial entitled "Putting Our Surpluses to Use," which appeared in the January 18, 1959, issue of the Des Moines Sunday Register. The editorial follows:

PUTTING OUR SURPLUSES TO USE

John H. Davis, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and now a professor at Harvard University, has recommended that the program for distributing American farm surpluses overseas be placed on a long-range basis.

Davis made a study for the Eisenhower administration of the operations of Public Law 480. This is the law which permits the sale of farm surpluses for foreign currency, as well as barter trades for strategic minerals.

Davis believes the program has been working fairly well, but he argues that both the United States and recipient countries could make it work better if it were set up on a 5-year plan.

Davis believes the sales for foreign currency could be gradually cut back if the program were on a 5-year schedule, instead of year-to-year operation. He thinks countries using the surplus farm products could prepare for a tapering off of these low-cost imports. At the same time, he believes United States could make needed adjustments in farm production.

It makes sense to establish the farm export programs on a long-range basis. But we doubt very much that it will be possible to taper off in 5 years. The lack of success in

adjusting farm production in this country in the past suggests that Mr. Davis is unduly optimistic about the future.

It is more probable that the United States will have still larger surpluses of farm products in the years ahead. At any rate, a long-range plan for use of these products in foreign economic development programs would be a good thing to have on hand.

The United States cannot operate in this field most effectively on its own. It should attempt to bring Canada, Australia, Argentina, and other surplus-producing countries into a joint program for using food surpluses to aid economic development in the poor countries. Controls need to be set up to prevent these donations or cut-price sales from interfering with normal commercial trade. International cooperation is needed to avoid charges of dumping or unfair usurpation of markets.

The Davis report deserves serious consideration by the administration and Congress. It would be a start toward a more sensible policy for utilization of farm surpluses.

Address by AFL-CIO President George Meany to a Joint United States-Canadian Labor Education Conference at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in spite of herculean efforts in the past few years, the local school districts have not been able to cut into the backlog of our classroom shortage. We still need more than 130,000 classrooms to educate our children. Of equal importance is the shortage of trained teachers. The following address by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, to the joint United States-Canadian Labor Education Conference held here in Washington on January 14, calls for immediate Federal assistance to the States to alleviate this crisis. He eloquently sets forth some of the reasons Congress should pass my bill, H.R. 22, which would provide for grants in aid for school construction and assistance in the payment of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Meany's speech follows:

Permit me to express my appreciation to the trade union representatives who are taking part in this conference on the urgent problems of education.

It seems you have come to the right place at the right time. The 86th Congress has just begun its sessions. Last Friday it listened to a message on the state of the Union which did not contain a single mention—not a single word—about the critical classroom deficit that exists throughout our country.

What we have to say at this conference about the shortcomings of our educational system may therefore serve to fill the gap. It may prove educational even to our highly educated Government officials and lawmakers. And let it not be considered presumptuous for labor to point the way, because it was our own trade union movement at its first national convention in 1881 that started the ball rolling for universal free education for the Nation's children.

Even if America's educational retrogression were to be considered in a vacuum, the picture would be disturbing. But looking at it, as we must, in comparison with the enormous strides taken by Soviet Russia, our retreat becomes alarming.

Last year an on-the-spot study of the amazing educational progress achieved by Soviet Russia was made by 10 leading American educators. In his report on that survey, one of our honored guests, Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, said:

"We are today in competition with a nation of vast resources, a people of seemingly unbounded enthusiasm for self-development and fired with conviction that future supremacy belongs to those with the best-trained minds, those who will work hard and sacrifice."

Commissioner Derthick called the turn. Recent occurrences in interplanetary space have made it painfully clear that Soviet Russia has outstripped us in certain scientific and technological fields, at least.

Just think of it—a nation whose people only two generations ago were almost wholly illiterate, today is turning out more scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians than we are.

We cannot consider this development with passive equanimity. It is not merely a blow to our national pride, but a distinct menace to our national safety. We are under no illusions as to the Kremlin's immediate policies or ultimate aims. The Communists are seeking and will never stop seeking world supremacy. America is the only major power which stands in the way of that goal. The cold war we are now enduring will inevitably become a hot war whenever the Kremlin is convinced it can win it. No other considerations count with Khrushchev and his associates.

Let me emphasize that I am no admirer of the Kremlin's educational concepts. The needs of humanity, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, can never be satisfied by chemical, electronic, or rocket exploits. Higher education will be truly high only when it enhances both the spiritual and material values of humanity—when it secures freedom, social justice, and enduring world peace. From our point of view, no education is complete or worthwhile unless people are encouraged to think for themselves, instead of being forced to follow the narrow channels ordained by a dictatorship.

But that doesn't take away the threat to our national security posed by Soviet Russia's educational advances. That threat is ominously symbolized today by the Lunik, the sputniks, and by Russia's acknowledged superiority in long-range missiles and rocket engines.

Since these are the products of the Kremlin's educational thrust, let us beware. The very fact that Soviet Russia's educational progress has become a potential weapon in her arsenal of international aggression compels us to give priority to improvement of our own educational system as a vital part of our national defense program.

It is not enough to attempt to make up lost ground by giving Federal scholarships for advanced study to scientific and technological students. Our school problems begin where the child begins—in the elementary school—and they exist all the way through high school and college. We must undertake a complete overhaul.

Toward that end, let us first consider the acute shortage of classrooms that afflicts even our more prosperous States. According to conservative estimates, we will need at least a quarter of a million new classrooms in the next 5 years to accommodate higher enrollment and to replace obsolete, rundown firetraps. How are we going to get this construction job done? There is no point in further talk of meeting this problem at the school district level, or even

the community or State level. Their tax well has run dry.

The responsibility of rebuilding our school plant to regain the advantage we have lost to Soviet Russia is not a local problem. It is not a State problem. It is clearly a national challenge and we can meet it only at the national level.

Two years ago the administration proposed a Federal program of aid for school building involving the expenditure of over a billion dollars in 4 years. There was no follow-up and nothing happened. Last year no program of any description was advanced to meet the classroom shortage.

The second educational problem which is causing growing apprehension is the poor quality of teaching many American children now receive. Surveys all over the country have found that our elementary schools are sending to high school students who have not absorbed the basics of the three "R's"; that the high schools are sending to the colleges and universities young people who manifest not only obvious educational inadequacies but who do not even like to learn.

To meet this problem, President Eisenhower last week proposed a study by a representative citizens' committee. He told Congress: "We must have teachers of competence. To get them and hold them, we need standards."

If by this statement, the President means we need higher salaries and better working conditions for teachers we of labor agree with him fully. But why is another time-wasting study necessary to corroborate this simple fact? Can anyone doubt that most teachers in America today are grossly underpaid? According to the Government's own figures, they receive less pay per child than the average baby sitter.

Every study so far made shows that thousands of high-grade teachers have quit the profession to take over jobs in industry at which they can earn a better living. Likewise, not enough qualified young people are attracted to teaching because it offers a dead end instead of an economic future. As a result last year—and undoubtedly the same condition still prevails—more than 90,000 full-time teachers who held substandard certificates were employed on an emergency basis.

There is only one way of effectively ending that emergency—to establish higher salary standards for teachers, a move that is long overdue. Here again, our Federal Government must assume the responsibility for action because we can look to no other source to assume the financial burden.

Our third major educational problem involves enforcement of the Supreme Court's ruling against racial segregation in the public schools. While the Supreme Court directed that its decision be carried out with all deliberate speed, it has met with all deliberate obstruction. In two States, the Governors have even closed schools rather than comply with the law of the land.

This is unquestionably a difficult problem but it cannot be solved by nullification of the law. Nor can it be solved by abandoning responsibility to the States. Already college presidents are faced with the necessity of refusing admission to high-school seniors who were deprived of the opportunity to complete their courses last year. This waste of time and human resources cannot be tolerated by American parents any more than by their Government. The time has come for Federal authorities to bring about compliance with law and order and to accord Negro children throughout the country their right to equal educational opportunities.

There are two auxiliary educational programs of prime importance that I will mention only briefly because they have been discussed by other speakers at this conference. I refer to the need for improved vocational education and for Federal scholarships

to permit the great number of talented students who now have to quit school prematurely for economic reasons to continue with their educational development.

All these programs, of course, will cost a great deal. There is no getting away from it—somehow or other, now and in the years to come, we are going to have to raise much more money and spend much more money for education.

The decision can no longer safely be avoided. It must be faced courageously and effectively.

Unfortunately, the educational crisis has come to a head at a time when Washington has suddenly become preoccupied with budget balancing and fiscal economies.

The American people are looking for bolder and more forward-looking leadership.

We have had budgetary deficits before without disastrous results, but an educational deficit of the proportions that will soon pile up can never be overcome.

Congress should take the President at his word when he said, "We can afford everything we clearly need, but we cannot afford one cent of waste."

For the sake of survival, for the future well-being of humanity, we clearly need and we can easily afford the funds necessary to rebuild and revitalize our educational system. By the same token, we cannot afford, in the name of false economy, to waste the heritage and the opportunities of our children.

Let us meet the educational challenge of our time as "one nation, under God, indivisible." That is the only honest, the only practical, the only available solution.

The Problem of Access to Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the January 15, 1959, issue of the *Conservation News*, a bimonthly publication of the National Wildlife Federation, contains some valuable information on our public lands.

The problem of access to public lands is a critical one. It is, however, an equally complicated problem. Yet as long as access to these lands is difficult or impossible, we fail to achieve the goal of multiple-use development. I am in complete agreement with the *Conservation News* in its statement that "perhaps the time has come for a reappraisal of public benefits to be derived from public lands and the administration of these properties." I am hopeful that such a reappraisal will shortly be forthcoming.

I think this article will be of great interest to all of my colleagues and ask that it be inserted in the *Record* immediately following my remarks:

THE PROBLEM OF ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS

Something of a furor was raised in central Oregon this past fall over advertised plans of a group of ranchers to permit deer hunting on a fee basis over some 1 million acres of land. Many sportsmen's groups and the Oregon Game Commission went on record in opposition to the system, partly because it failed to recognize the right of all citizens to share equally in utilization of the State's wildlife resources and, in addition, because some public lands in Federal ownership were

interspersed among the privately owned territory being advertised for fee hunting.

Reports indicate the fee-hunting plan was something less than a spectacular financial success, yet the incident does serve to point up a major problem, right of the public to enjoy access to, and use of, public lands for lawful recreational purposes.

The situation, largely concentrated in the 11 Western States but applicable to some degree all over the Nation, perhaps is best illustrated in Colorado. A survey just completed by the game and fish department and submitted to a State legislature interim committee reveals that 1½ million acres of public land in Colorado is controlled by private interests: farmers and ranchers, lumbering and mining companies, resorts and even municipalities. Members of the public can reach this land only by going across private property (sometimes for a fee, sometimes free, sometimes access is totally denied) or by detouring around at a considerable distance. Some Federal property is completely encircled by private holdings.

The final report covered 149 separate areas in 28 Colorado counties. The total public acreage controlled by private groups came to 1,462,738 acres, or 12.7 percent of the total public land area in the counties surveyed. From another angle, the study involved 10,788,402 acres, or 78.7 percent of Colorado's national forests. Of this total, 80 percent (8,695,357 acres) was considered to provide good hunting and/or fishing. There were 120 separate areas where the public was denied access to 1,038,190 national forest acres, or 12.1 percent of the total.

Public land access problems in Colorado are applicable, to a considerable extent, throughout the West.

In all, the Federal Government has some 406 million acres of land, exclusive of extensive holdings in Alaska. This huge area is broken down for administration into: National forests, 161 million acres; national parks and monuments, 17 million acres; national wildlife refuges, 10 million acres; military reservations, 25 million acres; and public domain, including grazing districts, 193 million acres. National forests, administered by the U.S. Forest Service Department of Agriculture, are dedicated to multiple use, including recreations such as hunting and fishing. National parks, administered by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, are dedicated to recreational and educational use, except hunting. National refuges, administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior Department, are dedicated to the preservation of wildlife and some provide recreational possibilities, including hunting and fishing. Military reservations are administered by the Department of Defense and offer limited public recreational opportunities, including hunting and fishing, depending upon the type of basic activity and national security. Public domain, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department, comprises the Federal properties which were left after the other lands were withdrawn for special uses.

The public access problem primarily concerns national forests and public domain lands. Each type of land has its own particular problems.

Speaking in generalities, many national forests are located in scenic but rugged mountain territory. Public domain lands constitute desert lands, plateaus, mountains, and odds and ends of Federal real estate, including huge tracts in Alaska.

Public domain property perhaps offer the most acute access problems. Whereas national forests were usually withdrawn or purchased in blocks, they are somewhat more easily administered than the public domain properties which often are widely scattered among more valuable land which was homesteaded, mined, or claimed for other purposes. Many public domain lands are rocky outcroppings, canyons, and gulches, or other unwatered areas of little or no value.

Access to public domain land and national forests is a thorny problem. The areas are so widely scattered and isolated that it is uneconomical to mark boundaries or to fence the properties. Even though State wildlife agencies are providing access to some areas, all cannot be opened in this manner. The Federal agencies understandably are reluctant to resort to condemnation procedures to insure public access to public property but this approach may, in the final determination, offer the only possibility. The Federal Range Code prohibits "interference with licensed hunters or fishermen to enter, and to hunt and fish on the Federal range covered by such license or permit" but many access roads are on private lands.

Admittedly, hunters and fishermen sometimes create damage and dismay for private landowners, but there also is another side to the coin. Denying entry prevents application of good wildlife management practices. It does not allow for proper harvest of such big game animals as deer and elk. When these animals come down to lowlands during the winter, they damage both public and private lands and, by their excessive numbers, create added problems.

Another problem resulting from denied access is one common to all posted property. Whenever hunting and fishing areas are withdrawn from use, greater and greater demands are made upon those still open. In some parts of the West the hunting and fishing pressures for certain forms of wildlife are not so great that, if scattered equally over larger areas, they would be harmful. The concentration problem, however, becomes more acute each time another area is blocked out from proper use.

As an expanding population gains more and more leisure time, increased demands will be made for recreational areas as well as for livestock. Problems of conflict over use of public lands are bound to result. Perhaps the time has come for a reappraisal of public benefits to be derived from public lands and the administration of these properties. Such a reappraisal may reveal the need for basic land-use law revisions.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of freedom who are paying tribute to the brave Ukrainians on their 41st anniversary of their independence.

After years of oppression, they were able to throw off the yoke of Russian rule. Despite Russian attempts to wipe out Ukrainian nationalism, their love of freedom and high ideals prevailed, and when, in 1918, they regained their independence, they proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic. They adopted a democratic form of government, and, with vigor, courage, and hopeful hearts, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Their liberty was short lived, for in 2 years the Russian Communists, by dint of their tremendous forces, again annexed the new Republic to the Soviet Union. Ever since 40 million Ukrainians have been bowed under Soviet rule in captive state; the freedom for which they sacrificed so much has been lost.

It is well that we commemorate the independence and freedom of the Ukrain-

ian National Republic; the people of the Ukraine are not allowed to recall the great day or celebrate by any outward sign. We who cherish liberty and democratic ideals can express our sympathy over their loss and also convey our good wishes that the day will come when their prayers will be answered and their and our hopes fulfilled—the day when a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic is again established.

We commend the Ukrainians now in our country for the splendid contributions they have made to our Nation in the fields of culture, science, and industry, as well as for their participation in our Government as splendid citizens.

Seventy-sixth Anniversary of the Civil Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

MR. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and a tireless champion of Federal employees, the senior Senator from South Carolina, made the principal address at a banquet on January 17, 1959, celebrating the 76th anniversary of the Civil Service Act.

The American Federation of Government Employees sponsored the banquet under the sage and mature leadership of Mr. James Campbell, its national president. Toastmaster for the occasion was the genial and witty Thomas Walters, operations director of the Government Employees Council.

There were many dignitaries present including the Honorable Arthur Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Honorable Barbara Gundersen, member of the Civil Service Commission. General Melvin Maas, a former member of this body and a distinguished member of the Marine Corps whose work among the handicapped is well-known, was present as Chairman of the President's Committee To Employ the Physically Handicapped.

Senator JOHNSTON delivered a stirring address in which he pointed that the vitality of the Nation depends in great measure on the strength of our Federal civil service.

I am honored and privileged to make his remarks a part of this RECORD:

SPEECH BY SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AT THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

President Campbell, Secretary-Treasurer Johnson, Secretary Fleming, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to join with you in observance of the 76th birthday of the Civil Service Act. I always look forward to and enjoy these meetings with you my fellow workers in the Federal service. Meetings of this kind are richly rewarding. They give us a chance to exchange ideas and to develop new ones.

New ideas and fresh thinking are needed today. We cannot afford to become sterile

or stale in our thinking or in the way in which we act.

Our way of life depends on our national strength and vitality.

The vitality of the Federal civil service will remain strong in the future on a balanced diet of improved public opinion, purpose and progress.

I long have held to the belief that our civil service has been the victim of undeserved bad publicity. It has been the victim of an unfortunate lack of understanding by the public of what it is and of what it does. If the man-in-the-street knew it as we do, there would be no need to concern ourselves with the problem of public opinion.

Unfortunately, that is not the case today. Neither will it be tomorrow unless positive steps are taken to bring it about. As for my part, I propose to do all in my power to help mold a better and more realistic public opinion of the Federal service.

You, here tonight—the organization to which you belong—others like you—should consolidate your efforts on ways and means of acquainting the public with the virtues and accomplishments of our Federal service and our civil service system.

I doubt that the public gives proper credit to our civil service. It contributes so much to making this Nation strong and great.

How many know that much of our once fertile land is tillable today only because of farsighted and well-executed programs of conservation conducted on a national basis.

Is the public aware that our rivers have been harnessed bringing flood waters under control; that our forests have been created, extended, and improved; that game and fish have not been allowed to become extinct as the result of national planning and programs.

Does the public know that the foods we eat are clean and pure; that the medicines we take are safe and up to standard; that the cosmetics we use are free of harmful ingredients because of federally administered programs.

Does the public realize that our progress in providing a network of better roads; faster and safer transportation by land, air, and water; more effective prevention and cure of disease; maximum safety of bank savings; old age and disability benefits; greater protection to the honest and innocent against crime and fraud; and, improved communications result from Government interest in and attention to our national social problems.

Even if the public had such an awareness—and I think we can agree that it doesn't—there would still be the problem of getting across effectively that each of these varied and complex programs are only as good as the people who carry them out.

The mere recognition and identification of a national problem of itself does not provide a solution. That is only the first step.

Enactment of legislation—no matter how well concerned and designed—does not assure solution. That is merely a second step.

The most important ingredient is the human element. Let me make that point clear. Generally, the results are better with a bad piece of legislation in the hands of good people than a good piece of legislation in the hands of bad people.

Our Nation is and has been fortunate in many ways. We are blessed with abundant natural resources, rainfall, and sunshine, an industrious and honest citizenry and a government run for and by the people. This concept of government gave birth 76 years ago to the enactment of the legislation from which our civil service merit system is derived.

The Nation is fortunate that the legislators of that day had the wisdom and vision to look so well into the future. Without the benefit of that act, I fear we would not have attracted and could not have retained the

high type of personnel needed to effectively carry out our many and varied Federal programs.

A good public opinion will not come our way easily or quickly nor will it remain with us long unless it is deserved. Unless we serve well and faithfully we do not deserve nor should we expect a good public opinion. To the end that we continue to warrant a good public opinion, we should reexamine our purpose in being where we are and in doing what we are doing.

We should each dedicate ourselves to the task of giving the public better service by doing our job as efficiently, effectively and economically as humanly possible.

Whatever our field—whatever our assignment—the world of today is a challenge to each of us to do our best that tomorrow may be better.

I think every position in the Federal service should have a purpose. If it doesn't, its existence can't be justified. Every employee should know fully the purpose of his position and periodically renew his dedication to the fulfillment of that purpose.

You, Congress, and the leaders in the executive branch must be alert to the needs for maintaining the kind of civil service system in which you can be proud to serve.

I am sorry to say, this administration has not been alert to those needs during the past 6 years. Some of the appointments it has asked Congress to approve as leaders of this civil service system have left much to be desired.

I am happy to say, it looks as if Rip Van Winkle has finally awakened to needs of the service. The recent appointment sent to the Senate for Chairman of the Civil Service Commission leads me to believe they are at long last taking a proper look at this important post.

I sincerely hope they follow up this appointment with a good legislative program to make the service more attractive and to reward you for a job well done.

Maybe this is too much to hope for; maybe this new found respect for the civil service system is still in such infancy that they do not have a bold new program to submit.

As for me I took the Democratic majority leader's recent words very seriously—when he said to the administration—"Lead or be led." He was endorsing my actions for the past 6 years. I think you all are aware of the accomplishments I refer to.

As for the future, I will offer a bold new program. I hope the administration will join with me. If they do, the task will be made easier. If they don't, I will do it anyway.

I have already introduced legislation to:

1. Create a Federal employees health insurance program: As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am going to recommend to the committee that this be the first order of business. If we receive any kind of cooperation from the administration, this bill should become law before this session adjourns.

- I am grateful to the subcommittee of the Government Employees Council for preparing this legislation. I know it represents many days of hard work.

2. Modify the Group Life Insurance Act to permit employees to purchase two times the amount of their salary; many employees have expressed the desire to be able to increase the amount of insurance they are allowed to purchase under present law.

3. Increase the per diem and travel allowance: I believe the present allowance is completely unrealistic. It was set in 1955. Recent surveys show the cost of travel has increased greatly since that time.

4. Allow persons convicted of an offense not involving the national security to draw the annuity they have earned, paid for, and are entitled to.

5. Preserve the rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; and

6. Give employee organizations the right to represent their members and participate more fully in the formulation of personnel policies and practices.

During a recent trip to several European countries, I was impressed with the fact that the governments of most of these countries maintain a splendid working relationship with leaders of employee organizations. These, then, are some of the things I hope to accomplish, to help insure for you a brighter and better tomorrow.

I say, thank you, for a job well done.
Good luck and God bless you all.

Success of Pan-American Games Vital to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Leo Fisher which appeared in the Chicago American on January 19, 1959, entitled "Success of Pan-American Games Vital to Nation":

SUCCESS OF PAN-AMERICAN GAMES VITAL TO NATION—UNITED STATES PRESTIGE AT STAKE AS WHOLE WORLD WATCHES

(By Leo Fisher)

Whether we like it or not, prowess in sport in recent years has become tied up with national prestige. Maybe it's a byproduct of the cold war with Russia, but the fact remains that success on the athletic field is a mighty important matter these days when everything we attempt is looked upon with a critical eye to the rest of the world.

This summer, for the first time since the Olympics at Los Angeles in 1932, the United States will have an opportunity to act as host for a big segment of the world's athletes in the pan-American games.

Many of them will be making their first visit to this country—and a good portion of these firstcomers not only will be interested in winning laurels, but also in seeing how much of the anti-American propaganda they have heard is actually true.

The games, to be held in Chicago August 27 to September 7, will bring some 2,000 contestants from Canada, Central America, and South America. They will participate not only in track and swimming, but also in gymnastics, tennis, wrestling, water polo, yachting, weight lifting, baseball, basketball, riding, fencing, shooting, cycling, boxing and many other competitions.

Leaders of these athletes and teams are among the most important and influential citizens of their countries, especially in Latin America. Their treatment, their accommodations, the conditions under which they compete and every other phase will make an impression that goes for beyond the realm of sport.

Chicago, of course, will do its share. The city figuratively already has rolled up its sleeves and gone to work with zest and enthusiasm. Mayor Daley and his committees will go as far as they can to provide the finances and the background to make the pan-American games as successful as any meet ever held.

But this is a project that goes far beyond our city limits. It is a showcase not for Chicago but for the entire United States. It is an event of hemispheric and worldwide importance which must have the backing of every American citizen.

That is why the success of the bill introduced in the House by Representative SIDNEY YATES is so vital. It provides for an appro-

priation of \$500,000 to be used toward the transportation, housing and feeding of the visiting athletes. It specifies that none of the money is to be used for permanent facilities, which is as it should be. Chicago can handle that phase of it as part of its continuing growth and its contribution toward the community's welfare.

A similar bill was passed by the House last year but was held up in the Senate committee until adjournment. With arrangements for the pan-American games now in high gear, speed is essential. The money is vitally needed to insure the finest of everything for our guests.

It is a nonpartisan project, just as was the appropriation of more than \$3,000,000 passed last year and signed by the President to help the State of California provide facilities for the 1960 winter Olympics at Squaw Valley.

The Nation's civic, industrial and political leaders in every region should forget partisanship and get solidly behind the Yates bill to insure its quick passage. As appropriations go these days, \$500,000 is hardly a ripple in the budget—but its importance is immeasurable in one phase of world affairs.

It should be looked upon not as a gift to Chicago, but as a small investment in the bettering of relations with our neighbors to the north and south of us. It will pay big dividends for many years to come.

Permanent Certificates for Helicopter Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include the following editorial published in the December 1958 issue of Flight magazine:

PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR HELICOPTER AIRLINES

Scheduled helicopter air services in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York have proved beyond the shadow of any doubt that they should become permanent arms of our domestic air transport system. The only way to do this is to provide them with permanent certificates of convenience and necessity, following the precedent established 2 years ago when Congress passed legislation ordering the Civil Aeronautics Board to certificate the local service airlines on a permanent basis.

It won't be necessary for the Civil Aeronautics Board to certificate helicopter routes into every nook and cranny of present areas of operations. It would be sufficient simply to provide permanent certificates for their major routes such as interairport runs and leave the other routes and future expansion on an experimental basis. For example, Los Angeles Airways is presently certificated to serve any point in an area of a 50-mile radius, which leaves the carrier enough latitude to find out by trial and error what service can be justified.

The three helicopter carriers have a combined operating experience of some 30 years. Surely the documented statistics are available to determine on what basis to provide the hardy pioneers with permanent operating status. They have gone just about as far as they can go as experiments. Bob Cummings, president of New York Airways, recently pointed out we must move immediately into the era when helicopter transport is a conventional business instead of a laboratory. Permanent certification of the

major routes of the three operations is certainly the first step to this desirable goal.

It's all well and good to get excited about the jet age and the coming supersonic age of air transport. But the low and slow business of helicopter airlift is just as necessary and exciting.

The coming of the jets means that the air traveler will spend a larger percentage of his origination-to-destination time on the ground than he does now with reciprocating craft and unless he can hop a helicopter or some other type of VTOL flying machine to and from the jet airport he wastes a lot of time he saves by the new long-range jet transports. So the helicopter either as a shuttle air taxi or a short-haul intercity bus must be developed simultaneously with the jet services if all the promises of the jet age are to be fulfilled.

It certainly is encouraging to know that the Civil Aeronautics Board as now constituted is perhaps the most progressive Board we've had in many years. The recent enunciations of several members in public addresses and the realistic approach to local service airline problems in mail rate cases and route extensions may be taken as an indication the Board will show the same brand of enlightenment toward the helicopter air transport companies. If and when permanent certificates are granted the Board should then begin to consider and adjudicate the many applications on file for similar services on a temporary certificate basis in other metropolitan centers.

The Supreme Court and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a most learned and appropriate article written by Mr. W. A. Langley, Laurel, Miss., on the question of the Supreme Court and integration. The article was printed in the August 28 edition of the Laurel Leader-Call. I believe that thoughtful readers will agree that Mr. Langley has correctly analyzed the situation. This able statement is but another argument for the bridling of this runaway Supreme Court.

The article follows:

PUBLIC FORUM

Sir: Since I have some firsthand knowledge of the school situation as well as an intimate understanding of social customs and taboos in the South, and having been educated partially in the East, I can grasp to a very limited degree something of the problems facing our Chief Executive.

Most southern schools and all of most Southern States are not going to integrate to any noticeable degree, immediately. If this be "anarchy," then it has been made so by outside interference and not by southern volition.

It is easy for anyone to conceive of any number of situations, which could make even our present executive rebel against a Supreme Court order. If by some coincidence the Supreme Court became controlled by the Communists and it ruled against the exercise of private enterprise, the present Executive would be first to lead a rebellion with all his might. The South would laud him for such action.

The North resisted, with all its might, the Dred Scott decision of 1857. President Buchanan tried very hard to enlist the sup-

port of all sections to the decisions; but the North would not listen to him any more than the South is listening to the present President. At that time the North quoted Thomas Jefferson as saying: "To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions is a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one that would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

Mr. Lincoln fought the decision. He said: "The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that imminent tribunal."

Was the North made up of anarchists when it resisted the Dred Scott decision?

Was Jefferson an anarchist when he said that the Court was not the ultimate arbiters?

Was Lincoln an anarchist when he said that when the people allowed the Court to become an oligarchy they had ceased to become their own rulers?

It just happens that the Court has become dominated by those who disregard States rights. To the South, integration is just as brazen a disregard of its customs as communism would be to the Chief. Legislation by no court will change the southern way of life, now. The future is unpredictable. Its changes will not be known until it becomes the past. However, one thing is certain, agitation by the courts will retard the future progress of good race relations rather than speed integration. If there is to be future tantalizing action by the courts, and other branches of the Government, future historians will write that the gravest error of the Eisenhower administration was race agitation.

Name calling cannot settle this or any other dispute; if so, the epithets hurled at certain branches of the Federal Government following the Army's occupation of Little Rock, would have amply achieved the desired ends. Southerners, sir, are not anarchists any more than the President would be an anarchist if he resisted a Communist-controlled court. Is it anarchy to disagree? It was in Hitler's Germany. It was in England in 1876.

The same Constitution which guards the rights of the individuals also guards the powers of the States and limits the power of the Federal Government. There is no provision made in the Constitution regarding education or social customs. If so, why does the court not so cite? "Powers not delegated to the Congress are reserved to the States." Integration is clearly then a State matter. Besides no Negro in America is denied education sufficient to meet the requirements of his ambitions.

The court has erred in projecting itself into the field of legislation. As authority for this statement see the report of the State chief justices now in session in California. The court's error leaves our chief some degree of latitude to correct the error partially. The phrase "with all deliberate speed" places the responsibility for the speed of enforcement directly on the Chief Executive. In the last analysis whatever errors are made in the speed of enforcement belong to him.

There is an unbiased and unprejudiced doctrine on American Government which touches directly this subject of legal and social coercion. To show that this opinion is unbiased, it was written decades before the race issue arose in our schools. The author was not from the South, nor from the North, nor from America. Lord Bryce in "The American Commonwealth" teaches that any American custom cannot become a successful American law unless it enjoys the overwhelming support of the population of a given area; that any present law that does not have the support of the great majority

should be repealed; that local customs in one State might become successful laws there and be failures elsewhere. This unbiased document by a great British statesman is still held up to college students as perhaps the highest authoritative treatise on the U.S. Government.

The great experiment of prohibition is here cited as an example that bears out the Bryce doctrine.

To show further that Bryce's law prevails here in Mississippi we have the most rigid prohibition laws of any State in the Nation. As a whole the State is technically totally dry; but in practice this is far from the truth. Certain counties and other government subdivisions do not subscribe to the State's liquor laws. Therefore, in these subdivisions liquor is sold openly across the counter.

Similar instances of local disregard for State or national laws can be cited in any of the States where the present Chief Executive has at times held his citizenship. Disregard for higher law then is not solely a characteristic of the South. It is characteristic of any American community where such a law does not enjoy the overwhelming support of the population. The supergovernment is not supposed to usurp the power of the supporting governments except under very limited circumstances as directed literally by the Constitution. If this usurpation does occur, then disregard of the courts legislation can be expected.

If the southern way of life had been left alone; and if as much progress in successful race relations had occurred during the next 50 years as has occurred during the last like period of time, the integration problem would have resolved itself through social development and change in the folkways. But the present turmoil has perhaps retarded solution for a hundred years. The South is simply not ready to integrate and integration cannot be successfully legislated without social acceptance by the affected locality.

The court and the Executive have made brave efforts; further forced attempts will be grave errors.

Any further attempts at integration should be done in conjunction with the local community. Wisely, a Commission has been set up to handle matters of integration. The only way the efforts of the Commission can succeed is with the cooperation of the community involved. Defiance of the wishes of a majority of any governmental unit by the Commission will mean ultimate failure in that unit. Cooperation with some units with no coercion, no threats, no force, no Army, no bayonets, no police action, no reprisals, no combination of these may achieve some degree of integration in some governmental units cooperation not coercion should be the motto of the Commission.

If demands for integration are made of any school board, then a petition to that effect should be signed by at least 10 percent of the bona fide patrons of the schools of the area concerned. This petition should then be submitted to the Federal Commission. In turn the Commission should hold an election of all the school patrons of the area (both white and colored) to determine the wishes of the majority. After the election the Commission would know whether or not any further efforts would be advisable according to Bryce's law. This would also answer the Court's directive relating to "all deliberate speed."

The success of your Commission will depend upon its tolerant understanding, its thorough investigation, its deliberate action, its willingness to give a little here and there, its ability to see a community as one who has spent his life there, its willingness to seek the advice of those in the community who are wise and fair, its awareness of social structure, historical background, and some sympathy with local taboos.

If the commission approaches this problem in this manner and not in the manner

of a police investigation, then on some distant day in a somewhat dim future, total integration will have a slim chance to succeed.

In the meantime the South goes along, unperturbed and fearless of the big bad wolf of integration, knowing that its bark is much more disturbing than its bite, believing that the administration should spend more of its energies in the solution of some of its foreign problems, rather than dissipating its energy and dividing our country—pitting one section against another—by dwelling upon a problem so impossible as the immediate integration of the races of the South.

W. A. LANGLEY.

Many Happy Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the January 15 issue of the Hillside (N.J.) Times, commenting on the 10th anniversary of one of the most unusual, constructive, and valuable civic associations I know of.

I have watched their activities over this period of time and I have no hesitation in recommending to our colleagues that the Hillside Industrial Association could be a most inspiring pattern for community-minded efforts throughout the country:

MANY HAPPY RETURNS

The 10th anniversary of the formation of the Hillside Industrial Association will be observed at a dinner next Thursday evening and Hillside residents could hardly be censured for pointing with considerable pride to this bouncing youngster.

For looking around us in all directions, we know of no other community, large or small, which can boast an organization quite like this one. Many municipalities have their chambers of commerce, but Hillside is the only community we know of where the industries have banded together to create better understanding not only by word but by deed.

Perhaps the most outstanding accomplishments of the association during the 10-year period was organization of the Hillside Industrial Foundation. In the short space of a few years it has contributed sizeable sums to a number of worthwhile civic projects, including a recreation fieldhouse, the building funds of two religious groups and several other endeavors.

All are familiar with the Ford Foundation and others on a national scale, but Hillside is probably unique in the entire Nation for having this foundation devoted exclusively to local projects.

During its 10-year life span the Hillside Industrial Association has initiated other projects which have been of benefit to the general public as well as its own members. These have included the second postoffice on Hillside Avenue, Youth-Industry and Teacher-Industry Days honoring Little League champions, and so forth.

The association's activities have won the commendation of two Governors, Alfred E. Driscoll and Robert B. Meyner.

On reaching its 10th anniversary, the entire community, we are sure, joins in wishing the Hillside Industrial Association many happy returns.

Appendix

Victory for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Saturday was a red letter day for the Democrats in New Mexico. They had a huge victory dinner at Albuquerque and were honored by having as their speaker the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Senator JOHNSON drew the largest crowd that has ever attended a political dinner in New Mexico. By actual count 1,105 people sat down in Albuquerque's huge civic auditorium to hear the majority leader. In addition, hundreds more were in the gallery to hear him.

They were not disappointed. The senior Senator from Texas was in rare form, not only in the formal address but in the friendly asides during the delivery of that address and in the stirring conclusion of his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY FOR AMERICA

(Address by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON at Democratic victory dinner, Albuquerque, N. Mex., January 24, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats, it is a special pleasure, as a Texan, to be here in one of the few States that outlie Texas.

As you know, of course, Texas suffered a little embarrassment recently. We used to be the largest State in the Union. Then we were knocked over by an iceberg.

DOWN, BUT NOT OUT

We are down—but not out. That is why we sent a Texan out here to take over as your Governor.

You know Colorado used to have a Texan as Governor. Oregon had a Texan as Senator. The Nation has a Texan as President.

Unlike John Burroughs, of course, these others are Republicans and that is one of our chief exports in Texas. We don't mind when they leave—in fact, we encourage it. We don't usually let the good Democrats like Burroughs get away.

CHERISHED FRIENDS

A special pleasure for me is the opportunity to be in the home State of two of my most cherished friends, DENNIS CHAVEZ and CLINT ANDERSON.

The Nation is fortunate that you have sent them both to serve in Washington.

DENNIS CHAVEZ holds a vital role in our national life as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. I congratulate you

on his reelection and, personally, I thank you for it.

I thank you also for CLINT ANDERSON. Several years ago, I asked a senior Senator to stand aside so that he might serve as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At this session, he again assumes the important chairmanship of that committee—and the job could not be in more responsible hands.

TWO GREAT SENATORS

You have two great Senators. You have, also, two of the most able young Congressmen in Washington—my friends, JOE MONTOYA and TOM MORRIS. Keep your eye on these two. They are on their way to positions of high responsibility.

These victories—and many more—we have come to celebrate.

THE GREAT CRUSADE

We are meeting tonight in the lingering twilight of the great crusade.

The noble slogans are muted and still. The polished brass has tarnished and scuffed. The flying banners hang listlessly and limp.

It was just 6 years ago that all the world was young and gay.

The ship of state was destined for a firm hand at the tiller. Fiscal solvency was the pole star toward which our course was set.

We were to have strength without exercise; health without care; an assured future without investment.

THE THREAT OF VETO

And now there is nothing left but a desire for quiet—and government by the threat of veto.

Our country is torn by a great internal controversy.

Communism has declared economic war against our way of life.

The United States—which led the world into the atomic age—now lags in the exploration of outer space.

A BALANCED BUDGET

And we are told that there is just one issue before us—passage of an artificially balanced budget with a dot over every "i" and a cross through every "t."

The people gave their answer to that kind of government 3 months ago. They repudiated the concept of administration by inaction, procrastination, and delay.

All over the country—from Maine to California, from Minnesota to New Mexico—they cast their ballots for men of vigor. They asked for—and they shall receive—leadership in keeping with their own desires for progress.

WASHINGTON RUMORS

But the ink had scarcely dried on the headlines of victory when the rumors began to seep out of Washington. The informed sources and the reliable informants all told us the same thing.

The President was determined to exercise his veto powers to the hilt to check a wild spending spree.

There is no American who objects to the exercise of the veto power. It is a proper, constitutional function and one of the most important checks in our system of checks and balances.

WILD SPENDING

There are very few Americans who favor a wild spending spree by their Government.

We all know that the end of such a spree would be fiscal insolvency.

But I think it is about time that somebody blows the whistle on threats to veto bills that have not been drafted and to cancel steps that have not been taken.

Perhaps I studied the science of government in an old-fashioned school that is now out of date. But I had always believed that the veto power was something that the President exercised after he had examined a bill.

It was only in Alice's Wonderland, I was told, that the rule was "verdict first, trial second."

And when the verdict is "veto," not only before the bill is passed but even before it is printed, it becomes little more than an instrument to blackjack Congress.

It is rather strange at this date to have the administration standing at the dyke to hold back the tides of spending. It is just 6 years too late for the role to be natural.

ADMINISTRATION BUDGETS

The present administration has drawn up, and administered, the largest peacetime budgets in history. And the last Democratic Congress clipped \$5,600 million off those budgets.

To set the present administration up as the guardian of the balanced budget is in the same class as hiring a coyote for a watchdog over the sheep.

The last Democratic Congress did not embark on any wild spending sprees. And there is certainly no reason for thinking that the present Congress will do so.

A CONGRESS OF ACTION

But there is every reason to believe that this Congress will be a Congress of action. And it is the concept of action that brings us to the heart of the matter.

There are two ways in which a nation—or a man—can remain fiscally solvent.

One is to pull in, cut down, retract, withdraw, scrimp, and shrink from activity.

The other is to expand, produce, work harder, be more efficient, welcome opportunities.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue before the United States today is which road we will follow.

Democrats believe the budget can be balanced if we take advantage of our opportunities to increase the wealth of the Nation.

Republicans believe the budget can be balanced if we turn our back on opportunities and resign ourselves to the status of a second-class nation—weak, but thrifty.

THE DEMOCRATIC TIDE

It is no accident that the Democratic tide, while rolling strong everywhere, reached high-water mark in the West. It is here in the West that men have the greatest vision of the meaning of opportunity.

We know, as westerners, that this whole vast region—from Texas to Montana and from the Mississippi to the Pacific—is one of the tomorrows of our Nation.

Your own State is a land of enchantment—not for the legends of its yesterdays but because of the lure of its tomorrows.

Here, all across the West, tomorrow is everything.

The same is true in all the regions of our young land.

We must make provision for the support of the population of the 1960's and 1970's. We must enlarge our productive capacity.

We must multiply our job opportunities. Add more schools. Erect more hospitals. Build more roads. Construct more homes. Increase the output of our farms. Solve the problems of our human relations.

THE MUSTS—THE NECESSITIES

These are musts, no choices; necessities, not options.

Today's leadership will be adjudged responsible or irresponsible in terms of how tomorrow is served by the course we set now.

As a Nation, we stand at the very edge of the most demanding era of our economy's history. Yet, as we see the needs ahead, we find our cities blighted, whole regions depressed, key industries sick, vital links of our transportation system mortally ill.

ACCUMULATED DEFICITS

Search the history of the Nation and you will find few periods of the past in which so many accumulated deficits have pressed upon us—at one time—for action and resolution.

Yet, in the face of this, we are confronted by a deepening division in the directions of our national leadership.

On the one hand, the representatives of the people—most recently elected to serve them—say that the time has come to put tomorrow back into the mind and heart of government.

On the other hand, those who serve in the executive branch of the Government are serving notice that there is no room for tomorrow in their planning. And, furthermore, they go one step farther: the partisans of those with Executive power are openly threatening to use that power to veto tomorrow.

WORLD LEADERSHIP

We cannot expect to lead the world if we turn our backs on tomorrow. Yet, that is now offered as the chosen course of those with executive responsibilities.

They have turned their backs on New England.

They are silent to the needs of the northern manufacturing States.

They are totally insensitive to the economic potential of the South.

DISREGARD OF THE WEST

Most tragically, this administration has elected to disregard the West.

Let us look for a moment at your own State of New Mexico.

In less than 15 years, New Mexico has grown enormously—both in population, in manufacturing, and in importance. Much of this has come directly from the stimulus of an industry which did not exist 20 years ago—and barely existed 10 years ago.

I refer, of course, to your atomic industry.

Out of this one new industry has come a whole new world of opportunity for you and for your children. Because of it, whole new cities stand in your State where none stood a generation ago. Great new wealth is coming from your soil. New capital is being invested here. A new future is opening before you.

What has happened to New Mexico because of the atomic age is only a beginning—for in the space age opening before us now, this story will be repeated many times.

STORY OF THE NATION

It is—or it can be—the story of the West and of the Nation.

For the real impact and import of the space age will not come in the skies above us but in the West about us. Our scientists tell us that in the next decade our space technology will produce a flow of knowledge and understanding of materials which will revolutionize our industrial system.

Entire new industries will be brought into being.

New uses for unused resources will be found.

New metals and new metals technology will develop.

Every region in the Nation will benefit from this, but the Nation will especially need—in this era—the full capacity of its West.

THE WATER PROBLEM

Furthermore, you know and I know that the full solution of the water needs of the West is not going to be achieved piecemeal, nor is it going to be met by conventional efforts alone.

In my State, we have drawn plans to take the surplus water from regions with an abundance and channel it across great distances to supply regions with a deficit.

The feasibility is established.

The sole question is not the way—but the will.

I remember 20 years ago that when the survival of the free world was at stake the United States marshalled its resources into the Manhattan project—to unlock the secrets of the atom. Through such concentrated effort, we solved—in less than a decade—a challenge which many doubters thought could not be solved. And because of our effort, we opened for all of humankind a new age of hope which we are only now beginning to realize.

MANHATTAN PROJECT ON WATER

I express to you my belief that the time has come when we must cease our dawdling over the water problems of the West. It is time for us to commit our resources to another Manhattan project on water.

The solution of the water problem is far nearer than was the task to which the scientists at Los Alamos first addressed themselves.

We know, already, for example, that it is feasible to transform salt water into usable water for municipal, industrial and agricultural use.

At modest expenditure, we should be able—within 5 to 10 years—to perfect our methods sufficiently to make such water available at an economically feasible cost to the West.

PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED

The point is this: the water problem of the West can be solved, insofar as engineering is concerned. The solution depends not upon the engineers but upon the decisions and courage of our political leadership.

Thus, the question is a question of political integrity—not technical capabilities.

I, for one, would express the hope that we may during this Congress lay before the executive branch this clearcut choice: hand to them a program for undertaking to find the solution to the water problem—then let them, with the eyes of the Nation upon them, make their choice.

Will they meet or will they fail the responsibility to tomorrow?

RESPONSIVE SERVICE

We of the Democratic Party have—for the past 6 years—served constructively in the Congress. We have not sought and we have not exercised a veto over progress—or even over Republican proposals that are in the interest of America. We have served responsibly and the elections demonstrate that the people approve.

Our sense of continuing responsibility does not permit us to follow blindly along a blind course—and this we shall not do.

DYNAMICS OF THE NATION

It is my belief—as I am sure it is yours—that the future of this Nation lies not in turning back to the past but in forging ahead to unlock the dynamics of our regions.

We do not propose to leave any region or any area or any city to stagnate amid the promises of these times.

We do propose to devote ourselves to the expansion and the growth and the confidence characteristic of America.

This is the spirit and the image of the Democratic Party.

By this approach, we shall make our victory of last November what it ought to be—and what we want it to be—a victory for the people of America and free men everywhere.

South Carolina's New Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 21, 1959, I had the pleasure of attending the inaugural ceremonies for South Carolina's new Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Jr. The Governor delivered a very able address which represents the thinking of the people of South Carolina. This address was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from several South Carolina newspapers which are very complimentary of the Governor's address, and which give further evidence of the fact that the people of South Carolina are standing firm for the principles of States rights and constitutional government.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ridge (S. C.) Citizen, Jan. 22, 1959]

NEW GOVERNOR

Gov. E. F. Hollings, sworn in as Governor of South Carolina on Tuesday of this week, is at 37 one of the youngest men ever to occupy that position. And he is the 105th, we believe.

Mr. Hollings takes office in a critical time of the State's history. The coming 4 years of his term will find him confronted with a variety of problems, the like of which could not have been envisioned less than a generation ago.

The battle will continue and be intensified to preserve constitutional government because those who would destroy the Republic will intensify their efforts. The nature of his position as Governor of South Carolina will place him among the leaders of those fighting to preserve the American heritage of a government of laws rather than of men. The State's right to work law will come under intensive efforts to have it repealed. Preserving the system of public education in its accustomed peace and harmony will certainly be one of his main problems. The further industrialization of the State and preserving a climate favorable to industrial investment also will have a high priority.

These he has recognized and pledged to meet properly, as a reading of accounts of his inaugural address will show. There are these problems and more, including the \$23-million deficit now facing the State, and it is to his credit that he accepted them in a spirit of challenge and proposes to meet them with confidence.

That he is a man of much ability is an impression we have had of him since we first knew him. That he also has ambition in ample supply we do not deny, nor do we find this a reason for criticism. Ambition that is made of Shakespeare's sterner stuff is a virtue, we think.

Our present impression is that his lack of years does not denote a lack of maturity. His inaugural address indicates a depth of understanding of the problems that will confront his administration. He is personable in appearance and popular with the people and with the legislature. In all, it's hardly possible to conceive of more auspicious circumstances under which to begin an administration.

We dare to hope that these good auspices will follow him throughout the next 4 years.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Free Press, Jan. 22, 1959]

LOOKING AHEAD TO PROGRESS

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, who was sworn in as South Carolina's new chief executive Tuesday, has sounded a call for progress in this State based upon conservatism and a rededication to constitutional government. We believe the new Governor has set a goal with which his fellow South Carolinians are completely in accord. It may well be that his 4 years in office will prove to be a period of unprecedented progress in the State.

The youthful Governor assumes his office with a wealth of good will on the part of responsible citizens. This is so not only because he is young, possesses a dynamic personality, and is temperate in his approach to political questions but also because the belief is widespread that he knows South Carolina and its business, that he will approach the State's economic problems realistically, and will effectively present South Carolina's case to the Nation.

Because he believes in his native State and possesses a great enthusiasm which will go far in helping him to convince others of its merits Governor Hollings may hold the key which will open a new era of industrial progress in South Carolina. He has promised to work unceasingly in this interest and citizens are confident that he has the ability to help the State take great strides forward.

During his inaugural address Hollings spoke on a general note rather than making any specific recommendations to meet the challenges before him. But in firm and ringing tones, he dedicated his term of office to the defense of States rights, continued resistance to racial integration, and preservation of the free enterprise system and those systems of government which have been tried and proved. He warned that South Carolina and the South stand in the critical role of fighting against a tide which would sweep us into national mediocrity, crush the States and their citizens into national molds, stifle the views and rights of minorities, and destroy the original constitutional balance of power among the individual States and the Federal Government.

He declared that because we stand firm against the national attempt to wipe out the boundaries designed to preserve the Federal system of checks and balances, we are labeled reactionaries by so-called liberals who seek to force their own idea of the centralized state upon all the United States. "It must be admitted," Hollings said, "that we do react against their scheme to subvert the basis of American Government as we have known it through the years. We also admit that we are conservative, in the sense that we seek to conserve those principles of government and of free enterprise which have been tried and proved, and which have made this Nation what it is today. We in South Carolina see no conflict between such conservatism and progress; indeed, we think they go hand in hand toward bringing us a better life, and it is our mission to put forward a dynamic conservatism as an asset, not a liability."

In spelling out a program of enlightened and progressive conservatism, Governor Hollings displayed a sureness of purpose and a calm determination that has inspired the confidence of his fellow citizens. Certainly

he will need the support and prayers of us all as he turns now to the task of putting his beliefs into practice—that upon our shoulders may indeed, as he expressed it, "ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth."

[From the Camden (S.C.) Chronicle, Jan. 23, 1959]

SOME WORTHY PLEDGES

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings' inaugural address yesterday was full of the common beliefs of a majority of the people he will govern: that the laws of the current Supreme Court are not constitutional laws; that both the white and the Negro races will be better served in segregated schools; that our battle for States' rights must be keenly pursued and intensified; that our beloved State has been touched by destiny to carry the hope of the South and the Nation in the continuing struggle for constitutional Government and States' rights.

Said the new governor of the Supreme Court's threatening attitude:

"The Supreme Court of our land was established to decide litigation in the light of past decisions and not in spite of past decisions. It is not the Court's function to lay down the law of the land by judicial fiat. It is the Congress under the American system that makes law. Flagrantly, baldly usurping the amendatory power of three-fourths of the States, the justices of the Supreme Court apparently take their gospel from Richard III, whom Shakespeare caused to say: 'Strong arms shall be our conscience, swords our law. March on, join together to pell mell, if not to heaven, then hand in hand to hell.'"

Governor Hollings, some believe, is a young man touched by destiny. He spoke potent words in his address—words which ditted the feelings of a majority of Southerners. He pledged himself to fight for his convictions. He has the energy of youth and the mind of maturity to carry our standard tall in the saddle. And with the help of God we believe he will.

[From the Camden (S.C.) News, Jan. 22, 1959]

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' INAUGURAL

The inaugural address of Gov. Ernest F. Hollings Tuesday gives patriotic South Carolinians assurance that this State will continue to resist any efforts of the U.S. Supreme Court to enact legislation affecting this State.

The new Governor took a bold and courageous stand. In taking the oath to preserve and defend the constitution of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States, he made it plain that he planned to defend the Constitution of the United States as it was written and not as it has been amended illegally by the U.S. Supreme Court.

"I cannot conscientiously take this oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and not object to the Supreme Court usurping the amendatory power that constitutionally is vested in three-fourths of the States," said the new Governor. "To do so would give us a government of men and not of laws."

Mr. Hollings said that "the segregation stand of the South is symbolic of the stand of our forefathers against the oppression of government when this great Republic was founded," and he gave assurance that our position of determined resistance will remain unchanged.

We liked the conclusion of his address when he said:

"With an humble prayer for God's blessings and guidance I assume this task with a vigorous pride that while South Carolina and our Southland 25 years ago may have been the Nation's No. 1 economic problem,

today, we are the Nation's No. 1 hope for the survival of the free enterprise system. Today, we are the Nation's hope for the survival of constitutional government. Today, we are the hope for the future."

His message was a most heartening one.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Jan. 21, 1959]

GOVERNOR HOLLINGS' INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Governor Hollings has spoken in terms authentic, mature, and even majestic in giving his concept of the vulnerability of our Republic and the requirements for its protection.

South Carolinians can be proud that such a call for the defense of the Constitution arises within its own borders. And it can be reassured of the soundness and comprehension of a new Governor still in his late thirties.

While we, his fellow citizens, can take comfort in his words as the heralds of the basic policy he will pursue, there is no consolation in his address for those national disciples of centralism who seek one government and one design for this Nation.

There is encouragement in his exceedingly able exposition of the great American tradition which has been the exact opposite of those destructive trends of the times he so literally enumerated.

We recall no statement on constitutionalism more forceful, more logical, and so well supported legally. And we know of none more solidly based on the broad sustaining principles of the United States as contrasted with expositions grounded on outward manifestations of our difficulties rather than on the roots of the evil.

Mr. Hollings admirably submerged the manifestations and emphasized the organic lesions, and it is there that the whole country is sick. The problem which has been created for the South, by one of the departures from the Constitution, is just one of the multiplying misfortunes befalling the whole of the Nation.

We are living at a time when emphasis on manifestations, and neglect of basic causes, goes beyond the broad problems of the Republic. We believe we see it in many facets of our life today and even in the church. When Mr. Hollings, pitches his deploring on the higher and more fundamental plane of the sources of disruption, he renders a service and demonstrates the deeper understanding which the times require.

There was a particular pause for us at the phrase, "oppression of government," in the governor's address, which was one of many striking phrases. There is oppression today as there was bound to be from the steady war of attrition on the American Constitution and tradition. There is not only direct oppression, but there is that oppression by indirection which pushes into subjugation those groups in the country so affected by governmental sponsorship and elevation of other groups. This is part of the general oppression deriving from what Mr. Hollings says is one to make the American into one mold.

The address of Mr. Hollings was that of the progressive conservative, not only as to his convictions on maintaining the original structure of our country as a union of sovereign States, but also as to the operation of his own State of South Carolina. He pledged that South Carolina would live within its means, that it would provide the freedom to work and the best opportunities within its means for its children. This is in the classic area of reasonable and advancing conservation.

And there was that singularly realistic and independent statement: "We do not look for security but for opportunity."

And if the oppression of centralism and nationalization can be warded off, there will

be opportunity and that species of security, coming from success, for the upcoming Commonwealth of South Carolina. It was to this sort of progress that Mr. Hollings pledged himself, as well as to the essential struggle to protect the rights of the States.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 21, 1959]

OUR NEW GOVERNOR SETS A GOAL

Ernest F. Hollings in his inaugural address struck a note of dynamic conservatism that will ring true in the ears of a vast majority of South Carolinians.

It was a philosophical speech, with little in the way of specific recommendations to meet the challenges which now face the State. Those suggestions will be made to the general assembly in other addresses, beginning today. On yesterday, he expressed the firm conviction that the will and the ability to meet these problems exists and the calm determination to meet and overcome them.

Governor Hollings limited himself to two chief topics: racial amity and the economic prosperity and growth of the State. The two, he pointed out, are not unconnected. South Carolina, he said, will overcome the obstacles which now surround each of them by a rededication to constitutional government, firmly rooted in the wisdom of the past but with a vigorous confidence in the future.

The common source of the State's present difficulties, he declared, is the growth of the centralized state, dedicated to the extinction of the individual and the regimentation of the group. The South in general, and South Carolina in particular, are well suited by custom and inclination to resist that encroachment.

In the opening paragraphs of his address, the new Governor made clear his position on the question of State and Federal relationships. He noted that the oath which he had just taken pledged him to the preservation and defense of the constitutions of South Carolina and of the United States.

But he firmly declared that he did not interpret this oath as binding him to observe blindly the unconstitutional decisions of a misguided U.S. Supreme Court.

"We recognize," he said, "that the United States Constitution is an inspired document and a great gift and hope to mankind, but when the form and letter and spirit of that Constitution are ignored, a gestation period of chaos erupts into a miscarriage of conscience and propriety."

"When the doctrine of 'separate but equal' was sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1896, neither Congress nor any court or State protested. On the contrary, everyone understood this doctrine as the basis upon which the States could conduct public education. The correctness of this understanding was confirmed repeatedly by the highest State and Federal courts in an unbroken line of decisions. The boundary line remained fixed."

"There is today no law and no provision of the Constitution requiring racially integrated schools. Until the Constitution is lawfully amended and the boundary line changed, the South stands on this boundary and on this principle."

"Until the Constitution is lawfully amended, my refusal to integrate our people during the next 4 years will not conflict with the oath I have just taken."

The threat posed by the Court's ruling in the school segregation cases runs deeper than this, however, as the Governor pointed out. It involves a none-too-subtle attack on our entire system of government.

The Constitution establishes checks and balances between the powers of the States and the Federal Government. If these bulwarks are destroyed, nothing stands between the individual and the soulless oppression of centralized authority.

Governor Hollings quite properly emphasized the danger to free enterprise involved in this totalitarian trend. He said:

"The opportunity to profit, to live, and to grow is fundamental to the American system of free enterprise. When the Federal Government, through its taxing power and other policies, kills this incentive to work and profit, to live and grow, then the boundary of the purpose for Government as we know it is exceeded by the power of Government and we are lost."

The new Governor contrasted the spectacle of the Federal Government with its inflated budgets, its apparently uncontrollable deficits and its incessant interference in private affairs with the stable, thrifty and less tyrannical government of South Carolina.

The assaults made by outsiders against our customs, he declared, are part and parcel of the greater attack on our liberties. If we ever surrender to regimentation over our institutions, the last hope for our economic freedom will vanish. If we cannot operate our schools as our experience and traditions dictate, then we cannot hope to operate our businesses or, indeed, our very lives.

"We are a State of hope and dedication," he said, "a State touched by destiny. The Battle for the Republic is truly at hand. On our shoulders ride the cape of leadership, the hope of free enterprise, and the dignity of truth."

In his address, Governor Hollings has, with the enthusiasm and vigor of youth, spelled out a platform of enlightened and progressive conservatism sorely needed in a nation and world beset with constrictive radicalism. The success with which he may be able to apply his beliefs to practical matters will mean much, and not only to the State which he will lead for the next 4 years.

He will have the support and the prayers of all South Carolinians in his attempts to that end.

[From the News and Courier, Jan. 20, 1959]
STATE LOOKS FORWARD TO PROSPERITY UNDER LEADERSHIP OF GOVERNOR HOLLINGS

Ernest Frederick Hollings, of Charleston, today becomes the 105th Governor of South Carolina with the confident expectation of his fellow citizens that his 4 years in office will be a period of unprecedented progress in this State.

Few administrations in the history of this State have taken office with such a wealth of good will on the part of responsible and serious-minded citizens.

The reason for this good will lies not simply in the fact that Governor Hollings is young, personable and temperate in his approach to political questions. That is all to his credit and to the advantage of South Carolina. The chief reason for the enthusiasm felt in this State is the widespread belief that he knows this State and its business, that he will come to grip with economic realities, and effectively carry the South Carolina story to the Nation.

In recent years, much effort has gone into programs to bring new industry to this State. They are the principal way in which the living standards of South Carolinians may be raised. Many new industries have located in South Carolina, but the State needs more plants and payrolls. A substantial increase in the prosperity of this State requires a more energetic approach to selling the Nation on the advantages of South Carolina.

Governor Hollings has pledged to tell the South Carolina story to industrialists who are considering building new plants down South. Citizens of this State believe in Governor Hollings' command of the facts and the effectiveness of his words and ideas.

A State, of course, is not a product. Nor is a governor simply a salesman who travels around the country promoting a brand

name. The South Carolina story that Governor Hollings has to tell people in other States is not a mere listing of physical assets. South Carolina is not the only State that has vacant land, people who are eager to work in industrial plants, pleasant temperatures, and adequate supplies of water and electric power.

The telling points in the South Carolina story concern the climate of freedom in the State.

South Carolina is a State where business can do business without the dictation of thugs or leftwing union bosses and without continual raiding by thoughtless and greedy legislatures.

South Carolina is a conservative State from top to bottom. Only last week Rep. Solomon Blatt, speaker of the State house of representatives, called for continued conservatism in State policies. He pointed out that private enterprise is running away from radical States and localities.

South Carolina has a right-to-work law that protects individuals and helps promote labor peace.

South Carolina has a population with deep roots and loyalty to a free way of life. Agitators meet with no success in duping the people into radicalism.

In short, South Carolina is a State that intends to progress through the sound, traditional methods of hard work and careful management of resources. A dollar's worth of service is demanded for each tax dollar spent. State business is conducted with honesty and decency.

The quality of the people of South Carolina and of their government can be described with pride by Governor Hollings.

As he takes the oath of office today as South Carolina's chief executive, Governor Hollings should be heartened by the fact that his fellow citizens are fully confident that he has the ability to help this State take a great stride forward.

Governor Brown Presents Vigorous and Constructive Water Development Program for California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, has delivered a special message to the State legislature on the subject of water, which everybody interested in water conservation and development should read.

Governor Brown makes the imperative point that the State and Federal Governments must team together to accomplish the important work that has to be done on California's rivers. We have reached the place where the State government must assume positive responsibility in the financing and construction of water projects, along with its long-established responsibilities in water rights and water contracts. The time for the State to act on this is now. As Governor Brown says, "It is time to start moving dirt and stop throwing mud."

Furthermore, State participation in the program, says Governor Brown, is

to be in full cooperation and coordination with the Federal programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The era of State-Federal competition in water development in California is past. I am mighty happy to endorse the new cooperative approach.

Governor Brown, incidentally, supports the San Luis, Auburn, Buchanan, and Hidden Reservoir bills which I have introduced, along with the senior Senator from California (Mr. KUCHEL), in this Congress. He also supports the Federal power program on the Trinity project.

But the Governor's message speaks well for itself. I ask unanimous consent to have the message printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WATER MESSAGE TO LEGISLATURE OF CALIFORNIA
BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, may I first of all thank you for your courtesy in arranging this joint session of the legislature. I have asked to come here today, under these extraordinary circumstances, so that we can meet together as the single voice of all the people of California. I have come to present a water program which I believe is rational, realistic, and responsive to the needs of all the people of California.

Our State is magnificently varied in its resources, its scenery, its industry, and its people. Providence, as I said in my inaugural message, seems intent on making us a great people in a great State.

Yet, in spite of our great endowment, it has become the fashion in recent years to dwell on our water problems as being awesome and impossibly complicated. We have brooded over the expense and become lost in a forest of fear. In prior sessions of the legislature, the result has been delay and frustration.

This stalemate must come to an end. If we take courage and put our fears behind us, we can replace narrow, sectional differences with confident, pioneering leadership. This the people of California demand and deserve.

It is not the lack of water which creates the problem we meet to discuss. Indeed, the average runoff exceeds our requirements by a safe margin.

The core of our problem is distribution. We do not have enough water when and where we need it. We have too much water when and where we do not need it. Thus, it is obvious that we must build dams to capture water which would otherwise escape, and we must build canals and aqueducts to transport the water we have saved to the communities where it is needed.

To accomplish these vital tasks, our State has a great natural advantage. The physical setting of the delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers is a gift from nature that we have never fully appreciated.

Above the delta, we have both a supply of water and the sites to store it. Within the delta, we have the natural point of convergence. When we wish to export water to an area of need lying to the south, the delta can serve as the pool, or, if you please, as the tap from which the water can flow.

Every year there are 3 million acre-feet of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which are not being used. At present, the water goes wasting out to sea through the Golden Gate. We must build the facilities for offstream storage and move this water to areas where it is urgently needed. Unless we save this surplus water, we waste a precious natural resource and fall the people of our State.

We should remember that we store water, not alone for future use, but also to avoid flood damage. To protect human life and valuable property, we must arrest our rivers in their headlong rush to the sea. Because the Federal Government contributes funds for flood control, we must impress the Congress with our urgent needs. We will also have to provide State funds to insure that flood control projects will be available for multipurpose use—not simply for flood control.

From our water development program, we should also create new sources of electrical energy. An ample supply of low-cost power is absolutely essential to our industrial future and to the needs of all our people. The State, too, will need an enormous amount of power to operate the pumps which are required to carry the water from areas of surplus to areas of need.

Fortunately, the extra cost of adding power facilities to our water projects is small in relation to the cost of the projects and small in relation to the resulting benefits. In addition, revenues from the sale of power enable us to furnish water and other benefits to deserving areas of our economy which cannot pay the total cost of water. As an example, I cite the Central Valley project, where the production of power has benefited our whole economy.

In planning our water projects we must give a high priority to recreation and to the development of our fish and wildlife resources. As our population grows and our leisure time increases, recreation requires added recognition as a beneficial use of water. Projects developed for recreational purposes provide our people with wholesome diversion and a happier and fuller life. At the same time, they stimulate the growth of portions of our State where recreation is the primary industry.

Against the background of these general observations, I propose the following program for water development:

First, I propose that this session of the legislature appropriate \$38 million from the investment fund to start on a construction program. It is time to start moving dirt and stop throwing mud. This is the beginning of a positive program for water development. In considering this \$38-million appropriation and subsequent expenses, I want to emphasize that the major cost of water development is eventually repaid from project revenues.

Second, I propose that we commit the entire investment fund to water development. This fund is unique in that it was built up through the depletion of a great natural resource, our offshore oil. I am determined that it shall be dedicated to the development of another precious resource, our water.

Third, I propose that in 1960 we authorize a general obligation bond issue in the neighborhood of \$500 million to complete the program outlined in this message. To all of you, I pledge that I will fight to obtain adequate financing to complete the great aqueduct, south. And to all of you, I pledge that I will fight to obtain adequate financing to provide the other facilities throughout the State necessary to meet the needs of our people.

Fourth, We must encourage the Federal Government to finance water projects designed for navigation, flood control, and irrigation. Considering the condition of our budget, it is plain nonsense to resist Federal aid. I am glad to see that the old hostility to Federal funds is now mellowing. We should use Federal aid wherever we can, but we must also remember that we have our own responsibilities in the development of our water resources.

Fifth, We should undertake the development of our water resources on a comprehensive statewide basis. Local agencies, of course, must be encouraged to move ahead

with those projects which have a primarily local impact. Yet, I am convinced that there must be an integrated statewide development of the massive works which affect many communities. Only thus can we prevent duplication and waste. Only thus can we avoid Balkanizing our State into competing water provinces.

Sixth, Many of the principles now applicable to the operation of utilities should guide us in the development of our State water resources. Thus, we should recognize our obligation to insure that water will be available to meet the proper demands of every part of the State. As in the case of a utility, we should be able to enlarge our facilities to bring more water into the delta pool and recover the cost from the system as a whole. Just as the first man to get a telephone does not enjoy a lower rate, so those who are first served by State water projects should not have a privileged status.

As long as the legislature guides our water development, we can be certain that the system will be completed and administered in fairness and equity. Those who would doubt this are questioning, not the water program, but rather the fundamental basis of democratic government.

In explaining this program, I have made no attempt to answer every conceivable question or satisfy all extremists. In addition, I have put to one side the question of a constitutional amendment. After long thought, I have concluded that an amendment is not necessary to an affirmative water program. Beyond that, I have found that there is no general agreement on what the contents of such an amendment should be. I am not hostile to an amendment and I am not closing the door on one. But I am convinced that our positive program of water development should not be delayed by further frustrating debate over the terms of a constitutional amendment.

Now let us look at the main points of the \$38 million construction program which I propose for this year.

The great aqueduct system from the delta to the south is a key to pressing problems of water supply. By carrying water to southern California the aqueduct will supply the area where the human need is the greatest. On the way southward, the aqueduct system will also serve areas of critical water shortage.

I urge you to appropriate \$10.7 million to enable us to start at both ends of this great aqueduct system. Of this amount \$1.3 million would be for aqueduct rights-of-way from the delta to the San Luis Reservoir site; \$3.8 million would be for the rights-of-way from San Luis to southern Kern County; and \$3.3 million would be for rights-of-way for the aqueduct system into southern California.

The remaining \$2.3 million would be used to complete the acquisition of the San Luis Reservoir site. This will provide an important portion of the State's share of the joint San Luis project. I am determined that the dam at San Luis shall be constructed to its full height so that we can store 2.1 million acre-feet in the reservoir.

In the past few days bills have been introduced by Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL and Congressman SISK and JOHNSON to authorize Federal participation in the San Luis project. I will do everything in my power to insure the passage of these bills. I see in them a reasonable compromise of the intra-state conflicts which have been a roadblock to this vital project. We must not allow disputes within the California family to delay us further.

There is also a vital need for a South Bay aqueduct to bring water from the delta to Alameda and Contra Costa Counties and portions of northern Santa Clara County. I am asking you to appropriate \$7.9 million for

rights-of-way and for initial construction of this facility.

The units proposed for immediate construction will serve the Livermore Valley and the Niles Cone area where fresh water is urgently needed to prevent sea water encroachment into the underground basin. When Santa Clara representatives have completed their studies, the South Bay aqueduct can be extended to northern Santa Clara County.

The department of water resources has recommended that water service to southern Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties should be provided by a Pacheco Pass route. I will urge the Bureau of Reclamation to accelerate their studies as to the feasibility of serving these areas as part of the Federal Central Valley project.

The use of the delta as a collecting pool will require the construction of works to guard against sea water encroachment in the westerly portion of the delta. We are well aware of the hydraulic problems of the delta and the complex questions regarding water rights in that area. The department of water resources has been studying this matter for a long time and, remarkably enough, there appears to be a relatively inexpensive physical solution. By April 1, when these studies will be completed, I expect to ask an appropriation to begin the initial work for bringing fresh water to the threatened delta areas and thus also to permit increased diversions from the delta.

Let us now turn to consider facilities above the delta.

There are, of course, also areas in need of water which cannot be served from the delta. For example, Sierra Valley in Plumas and Sierra Counties is critically short of water necessary to support its agricultural economy. To provide service for this area, I will ask for \$2.4 million for rights-of-way and construction of upstream features of the Feather River unit. The principal one of these would be Frenchman Reservoir.

I will also ask for the appropriation of \$11.9 million for construction of the combination railroad and highway bridge over the west branch of the Feather River. The bridge will enable us to use the new high speed highway which is being completed this year.

A board of consulting engineers is conducting a study to determine whether construction on the Feather River should be started at Bidwell Bar instead of Oroville. On this technical question, I intend to accept the judgment of the department of water resources after it has had the benefit of the study which will be completed on February 1. I will then ask for funds to carry forward this major work on the Feather River which is vitally necessary for flood control.

Let me now turn to consider additional flood-control works. I will ask for \$7.3 million as the State's share of the Black Butte project presently under construction on Stony Creek in Tehama County. I will also ask for \$6.4 million for the State's share of the New Hogan Reservoir on the Calaveras River. Since the 1958 legislature appropriated \$10 million of this amount, only \$3.7 million in new money is involved.

These are multipurpose projects, which are urgently need for flood control, but are not immediately required for water conservation in their local areas. The flood-control benefits will be paid for by the United States. If the State will assure repayment to the United States for the conservation features, we can move forward with these construction projects. Since the State's entire financial obligation will be eventually repaid from the sale of water made available by these projects, I urge their approval now.

We must also bend our efforts to develop an economical means of obtaining fresh water from the ocean. Therefore, I request

an appropriation of \$1.6 million for use in cooperation with the United States in the construction of a sea water conversion plant. This plant, which will probably be located in southern California, will include a nuclear reactor as a source of energy.

Turning to Federal matters, I intend to urge the Congress of the United States to take the following action:

Authorize construction of the Auburn, Buchanan, and Hidden River Dams and the Folsom Canals;

Appropriate approximately \$60 million for flood control construction and \$70 million for reclamation in the State next year; and

Take the necessary steps to insure that water can be delivered in the Sacramento Valley canals area.

Further, I will urge the Federal Government to construct the power features of the Trinity Division and distribute the power in accordance with existing Federal law. The State itself will purchase a large volume of Trinity power to operate the pumps for its water projects. I am firmly opposed to the suggested partnership arrangement. Such an arrangement would deny to the State the preference that public agencies are now granted by Federal law.

I also intend to press for the enactment by Congress of the Engle-Kuchel bill which would permit low cost Federal loans for irrigation features of projects which are primarily municipal and industrial in character.

In this broad statement I have emphasized the first and immediate steps that we must take. But in our long-range plans for water development, we must and we will give thought to the future facilities that will undoubtedly be needed as our State grows. These will include additional local projects, expansion of the aqueduct systems, new works in the delta, master drains for the Central Valley, and, at the proper time, importation of water from the Eel River system and other streams of the north coastal area.

By all these recommendations, I have sought to bring the forward force of responsible liberalism to the specific problem of water. As I conclude, I would emphasize that our problem lies, not so much in the control and use of our rivers, as in ourselves. Let us resolve to prove that we are one State, one people, and that we can produce one good water program. Let us grow with the strength of unity, as we begin to fulfill our destiny of greatness.

The Recent Visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the script of a radio broadcast made by the distinguished commentator, Sam M. Jones, on Sunday, January 25.

Mr. Jones enjoys a national reputation as an experienced and well-informed observer on the Washington scene. His comments on the recent visit of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan are revealing and penetrating. In my judgment, they merit careful reading not only by Members of Congress, but by all other Americans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. This is Sam Jones reporting from Washington.

Our Government and our opinion-molders have been terribly concerned for so many years about what other peoples and other nations think of America and its citizens. In an effort to make other peoples and other nations think kind thoughts about America and its citizens, our Government has spent billions of dollars in giveaway programs. These programs were also supposed to insure military help from the nations we have befriended, in case of an enemy attack on the United States.

How many friends have we bought? And how many of them would come to our aid if we—the United States—were bankrupt, or under attack by Soviet Russia? Probably none, unless their own survival was dependent on ours. Should we, therefore, accuse our beneficiary nations of gross ingratitude? I do not think so. Good will is not for hire and a fool throwing money to the winds—whether it be an individual or a nation—sooner or later pays the price of folly—and there are no mourners at the funeral.

Wouldn't it be nice if our Government and opinion molders would become concerned with what we think of ourselves, and let other nations and other peoples think as they please about us? A self-respecting person, aware that he is far from perfect but doing his best, doesn't worry about what the neighbors think. And if he is blessed with commonsense, he knows that he can't buy friends, nor buy off enemies. And in these circumstances a nation is no different than an individual.

Some years ago I was talking to George Sokolsky in New York. He posed this question: "Have the American people lost their capacity for moral indignation?" I had just driven in from Arizona—I had been refreshed by my own, my native land—west of the Hudson and south of the Potomac.

So I replied to Mr. Sokolsky. "Get out of New York, stay clear of Washington; listen to the average person everywhere. For in them our salvation lies. The people who never make headlines, who are slow to anger and sometimes easy to lead. But they are not sheep to be herded nor cattle to be driven." Mr. Sokolsky said: "I hope you are right."

I hope so, too.

Despite a generation where fools have walked with careless ease and traitors have overtly or covertly contributed to the destruction of this Republic—I still believe in America. I believe in miracles. I believe we can pull ourselves up by our bootstraps. But time is running out.

Our time.

Undoubtedly you are familiar with some of the highlights of the visitation of Comrade Mikoyan, the Armenian butcher, Comrade Khrushchev's right-hand man. He looked America over as a prospective buyer might, quite sure that he could buy, or that Russia could buy, come the day, on the buyer's terms. It would be silly to destroy the cities and the productive capacity of the United States with H-bombs or intercontinental missiles. Not when you can herd the sheep and round up the steers. A nation grown soft and fat and emasculated, a pushover.

Comrade Mikoyan is not to be blamed for his lack of depth perception. Superficially, his conclusions are right. The United States of America—our ship of state—is between the Scylla of bankruptcy and the Charybdis of conquest. And our skippers past and present—to say the best for them—knew little about navigation. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, they meant well. But they couldn't tell port from starboard; nor read a compass; nor discern the difference between

black and white. If they are to be blamed, so are we, you and I. In this Republic—usually miscalled a democracy—we, the electorate, choose our leaders; ballots, not bullets, put them in office. But when a country reaches the point where the voters flip a coin to decide which candidate for president is the lesser evil, it's time for all good men to come to the aid of the country, while we still own it. Sometimes it seems that we have forgotten that we are the sovereign people and that our officeholders hold office by and with the consent of the governed.

Let us return to Comrade Mikoyan—the No. 2 man of the Kremlin. This super Al Capone who crawled across corpses to win favor in the Kremlin is in a way a success story, not exactly in the Horatio Alger vein, not bootblack to president, but bootlicker to super-salesman and panderer in chief of the murderous mob in Moscow.

I am going to tell you about Comrade Mikoyan's visit to the National Press Club, but first I would like to recall a historic incident which occurred some 20 years ago.

An Englishwoman en route from London to New York—a woman of wealth and position and questionable morals—was disembarked from a Cunard liner and held at Ellis Island on the charge of moral turpitude. Now the worst that could be said about this woman was that she was free with her favors—she had no intent to overthrow the U.S. Government or even to corrupt Hollywood. If that's possible. So what did we do in our righteous moral indignation? We shipped her back to England. Very righteous. I think she had written a book, nothing as pornographic as any teen-ager can buy in any drug store today, but we just weren't going to be contaminated.

So times change. Comrade Mikoyan pays his disrespect to the United States of America. His contempt, in fact.

Is he held at Ellis Island? Oh, no. Is he deported because of moral turpitude? Oh, no. Suppose he did kill some people and order the torturing of others? What of it? "That's a mere matter of policy," nothing personal, so saith the Armenian butcher. So what do we do. We rolled out the red rug. We gave him maximum security.

The metropolitan and the State Department security police and the CIA and all other Federal, State, and local protective agencies had an around-the-clock mission to see that Comrade Mikoyan was not endangered or annoyed by the American rabble or the relatives of the victims of the Communist tyranny.

My office is on the 13th floor of the National Press Building, the same floor as the National Press Club. I stepped out of the elevator on Monday, January 19, and started for my office. Two policemen in uniform asked me if I had a pass.

I said, I didn't need a pass to go to my own office and try and stop me. They could have, of course, quite easily. I'm no match for a couple of well-trained, young, athletic police officers. But it was quite obvious that they didn't like their assignment, and it was equally obvious that slugging or shooting me in potential defense of Comrade Mikoyan went against the grain. Theirs not to reason why. Nor was it my job to spend the afternoon in jail. So I showed the police my card signed by the head of the Secret Service, entitling me to admission to the White House. That made the cops feel pretty sure that I wouldn't shoot Comrade Mikoyan, so they let me go to my office.

Maybe you think this is fantasy, something I made up. It isn't. It happened to other people pursuing their lawful occupations. The 12th floor of the Press Building was also blockaded. Many other members of the Washington press corps also met a roadblock of cops and were compelled to produce credentials to gain access to their offices.

We treated Comrade Mikoyan real nice. A few people with Hungarian and Polish backgrounds, and other victims of the Red whip, made minor demonstrations, but all went well. Our best people—like Comrade Cyrus Eaton—whose tangible quid pro quo was four white horses (out of the Trojan stud) extended the utmost hospitality. Nor were the executives of major industries, the *creme de la creme* of capitalism, laggard in their tribute to Mikoyan. Will they tell their grandchildren, "This is the hand that shook the bloody hand of the Armenian butcher"?

The Washington Post—bugle of left-wing liberalism in the Nation's Capital—rebuked Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, in its editorial columns for raising his voice in protest against the luncheon given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in honor of Comrade Mikoyan. Senator BRIDGES' refusal to break bread with and share the salt with a killer who has achieved second place in the godless Communist conspiracy, shocked the State Department and provoked the Washington Post. I am quite sure, however, that the Senator's constituents in New Hampshire who, to the distress of the State Department and the Washington Post, are patriotic Americans—are not displeased with their senior Senator. And it may be noted in passing that when Senator BRIDGES ran for reelection in 1954, he received the largest majority ever accorded a senatorial candidate in his State—without a single word from Ike, and despite the covert opposition of Sherman Adams and the all-out attacks by big labor.

On the floor of the Senate, Saturday, January 17, STYLES BRIDGES made a brief speech (which I quote in part): "I cannot condone the activities of those who indulge in socializing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan. A few of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers have given him the 'red carpet' treatment as a matter of obvious self-interest. I wonder if these bankers and industrialists are aware of Lenin's statement: 'When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of hemp to us.'" And Senator BRIDGES asked: "Why do we pay tribute and social adulation to a man who does not bother to conceal the fact that he despises us and our way of life? Only a few months ago an unarmed American transport plane, enroute from Turkey to Iran, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over Armenia, Comrade Mikoyan's home base. Mr. Mikoyan's government, the U.S.S.R., was kind enough to return the bodies of four American soldiers. There were 10 others on that plane. Where are they? We do not know."

Well, Comrade Mikoyan is now safe in the Kremlin. By and large his American journey, from the Communist viewpoint, was very successful. No one took a pot shot at him. No one even spat in his face. His own observations, his regal treatment, provided good reason for his outspoken contempt for America and Americans. He didn't need Adlai Stevenson's assurance that we are soft and weak. That was a gratuity from Adlai.

But there is something that the Armenian butcher didn't see; there are intangibles that Comrade Mikoyan did not feel; there is history that this entrepreneur of our catastrophe has forgotten. We have our share of traitors and fools in high places, and the latter are more deadly, but their warning to the bear that stalks like a man: It isn't as easy as it looks. Remember the Kaiser; remember Mussolini; remember Hitler; remember the Japanese Empire. They sold us short, too. Where are they now? Think well, Comrades of the Kremlin. We gave you in our folly what you are today—a Frankenstein monster. But what we made we can destroy. And to us, to Americans, I would like to recall Abraham Lincoln's words:

"Shall we expect a transatlantic military

giant to step the ocean and crush us with a blow? Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa, combined with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted), with a Bonaparte for commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio (River) or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of 1,000 years.

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer: If it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and its finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through our times or die by suicide."

This is Sam Jones speaking.

Chicago Wants More Lake Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a perceptive and thoughtful editorial from the Green Bay Press Gazette entitled "Chicago Wants More Water." The Press Gazette has an excellent reputation for careful and responsible expression in its editorial policy. I commend to my colleagues this persuasive reply to the advocates of Chicago water diversion bills which will be before this Congress later in the session.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO WANTS MORE LAKE WATER

The first bill introduced in the House at the opening session of the 86th Congress was a measure to permit Chicago to divert more water from Lake Michigan. The bill which will be known as H.R. 1 would authorize Chicago to increase its diversion from 1,500 cubic feet per second to 2,500 cubic feet per second. The increased diversion is asked for 1 year only as a part of a 3-year testing program.

Bill H.R. 1 is said to be almost identical with bill H.R. 2 which was adopted by the House during the 85th Congress. That bill authorized the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw an annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan for the Illinois Waterway during a 3-year period with the maximum direct diversion never to exceed 5,000 cubic feet per second. The Secretary of the Army was to report the results of the test to Congress. Since the President had vetoed two similar bills in previous sessions largely on the ground that Canada had objected to it, there was much discussion about Canada's interest in the bill at the last session of Congress. A big point was made over whether Canada had actually agreed to the test. The bill finally died under a filibuster staged by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin.

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan by Chicago has been opposed by all of the States bordering on the Great Lakes, by New York and in the past by Canada on the grounds that it would lower the level of the Great Lakes and reduce the flow of water over Niagara Falls. The Chicago advocates of diversion claim, however, that a diversion program within the limits of that asked by

Chicago could operate for 3 years without lowering the level of the lakes as much as 1 inch.

In spite of these assurances, people interested in shipping in the lake States have consistently and at great expense opposed all efforts of Chicago to divert water from Lake Michigan. The struggle began in 1900 when the city of Chicago and suburbs arranged to dispose of sewage in that area by reversing the flow of the Chicago River from Lake Michigan through the Chicago sanitary canal, the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers, and eventually to the Mississippi. This began a heavy flow of water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi basin and the fight was on. The fight has gone on for the 59 years since. Those opposing the diversion claim that the Chicago sanitary district has at times withdrawn as much as 14,000 cubic feet of water per second and that it had averaged 10,000 cubic feet of water per second in 1928.

The lake States finally brought an original action in the U.S. Supreme Court to enjoin Chicago and the State of Illinois from further diversion. After years of hearings and investigations the Supreme Court, in 1930, held that the Chicago water diversion had caused a lowering of 6 inches in the level of the Great Lakes. It declared that the lowering of the water had caused substantial damage in connection with fishing, hunting, beaches, summer resorts, and public parks. The Court then ordered a gradual reduction of the diversion of water from the amounts being taken for Chicago to provide means of disposing of the sewage in the sanitary district. Finally, the order fixed the amount of water that might be diverted permanently to 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage. Since that time the Chicago sanitary district has made great progress in sewage treatment but it has never given up its struggle to increase the amount of water taken from the Great Lakes.

In the beginning Chicago depended upon its claim that it needed the water to preserve the health of the millions of people in the Chicago area. In later cases, however, it rested its case upon the ground that navigation on the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers was impaired by low water due to drought conditions which had prevailed in the upper Mississippi Valley.

However, the opponents of diversion have never relaxed for a second in their continuing battle against what they call the Chicago water steal. At present they are opposing the diversion on the ground that it is illegal and improper to divert water from one watershed to another. It is pointed out, for example, that Wisconsin cities taking water from Lake Michigan in all cases use it and return it to the lake so that there is no change in the level of the water. On the other hand, Chicago would take water, use it for sanitary purposes, for navigation and for waterpower and then dump it across the watershed into the Mississippi where it is lost forever.

The reasons given for Chicago's wish to divert water are sufficient to explain the tremendous effort they make to gain their point. However the efforts by leaders in Wisconsin and the other Great Lakes States are purely in defense of the lake levels. It is unbelievable that they would carry on a campaign extending across half a century at tremendous expense if they were not convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that diversion would cause serious damage. There can be no doubt but that the people in the Great Lakes States are firmly convinced not only that they have a great asset in the Great Lakes waters for use in recreation and in commerce but that they also are certain, after years of study, of the conditions on the

lakes, that shipping and shore property would be seriously injured if additional water should be diverted. They feel now that even the amount authorized for diversion is a concession to Chicago and not a thing that Chicago people are entitled to by any right. It must be clear to everyone that the waters in the Great Lakes basin belong there and the best public policy will be to have all such waters taken for use returned to that basin.

Congress Needs Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Needs Facts," published in the January 18, 1959, issue of the Columbia Missourian.

Because of my own interest in adequate freedom of government information, and also because of the interest of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee in continuing studies of the subject, I believe this brief editorial is most timely. I agree that Congress must have access to opinions and facts from Government officials to carry out its own serious responsibilities to the American people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS FACTS

Congressional hearings on President Eisenhower's proposed budget are starting off with a storm of controversy over an administrative letter reminding Government officials that it is a violation of the 1921 Budget Act to ask increases in appropriations without clearing through proper channels.

A Budget Bureau spokesman denied that this was intended as a gag on prospective witnesses, but if it was not this, just what was it?

It is known that many of the officials are sure to be dissatisfied with the amounts allocated their departments and bureaus by the President's budget. Army and Navy spokesmen are certain to protest huge cuts in their requests, for example.

It is the duty of the Congress to make appropriations, and in carrying out this duty, it must investigate all possible sources of information. The most natural sources of information are Government officials. Congressmen must try to find out whether their requests are justified or not.

What causes much of the concern over the testimony of Government officials is that their motives for increased funds sometimes are questionable. One of these, of course, is the mere wish to rise in importance, influence, and power. More money would give them this.

Who is to judge these men? Congress has the responsibility for making appropriations. It must have information to do this. So, it must have access to opinions and facts from Government officials and make decisions based on committee findings.

Defeat—A Famous Figure Reflects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just completed reading a very interesting article in the Wall Street Journal under date of January 20, 1959, concerning our friend and former colleague, a distinguished citizen of my State, William F. Knowland, of Oakland, Calif. The article discusses former Senator Knowland in his retirement from the Senate and in his capacity as a publisher of a great California newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEAT—A FAMOUS FIGURE REFLECTS

(By Jonathan Spivak)

OAKLAND, CALIF.—The political tom-toms were still, the bitterness of the campaign long past.

He had come home as assistant publisher of the family-owned newspaper. In this industrial city, his name was admired and respected despite the final defeat.

As on those broiling autumn days of electioneering, he was shirt-sleeved and smiling. The cast of his bear-like shoulders, the deliberate power of his handclasp were unchanged. And yet there was a perceptible difference about the man.

Somewhere along the corridors of defeat Bill Knowland had shed his Senatorial robes. His simple and unpretentious desk was bare save for an open appointment book. There were no autographed portraits of famous figures along the walls. Only a wood plaque embossed with a few lines of poetry.

The office was an oasis. No phones rang, no eager secretaries bustled in with messages. Four flights down the presses roared, but in the room there was only the gentle hum of conversation.

Tanned and relaxed, he rocked back in his swivel chair, hands clasped behind his head. The stern belligerence of his features had mellowed. He no longer delivered speeches, but spoke as one newspaperman to another.

The causes of his defeat for the California governorship, and for the defeat of many other Republican candidates last fall, still perplexed him. "Some of the early columnists tried to oversimplify it," he said, "as a problem in one area or branch of the party. But on reflection that is not the case."

NO FIXED PATTERN

Pro-Benson and anti-Benson Congressmen were beaten. Republicans with good labor records and Republicans who were bitterly opposed by the AFL-CIO lost. "There was no fixed pattern or reason for it," he insisted.

As for his own campaign, one that probably cost him his political career, he had no misgivings. He spoke with the resignation of a man who had played for high stakes and lost. "I frankly have no regrets whatsoever in raising the issues I did and making the fight I did. I think that is what campaigns are for."

Then he added, with a touch of the crusader still, "I think it will help alert the people of California to some of the dangers ahead. History shows that the issue of slavery wasn't solved the first time Lincoln and Douglas debated it. Douglas won and Lincoln lost." He referred to the proposed right-to-work law which he vigorously supported as a union reform measure, but which was defeated along with him.

He had gained, however, a grudging respect for the political effectiveness of the unions. "Organized labor," he conceded, "certainly did give the Democrats a highly efficient, well organized in most cases, intelligently led and well-financed group able to do much more than the party could."

As a politician, the Senator rarely talked about himself in his speeches. As a private citizen he is much less reticent.

The single greatest change in leaving public life, he said, was that time was suddenly his own. At the Capitol his workday usually started with a 7:30 a.m. breakfast with perhaps members of the White House staff, or Cabinet officers, or other Congressmen. It rarely ended in less than 12 hours. In election years he campaigned through 12 to 14 meetings a day.

He plans to take a personal interest in the editorial department of his newspapers. "I've been associated with the paper for 30 years. I'll do some editorial writing from time to time as I feel the situation warrants it. I'll keep in constant touch with the editorial department, go over editorials, make suggestions," he said.

INDEPENDENT POLICY

Democrats and Republicans would fare alike. "There will be no carping criticism," he insisted. "I don't believe in it and never have." He said the Tribune will continue to do two things: first, cover the news and, second, comment on it constructively. "We'll be free to praise any Democratic official regardless of who he is. And if he happens to be a Republican who merits condemnation, we'll be critical," he declared.

The toughest question was saved for the last. "What of his future, did he plan to seek public office again?" "I have no present intentions," he replied firmly. "Right now I expect to be deeply involved in the newspaper business and my family. There is no appointment that I seek or would accept."

Then, for a fleeting moment, he gazed contemplatively out over the Oakland horizon. He mused: "Having been an active participant in history in the making for 13 crucial years, it will be very interesting to watch these events from 3,000 miles across the country."

And perhaps it will.

Brandeis on Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Louis D. Brandeis, regarded as one of the great American liberals, did not favor oppression of any kind in business and industry—neither by the ownership and management nor the unions. The able editors of the Charleston News and Courier have disclosed this in an editorial printed in their January 20 edition, entitled "Brandeis on Unions."

I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANDEIS ON UNIONS

Liberals and self-styled friends of the workingman are forever blasting monopolies. They are blind to monopoly by labor unions.

Citizens who favor right-to-work laws to protect the worker from union bosses are denounced as reactionaries. Yet Louis D. Brandeis, still one of the great names among American liberals, understood and approved of the principle of competition between union and nonunion members.

Brandeis, late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, said:

"The ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade, outside of its ranks, an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer."

If there is a right to organize, there should be a right to refuse to be organized by union bosses. That is the purpose of right-to-work laws. These laws are under constant fire.

Louis Brandeis may become reactionary in the eyes of those who talk of freedom but act like tyrants.

Way Down Yonder in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Star which deals with the U.S. cultural and scientific exhibition now planned for display in Moscow next summer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY DOWN YONDER IN MOSCOW

Those in charge of the U.S. cultural and scientific exhibition in Moscow next summer are big with plans. The Russians are to be exposed to our kitchen conveniences, paintings, photograph collections, hamburgers, and perhaps the Chicago symphony orchestra and a rodeo.

However, a special adviser, Norman K. Winston, now tells the New York Times that the U.S. Information Agency wants to send along a jazz orchestra but that the Soviets frown on the idea. "They're worried it might put on some rock 'n' roll and have a bad influence on youth," says Winston.

This stand illustrates beautifully the ignorance of the benighted Russians in such matters and their need of deliverance. Rock 'n' roll is not jazz.

In fact the Russians have more reason to resist jazz because it gives a picture of America they would like to deny. The music is one of the happy results of the collision of European and African cultures on American soil. Its enjoyment knows no racial or national boundaries. Traditional or modern, Louis Armstrong or Dizzy Gillespie, we doubt that the Russians have heard anything like it. And from it, they could learn a little more about America. Perhaps that is the influence that really worries Soviet officials.

Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles on the subject of our Latin American relations, by Edward Tomlinson which appeared on October 27, 1958, December 29, 1958, and January 5, 1959, in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO LATIN HIGH DESPITE CRITICISM

(By Edward Tomlinson)

Our relations with the majority of Latin American nations have improved considerably in the past few months, especially since the Foreign Ministers of all the 20 republics met here in Washington.

Most of the ministers went away enthusiastic about the sympathetic understanding and spirit of cooperation they found among our officials.

But some of their political leaders still think we are not doing as much as should to help strengthen the economies of our neighbors.

CRITICAL

Brazilian representatives in the United Nations, who sat in on the foreign ministers' meetings, have been particularly critical of us in the last 10 days. Senhor Augusto Frederico Schmidt, a close adviser of President Juscelino Kubitschek, has attacked the State Department because one of its spokesmen suggested there is a limit to what we can do.

The Foreign Minister of Panama returned to the isthmus and said that the Department of State is obstructing President Eisenhower's desires to see that terms of the 1955 treaty revisions are carried out immediately.

The Bolivians have bought full-page advertising space in newspapers to appeal for more financial aid, and remind us that we will be the losers if communism takes root in their country. Haiti and several others which have been hit hard by inflation and low income are desperately pleading for more financial assistance.

RECORD

However, our record of assistance, and the machinery for maintaining a steady stream of loans and aid to every one of the republics in the future is quite impressive.

The Export-Import Bank has made more loans for the construction of steel mills, hydroelectric and irrigation projects, road building and other public works in Latin America than in any other part of the world.

The International Bank, in which we are the largest stockholders, has advanced over a billion dollars to the different countries, while the International Monetary Fund has earmarked huge sums to bolster most of those confronted with inflation and other exchange difficulties.

We have set up the facilities of the International Development Corporation to which any country may apply for long term loans for productive enterprise. We have agreed to help set up an Inter-American Bank, which has been near to the hearts of Latin American leaders. We have joined in helping to stabilize the prices of several of their chief commodities, including sugar and coffee, and agreed to discuss the possibility of

establishing regional or common markets in this hemisphere.

Our citizens have invested more than \$8 billion in the 20 republics, and we still buy the bulk of all their products, paying for them in dollars on the barrelhead. All of which may not be as much as we should, or could do, but it is far from niggardly.

REDS OPEN NEW PUSH IN LATIN AMERICA (By Edward Tomlinson)

The Communists are going all out to forge new bridgeheads in Latin America in 1959. Voters in most of 20 countries have dealt the Reds sharp rebuffs in the past year and a half. Communist-supported candidates for the presidency in practically all recent elections south of the border have lost.

Diplomatic reports from key capitals indicate that Moscow's chief weapons in the coming campaign will be trade and propaganda. It will concentrate on the big countries that are inflation ridden and short of foreign currency, particularly those in which dollars are scarce.

Conditions in such countries as Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, where inflation has already reached catastrophic proportions, are made to order for the Kremlin. Soviet agents, diplomats, and special trade missions already are making headway in these three countries.

Last summer U.S. economic experts were pointing out what some of them insisted was the big drop in trade between these three countries and the Russian bloc.

But by early December American business firms were warning of a sharp upward trend in Communist commercial activities.

Dollars, pounds sterling and other sound currencies are so limited that they are compelled to barter with Iron Curtain nations for increasing quantities of machinery and other needed products.

The Argentine Government has announced the signing of a new trade agreement with the Soviet Union. Russia will supply Argentina with a variety of heavy machinery and tools for the state oil monopoly and receive in return Argentine wool, hides, tanning materials, and other products.

To facilitate the deal, the Soviets extended Argentina a 10-year \$100 million credit. Both Argentina and Uruguay have been bartering wool, corn, and other commodities for Russian oil since the first of the year.

Brazil has been selling Russia cotton, chocolate, and coffee in limited quantities for some time. Now she has entered into a barter agreement by which she is buying Russian crude oil in return for coffee, cacao (chocolate), castor oil and other surplus Brazilian products.

Some 500,000 barrels of oil are now on the way and 3 million more are expected to be imported during 1959. The Brazilians had already bought 12 cargo ships from Poland for her coastal trade.

In the last half of 1958, Chile sold large orders of copper wire to Russia, East Germany and other satellite countries. Meantime, Soviet and Communist Chinese trade missions have been pressing the Chileans for further commercial agreements.

The Czechoslovakians are even offering cargo and military transport planes to all these countries in exchange for mineral and agricultural commodities.

THINGS LOOK UP IN THE AMERICAS (By Edward Tomlinson)

Latin America and its 175 million people have started a new year with more political freedom, but confronted with bigger economic and social problems than at any time since World War II.

Meantime, our relations with these 20 Republics next door have taken a turn for the better. At least the Eisenhower administration has finally come up with a definite and generous economic policy toward our neighbors.

TRUJILLO, STILL

In the political field, dictators have been walking the plank in almost rhythmic succession. Backward Paraguay and Haiti still are in the hands of minor strong men. But among the major despots only Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic survives.

In the majority of the Republics from Mexico to Argentina general elections have taken place in the past 12 months. Mostly middle-of-the-road candidates, some avowedly conservative, have been elected. The extreme nationalists as well as the Communists have lost ground everywhere.

Three or four of the current regimes are shaky, including those of Honduras, Haiti, and Bolivia. Cuba's political future now hangs in the balance and the newly elected government of Venezuela will not take office for another several weeks. Some observers agree that but for the backing of the military, Presidents Juscelino Kubitschek, of Brazil, and Manuel Prado, of Peru, would have difficulty maintaining their positions.

In nearly all the countries the governments are grappling with runaway inflation, mounting living cost, huge debts, and falling prices of their chief products.

BLIND SPOT

Until recently top officials in Washington, and for that matter the American people, had been so preoccupied with crises in Europe, the Middle and Far East, that they were apparently unaware of the alarming and in some cases desperate state of affairs in many of our sister republics.

But when Vice President Nixon ran into such angry outbursts of opposition in a half dozen of the capitals of South America last summer, everybody from the President down got busy with fence mending.

The flowering of a series of economic gains came after the new government of President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina broke away from the past and instituted some of the most drastic and unprecedented national reforms in the history of Latin America. It scrapped its fanatically nationalistic laws against foreign oil companies. As a result, more than \$500 million of United States and other private capital is flowing in to help expand the petroleum industry.

The Frondizi government also knocked the artificial props from under the peso, so that it could find its real value.

Washington also indicates there are millions for other countries that are willing to face up to the facts of economic life.

Actually, when it comes to financial aid, the United States had not neglected the Latins. More North American loans and credits have been flowing into the 20 countries in the last decade than to any other area of the world.

What we have neglected is the human factor. For the most part, we had acted like a doctor with poor bedside manners. We extended a lot of healing loans and credits, but failed to exude a sympathetic understanding of the plight of our ailing friends and neighbors.

Who's a Reactionary Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, present day parlance is replete with labels such as liberal and conservative and radical reactionary. It is refreshing

to discover the correct usage of one of these terms by the press. An editorial in the Greenville News of January 26, 1959, entitled "Who's a Reactionary Now?" is illustrative of the correct way to apply the term "reactionary" as Webster defines it. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S A REACTIONARY NOW?

The union bosses like to call the right-to-work principle reactionary and say it is designed to break organized labor but they are woefully short on evidence to back up their claim.

In fact, many European nations, including some well down the road to outright socialism, have such laws on their books, with no noticeable diminution of union strength.

And the European counterparts of Reuther and Meany frankly say they like the open shop idea.

The February issue of Fortune magazine cites some examples of this somewhat surprising attitude. It notes that the British Trade Union Congress has a membership of over 8 million workers out of a total labor force of some 24 million. The closed shop exists only in parts of a few industries, mainly printing and mining, and the rest of the workers are completely free to join a union or not as they see fit.

The same general conditions exist in Germany, Italy, and France, all of whose governments are much nearer the welfare state form than our own.

The magazine quotes Charles Geddes, former president of the Trade Union Congress, as expressing satisfaction with the open shop. He said:

"I do not believe in a closed shop. . . . There is a fundamental issue here of the right of the individual to say whether or not he would become associated with other people. . . . I want the right to exclude people from my union, but that cannot be done on the basis that everyone must belong or starve."

For expressing sentiments such as these in this country, Mr. Geddes would be denounced as an out-and-out union-buster. We hate to think what he would be called by Mrs. Roosevelt who accused movie actress Irene Dunne of advocating slave labor in supporting right-to-work legislation.

So far the union bosses have been successful in arresting the trend toward open shops in the large industrial States. Why they should do so in the face of the position of their counterparts abroad with much more experience is quite another question.

It is probably just another manifestation of the fact that most of them are about 50 years behind the times. They are simply aping the actions of the robber barons of another era.

Juvenile Problem Types

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian. It deals with juvenile delinquency and will furnish the Congress

with important statistics concerning the juvenile problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE PROBLEM TYPES

Not all schoolchildren are little monsters, according to the National Education Association, despite the impression that may have been created by the publicity given to juvenile delinquency. The NEA finds a higher percentage of those in school lead exemplary lives than do members of the older generations.

In a handbook for parents and teachers entitled "Juvenile Delinquency—Research, Theory, and Comment," the education association goes into some detail in analyzing the age groups of the most susceptible and the influence of schools on the problem. It even categorizes delinquency into two parts: Cultural and emotional delinquencies.

Less than 5 percent of school-age children were found to be other than normal, reasonably healthy and law-abiding citizens, and of this 5 percent a remarkably large number were found to be not in school. Of delinquents, 95 percent of those 17 years old, 85 percent of those 16 years old, and 50 percent of those aged 15 do not attend schools, according to the NEA's survey.

"The big stumbling block—for the general public as well as for teachers—is the scarcity of reliable information on the subject compared to the abundance of medicine-man prescriptions," complains the NEA. Despite the lack of material and proper guidance, the schools seem to have done a commendable job in promoting citizenship among their students.

In dividing juvenile delinquency into two parts, the educators have eliminated from the hard core of hoodlums the passively antisocial cultural delinquent. He is described as the otherwise normal child who shows antisocial tendencies only so far as is necessary to conform to the code of his gang.

The emotional delinquent is the bully, the sadist, or the violent hoodlum who is motivated by inner urges. He is the true delinquent, the menace to society, and the one responsible for the shadow of guilt cast wrongly on many of his youthful contemporaries. He is also the one in need of psychiatric or psychological help.

It is both gratifying and revealing to note the small percentage of youths who have earned themselves the label of juvenile delinquent. Even this small group, however, is responsible for some of the most heinous crimes and it is to the eradication of this element, and not the blackening of youthful reputations, that the fight against juvenile delinquency must be waged.

Deficit Financing and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, economy measures by the Federal Government are often pictured as the hobgoblin which brings unemployment and hardship to the average citizen. Such illusions are dispelled by an editorial in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., published on January 24, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT FINANCING AND UNEMPLOYMENT

A typical Herblock cartoon published originally in the leftwing Washington Post and used in one or more South Carolina newspapers implies that, somehow, the President's proposal of a balanced budget and eventual tax cuts will increase unemployment and make worse the plight of those now unemployed.

Neither the balanced budget nor the promised tax cuts may come about. Defense urgencies may make them impossible, or so it may seem to Congress.

But the picture of a balanced budget bringing hardships on working people is a false one. It is the old delusion, long since dispelled in the minds of most reasonable men, left over from the heyday of the New-Fair Deal tax-spend philosophy.

Certain liberal economists still hold to the idea, of course. Their theory is that the way to offset depressions and provide full employment is for the Government to spend more, even if it has to go into needless make-work projects and finance these on a deficit basis.

The theory works, for a time, but experience has shown that eventually it defeats its own purpose. Deficit financing by the Government inevitably causes more inflation. The dollar is depreciated and wages and salaries buy less and less.

Actually, Government spending strikes the economy a double blow. The Government must tax the public to get the money it spends. The result is that the consumer has less money with which to buy things he wants and needs; business has less capital to put into improvements, expansions, new plants, and the development of new products. Thus, fewer jobs are created, and, worse still, many jobs are eliminated.

Along with this may come price increases. The net result is less consumer buying power and more unemployment.

We haven't tried it in a long time, but perhaps a different Government policy would produce the opposite—and more desirable—result.

A balanced budget, an end to deficit financing, and, perhaps, a reduction in the national debt would tend to peg the dollar at something like the purchasing power it still has left. The consumer could buy more goods, thus creating jobs. Tax reductions would give the consumer still more purchasing power.

Both factors would encourage business and industry to expand and create still more jobs. An expanding economy would enable the Government to maintain a healthy budget without reducing services, and the end result would be good for all.

Some, especially the tax-spending crowd, may call it fanciful reasoning, outmoded economics, or worse. But it might work. Who knows?

Senator Bridges and Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Bridges and Mikoyan," which appeared in one of New Hamp-

shire's leading daily newspapers, Foster's Daily Democrat, of Dover, N.H. on Saturday, January 24, 1959.

I believe this editorial comment, with regard to the wining and dining which Mikoyan received in this country, accurately reflects the attitude of the great majority of New Hampshire citizens.

This sound, well-written editorial merits the attention of all people in our country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BRIDGES AND MIKOYAN

Have we, in our great preoccupation with material wealth and immaterial entertainment, lost our priceless heritage, the capacity for moral indignation? This Nation, which refused tribute to Tripoli, pays casual toll to labor racketeers; which two generations ago threatened a sultan with death rather than ransom an America (who was forthwith released), has within this generation paid ransom to or left prisoners in half a dozen third-rate Communist countries; which for 150 years stood for principles recognized and honored throughout the world, has recently wine, dined, and feted the murderer from Moscow.

Granted that it may sometimes become necessary to meet with such a creature over the conference table, it was an example of extremely poor taste and judgment for some leaders in American business and political life to roll out the red carpet. We are gratified to learn that our Senator Bridges was one of several prominent persons who showed both the sense and the courage to refuse social invitations where Mikoyan would have been present.

Independent View of U.S. Prestige Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I saw on the CBS Television Network a very fine program of news analysis entitled "Years of Crisis." Participating were Edward R. Murrow, Winston Burdett, Charles Collingwood, Richard C. Hottelet, Peter Kalischer, Ernest Leiser, Paul Niven, David Schoenbrun, and Eric Sevareid.

I was particularly impressed with the fact that these able and experienced news correspondents felt that the prestige of the United States is higher throughout the world today than it was a year ago. This is timely recognition that our foreign policy is operating to strengthen the United States in its relations with the rest of the world. Since I believe my colleagues would be interested in this impartial judgment on our foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MURROW. Gentlemen, most of you have spent the last year looking at your own

country from the outside. How do we look? What is our posture? Leiser?

Mr. LEISER. Well, Ed, I think our position and our prestige in Europe are considerably higher than they were last year at this time. Our allies always hope that we'll stand firm without being belligerent and we satisfied those requirements in Berlin, at least so far. And then there's something else to remember. Last year at about this time the beep from sputnik was the only sound in outer space and our earth-bound voice was one of outrage and fear. Now we're up in space, too, and in a pretty impressive way. In Berlin, the very day that a Soviet general was making specially belligerent threats to us, we shot our talking satellite up into the air. And the Berliners paid a lot more attention to that satellite than they paid to the Russian general's threats.

Mr. MURROW. Burdett, how do we look from the Middle East?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, in the Arab part of the Middle East, the United States still faces the profound instinctive mistrust of the Arab nationalists and we're still very far from overcoming it. We're still regarded as the country that refused to invest in an Egypt that was taking arms from the Russians, as the country that decided not to help build the Aswan dam when we discovered that the Russians were not interested in building it. I think we'll have to do something radically new to persuade the Arabs that we are not interested in them merely because we're afraid of the Russians.

Mr. MURROW. Kallischer?

Mr. KALLISCHER. Well, Ed, in Communist China we're Public Enemy No. 1. In South Korea and South Viet Nam, the anti-Communist bastions we've erected, we look pretty good, particularly after Quemoy. In the neutralist countries, India and Burma, we look much better than we did last year, possibly because Washington has ceased to regard neutralism as a dirty word. In Japan, our military bases are looked on as the accommodation you must make to your best customer.

Mr. MURROW. Hottelet?

Mr. HOTTELET. Well, I think we look a good bit better in the Western Hemisphere, too. We've done some concrete things. We're encouraging regional development and the common market in South America and that's noted and very much appreciated. But we still somehow missed that meeting of minds that engenders real cordiality. Friendship is a two-way street that seems to be a pretty rough road. The South Americans expect us to bail them out of all their troubles, and we smile at their dreams. Up in the north, Canada feels penetrated and dominated by American capital. I think somehow it's a problem of communications more than anything else and we miss in a field in which we normally excel.

Mr. MURROW. Collingwood, how do we look as viewed from London?

Mr. COLLINGWOOD. Well, the British having accepted the fact of American dominance in the western coalition are not immune to the thought that perhaps they could manage these things better if they still had the leadership. Nevertheless, they think that we're doing pretty well lately, perhaps because we're doing a little more the sort of thing that they think that they would have done. An interesting development has been the way in which President Eisenhower has ceased to be the image of American leadership in Britain. When the British talk about American foreign policy, they tend to talk about it in terms of Dulles rather than of Eisenhower. When Vice President Nixon was there, the things he said, the things he did, made more impact than anything that's come from the White House. And the British tend to be a little skeptical about the tone and the style of the American image in the world. For instance, they were very

impressed by the feat of getting the Atlas into orbit; but when the Atlas began to talk, the British thought it rather an odd thing to say from a military missile.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, we began by talking briefly about the significant developments of the last decade. Let's go back to that. Schoenbrun, what would you regard as the most important development in Europe in the last 10 years?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Ed, the most important developments are not always the most spectacular. In my area the most spectacular development, of course, has been the rise and fall of the French Republic, but, although important, I don't think it was the most important. I think the most important has been the birth and the growth of European economic union, the hard core of which is the reconciliation of the French and German peoples—united for the first time in a millenium, economically, militarily. Now this unity of France and Germany has grown up behind the shield of NATO.

Mr. MURROW. David, are they united to stay, do you think, or is this just a personal relationship between Adenauer and De Gaulle?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Oh, no; I think they're united to stay. I don't think it has anything to do with De Gaulle and Adenauer at all. There are real factors involved in this, and I think the growth of Europe is a permanent thing. I think, also, just as important as the growth of Europe is the Atlantic alliance which has permitted Europe to grow. Ed, I would suggest that had there been a NATO alliance in 1913 or in 1938, the World Wars would never have broken out.

Mr. MURROW. I think we can all agree with that.

Parity Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Missouri Delta Farmer, published at Portageville, Mo. The editorial deals with the parity concept, and makes an interesting comparison between this concept and minimum wage laws. I commend the editorial to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD THIS BE SO?

The Secretary of Agriculture and a few professional followers have commenced a ballyhoo barrage designed to convince the Members of the 86th Congress that the farmer would like to abandon the parity concept. Rejection of the corn marketing quota is being cited by the Secretary in support of this contention. In short, farmers are solidly behind the Benson theory of no supports and unlimited production, with the devil to get the hindmost.

Now organized labor is strongly contending for minimum wage laws to apply to every workingman. Minimum wages are supposed to supply the cost of living; the things the worker has to buy in order to live and work. In a real sense, established minimum wages set a standard of parity compensation for the workingman. The Secretary of Labor and leaders of organized labor have, so far,

at least, raised no cry for the abandonment of the minimum wage. Why should they?

To a greater extent than any other worker the farmer is forced to buy materials with which his product is produced. Far larger than the mere cost of living is the investment he makes in implements, fertilizer, seed, motor fuel, agricultural chemicals, services and repairs. The return on his investment, the profit on his crop, even his daily wage, depend on the relation between what it costs to produce a crop and what that crop will bring. We see little difference in either principle or effect between the minimum wage for labor and the parity concept for the farmer. Wonder if we could get the Secretary of Labor to step across the hall and explain some things to Elder Benson.

D. W. Watkins, of Clemson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is seldom that we recognize the contributions of servants of the public during their lifetime. An editorial published on January 23, 1959, by the Greenville News, a prominent newspaper in my State, illustrates that such is not the case with Dr. D. W. Watkins, the splendid leader of the Agriculture Extension Service in South Carolina. As the editorial points out, Dr. Watkins' contributions in the field of agriculture have been so outstanding they have merited the acclaim of his fellow citizens while he still lives. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I refer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATKINS PORTRAIT SYMBOLIZES AN ERA

Across the history of the progress in agriculture in South Carolina during the last quarter of a century D. W. Watkins, of Clemson, casts a long shadow.

And because the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service is closely related to Clemson College's contribution to the State, Dr. Watkins stands tall in the annals of that institution.

Therefore, it was with pleasure that we learned that his portrait had been unveiled and appropriately displayed in Long Hall on the college campus.

Even more fitting was the fact that the portrait was painted by the beloved Dr. B. O. Williams, former professor of economics at Clemson who is now on the faculty of the University of Georgia. Dr. Williams, an accomplished amateur painter, left more than 15 years ago for a larger field of activity, but his heart has never left the Clemson campus, much less South Carolina.

For about a generation, the name of D. W. Watkins was synonymous with the development of agriculture in this State. He assumed leadership of the Extension Service, with its county agents and home demonstration agents in 1934, a time of crisis with the whole economy and an even more acute crisis with the farm economy.

It was the beginning of the period of mighty transition in the South. We shifted from the one-crop system to the dynamic idea of diversification and we began to bal-

ance agriculture with industry. It was the beginning of the era of experimentation with better crops, cattle, dairying and forestry. Soil conservation became a major objective of the whole operation.

Over much of this change, Dr. Watkins presided with a kindly but firm sort of leadership and he helped it along in many ways with a benign sort of missionary zeal.

It is well that this fine man has received homage while he is still able to enjoy it. By honoring him Clemson honors itself and its traditions.

It behooves the rest of us to think of him and the men and women who worked with him during his era and those who are following after them every time we see a handsome rural home where once a tenant cabin stood, a green pasture with grazing cattle where once there were only weeds and rodents and fertile fields where once there were only gullied hillsides and silted bottomlands.

They didn't do it alone, but they provided the leadership.

We and the Russians; Let Us Not Be "Luniks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, from the magazine *Iron Age*, entitled "We and the Russians; Let Us Not Be 'Luniks'."

Mr. President, it is heartening to me, in the face of the socializing and triumphal ovation activities of some of our industrialists, to see this editorial in a magazine which is a spokesman for the steel industry. This cool-headed, practical appraisal of Mikoyan's visit is in encouraging contrast to those who are emotionally blind or have unwarranted hopes of quick profit through liberalized trade.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Iron Age*, Jan. 22, 1959]

WE AND THE RUSSIANS; LET US NOT BE "LUNIKS"

(By Tom Campbell)

As usual, many Americans, high and low, are falling for the soft-soap spread about recently by Mr. Anastas I. Mikoyan. Maybe some will soon be calling him Mike, thus making everything right with the world.

The picture that unfolded as this astute old Bolshevik charmed our business people, our actors, and our publicity seekers smacks of the early thirties. Then there was a reawakening in Russian friendship followed by a diplomatic recognition. This was followed by a long list of reneging on agreements, by power grabs, and by imperialistic moves by the Reds.

We can't blame Mr. Mikoyan if a lot of people who ought to know better act like babes in the woods. There is nothing wrong with putting out the carpet for the Russian mouthpiece. He has done a good selling job but he had help from our naiveness.

There are a few simple things for us to remember in dealing with the Reds. Russia is ruled by an iron dictatorship. The people do as they are told by the State.

We are in the midst of a struggle between communism and our type democracy. This fight extends to trade, to minds, to expansion, to agreements, to allies, to science—and possibly (we hope not) to war.

Now that the United States is strong and capable of protecting herself and helping her allies protect themselves, we can afford to be less jittery. But we can't be relaxed to the point where we actually give the Reds what they are prepared to fight for.

The expansion pattern of the czars has been adopted under a new banner by the Reds. Everything is directed toward the goal of world rule. We and our allies have no such goal. Thus all the talk about coexistence, friendship, peace, et cetera, is propaganda. We must keep our eyes, ears—and minds—open.

It may help our people to see more of the Russians. But it won't cause them to adopt our way of doing things. It won't hurt to sell Russia nonstrategic items but the truth is that if we do, it will produce something the Russians want and need without benefit to us.

Let the "Luniks" fly out in space. Let us keep a cool head about us. Let's not mix our genuine good naturedness with Red deception.

Claude Miller—American, Friend, and Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the late Claude Miller, of Wichita Falls, Tex., retired from business life several years ago, but he never retired as an active and patriotic citizen. Right up until his untimely death at 82 in December 1958, Claude Miller kept working for the America he believed in.

A native Texan, born at Jonesboro in Coryell County, February 21, 1876, he later moved to the Oklahoma Territory. He settled at the small town of Altus and immediately began working for civic improvements. He led the movement which brought the railroad to Altus and was instrumental in the subdividing of Greer County to form three counties—Greer, Harmon, and Jackson.

Claude Miller worked to have the Oklahoma Territory become one of the United States, and was a delegate from Greer County—later Jackson County—to the statehood convention. He was active in the election of Charles N. Haskell, the first governor of the new State, and worked untiringly for the nomination and election of Scott Ferris to the U.S. House of Representatives. Mr. Ferris was the first Congressman from his district.

Later, Mr. Miller, himself, ran for Congress from the new State of Oklahoma, but unfortunately was not elected. He was a delegate from Oklahoma to a national Democratic convention.

He married the former Miss Daisie Kimberlin at Altus in 1903. They had three children, Tom Mike, who died some years ago, Joe Betsy, and Claude, Jr., who is now a surgeon in Washington State.

Mr. Miller took his family to New Mexico for a short time while he opened some stores there, then they returned to Texas in 1919 and he entered business at Wichita Falls.

There Joe Betsy married a young attorney named James V. Allred, who later became district attorney of Wichita County, then attorney general, and later Governor of Texas. Mr. Allred was appointed a U.S. district judge in Houston in 1940, but resigned 2 years later to run for the U.S. Senate. Losing by a narrow margin, he entered private law practice in Houston until 1950, when he was reappointed to the Federal bench. He is now judge of the southern district of Texas and lives with his family at Corpus Christi. In spite of the fact that times were hard in business, Mr. Miller was extremely active in all of Allred's political campaigns, traveling about the State distributing literature and speaking to the people.

Mr. President, I was an Assistant Attorney General under James V. Allred, and first came to know Mr. Miller at that time.

I am proud to say that through my three races for governor of Texas, when all of us knew the difficulties of defeat, Claude Miller was one of the most active workers, and one who never lost heart in our fight for good government. He was also one of the instigators and statewide organizers and leaders of the "draft YARBOROUGH" movement which elected me to the United States Senate in April 1957, and has always been a loyal friend and true adviser to me.

Claude Miller was a loyal, active Democrat. He was a precinct chairman in Texas and a delegate to county, State and National conventions.

Mr. Miller's motto was "Don't do anything which would disappoint your friends." I believe he never did.

Mr. President, as an indication of the honor and esteem of the Nation for this civic-minded American, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of Mr. Miller's death which was published in the *Wichita Falls Daily Times* for December 13, 1958, and an article which was published in the same newspaper on December 15, 1958, under the heading, "Senator Pays Tribute to Claude Miller."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Wichita Falls (Tex.) Daily Times*, Dec. 13, 1958]

RETIRED BUSINESSMAN DIES AT HOME HERE

A Wichitan since 1919, Claude Miller, 82, father-in-law of Federal judge and former Texas Gov. James V. Allred, died at about 7 a.m. Friday in his home, 1009 City View Lane, after a sudden illness.

Funeral services will be held at 3:30 p.m. Monday in the First Methodist Church with Dr. Neal Cannon, pastor, and Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the First Christian Church, officiating. Burial will be in Riverside Cemetery under the direction of Hampton-Vaughan-Merkle Funeral Home.

Miller, a native Texan, moved here in 1919 from Oklahoma City and went into business at Tenth and Indiana in the Miller-Ferguson ready-to-wear. He had been active in real estate, insurance, and other businesses before his retirement.

He had always maintained a keen interest in politics, making numerous talks in behalf of his son-in-law in his campaigns for State attorney general and later Governor, and in recent years had allied himself with campaigns of several Democrats seeking State offices, including Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH.

Miller was born February 21, 1876, at Jonesboro in Coryell County. He was a member of the First Methodist Church and also the author of a volume of poetry, "Texas Rhymes," published in 1940, which mentions many Wichita Falls people.

He was a business promoter during the boom years of Oklahoma's growth and worked closely with the pioneer builders of Oklahoma industries. Miller was active in numerous civic affairs of Oklahoma City while he lived there.

Previously, he and a brother had owned and operated Miller Bros. Dry Goods Co. at Altus, Okla., where he and his wife were married in the home of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. N. Kimberlin, November 8, 1903. Mrs. Miller survives.

Other survivors are a daughter, Mrs. James V. Allred, of Corpus Christi; a son, Dr. Claude K. Miller, of Wenatchee, Wash., two sisters, Mrs. E. R. McDaniel, 1903 Britain, widow of a Times Publishing Co. employee who served in the company's circulation department for many years, and Mrs. Patty Wisdom, Tyler; and seven grandchildren, Sam Houston Allred, Corpus Christi, James V. Allred, Jr., Austin, Dave Allred, a former Associated Press writer at Montgomery, Ala., now a member of the staff of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, and Kim Miller, Pamela Miller, Rad Miller, and Claudia Miller, all of Wenatchee, Wash.; and one granddaughter of Austin.

The family requests no flowers but asks instead that donations be made to the Heart Fund.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Daily Times, Dec. 15, 1958]

SENATOR PAYS TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE MILLER

"Claude Miller was a believer who translated belief into action."

So spoke U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH Sunday in eulogy to the 82-year-old lifelong Democrat who died at his home in Wichita Falls Friday.

The junior Texas Senator flew into Wichita Falls Sunday afternoon to visit the family of Miller. He was scheduled to go back to Austin late Sunday night.

YARBOROUGH said he was in Denver, Colo., Friday when notified of the Wichitan's death and immediately began rearranging his schedule so he could come here and pay his respects to the family.

He expressed regret that an unbreakable Houston commitment would not allow him to attend Miller's funeral Monday afternoon.

Miller was active in Senator YARBOROUGH's gubernatorial campaigns and was one of the chief figures in the move to draft YARBOROUGH to run for the Senate in 1957.

"While I have lost a close personal friend, I feel that Texas has suffered the greatest loss because Miller was a dynamic believer in democracy for the people," the Senator said.

YARBOROUGH recalled that he first met Miller more than 25 years ago while serving as assistant attorney general under James V. Allred.

Allred, now U.S. district judge, is a former Texas Governor and attorney general. Miller was his father-in-law.

With YARBOROUGH Sunday was Dave Allred, 25, of Corpus Christi, one of the Senator's research assistants and grandson of the deceased.

YARBOROUGH said that Miller traveled to 17 counties in the 1952 campaign when he was already 76 years old and personally nailed up placards.

"During five statewide campaigns in the past 6 years, he was one of my staunchest friends," YARBOROUGH said.

"Not long before his death, he wrote a little verse with a line that said, 'Democracy is my hobby.' It really was more than a hobby—it was a part of his life."

"I know of no one in Texas to fill his place," Senator YARBOROUGH concluded.

Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's Recent Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorial comment which appeared in the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette of January 22, 1959. One is identified as "Soviet Spider Draws U.S. Flies." I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues who were concerned with the recent visit to this country by Deputy Premier Mikoyan.

The other comment, written by Mr. James W. Tucker, and published in his column "Our Town," also concerns the Mikoyan visit.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Jan. 22, 1959]

SOVIET SPIDER DRAWS U.S. FLIES

It looks as if we might have invited Khrushchev himself (the self-appointed grave-digger for the United States) to visit us than to have permitted his First Deputy, Anastas Mikoyan to land on our shores. As keen as he is cruel, as cunning and ruthless as is disarming, this number one henchman is bad medicine for the United States.

Except for minor annoyances created by Hungarians who resented his slaughter of their kinfolk in the double cross of Budapest, this arch enemy of the United States was given the conquering hero treatment, wine and dined and fawned upon, from coast to coast, by an eager press of politicians and tycoons who should have known better. By the time he had returned to New York, where the police commissioner deemed it wise to detail 500 men to his protection, Mikoyan had spent most of his synthetic sweetness and was talking tough. Next on his agenda were Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower. He indicated in advance that he would find what Mr. Dulles meant by his recent statement that there were other ways of unifying Germany than through elections, would be interested in an alternative—if Mr. Dulles had one—but considered the arrogant Red plan to swallow Berlin the best yet. The President, whose weekends have generally been considered inviolate, stayed in Washington to receive Russia's star salesman Saturday.

We applaud the position taken by our own Senator STYLES BRIDGES who declared Saturday on the floor of the U.S. Senate:

"After a good deal of soul searching, I simply cannot condone the activities of those who indulge in socializing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan. Were he here on some specific business I could understand formal talks with him by our officials who would be concerned with his proposals. It should

be obvious to all that Mikoyan is here for a propaganda good will tour; first, to try to weaken our hitherto firm stand in regard to the Berlin situation, and secondly, to attempt to soften us up for eventual proposals of increased trade with the Soviet Union which can only have the effect of weakening our comparative position.

"A few of our industrialists and Wall Street bankers have given him the 'red carpet' treatment as a matter of obvious self-interest if his mission is successful. I, for one, certainly do not intend to aid him in the accomplishment of his mission. I wonder if these same bankers and industrialists are aware of Lenin's statement that, 'When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of the hemp to us.' When will we learn that men cannot be both greedy and free? Why do we now pay tribute and social adulation for a temporary smile from a man whose every past word and deed indicates that he despises us and our way of life. Has his many years of Communist indoctrination thinking so suddenly changed?"

"I am distressed that some of my congressional colleagues have also accorded him recognition in social activities. It is especially disturbing that this man, one of the top plotters of our destruction should have been given a luncheon under the very dome of the U.S. Capitol, which is the most important citadel of human freedom in the world today. Those of us in public life who have entrusted to us the safeguarding of the constitutional guarantees of human freedoms might better follow the course set by that astute and beloved leader of the Catholic church, Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, who recently said without equivocation. 'I shall not receive Mikoyan nor attend any functions in his honor.'

"That should, indeed, be the course of our people whose memories are not so dull that they have already forgotten an incident which occurred just a few brief months ago and which characterizes the calculated course of that ruthless regime which Mikoyan represents. An American unarmed transport plane on its way from Turkey to Iran was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over Armenia, which happens to be comrade Mikoyan's homeland. Eventually, Mr. Mikoyan's government was kind enough to return to us the bodies of four American soldiers. Where are the other 10? We don't know.

"Instead of traipsing around the country exuding affable charm. I would be much more impressed if Mikoyan would address himself to giving us some information concerning the whereabouts of those sons of American mothers.

"Cardinal Cushing's course is the one that I had already set for myself from the time Mikoyan arrived in this country. In that decision and in my whole course of action, I will continue to do my utmost to convey to the Soviet enslaved peoples of the world that the torch which they bear in their never-ending struggle for freedom still shines brightly in the eyes of the vast majority of the people of this Nation.

"It will be my purpose to demonstrate to those people of the world who look to us for leadership that the adulation and free-wheeling publicity accorded Mikoyan in some quarters is only an expression of the views of a small fraction of the people of this country. A vast majority echo the words of Rudyard Kipling in that great anthem entitled 'The Recessional' which concludes with:

"Lord God of Hosts be with us yet—

Least we forget, lest we forget."

"I have full faith that the people of this country have not forgotten."

Would that more of our country's political leaders had the same foresight and clear thinking of STYLES BRIDGES and Cardinal

Cushing in respect to the Russian threat to America's heritage of freedom.

[From the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Jan. 22, 1959]

OUR TOWN

(By James W. Tucker)

BUTCHER OF HUNGARY

We had a sheaf of notes relative to some uncomplimentary facts we intended to write about Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, top Kremlin agent in Budapest during the rape of Hungary and presently an uninvited visitor in our country. Then, in last Saturday morning's papers our Senator, STYLES BRIDGES, said what we had in mind much more politely, concisely, and diplomatically than we could ever have written it. He said: "That sight of American industrialists and Wall Street bankers fawning over Mikoyan makes me sick at my stomach. I regret that some of my own colleagues have seen fit to invite him here."

Technical and Legal Problems of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the technical and legal problems which surround the entry into outer space are receiving the active consideration of legal minds throughout the country. The section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association has held two seminars and discussions on this subject in the past year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excerpts from a report on these seminars, quoting the views of Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy, Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, and those of Loftus Becker, legal adviser to the Department of State.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS IN LAW FOR OUTER SPACE

(Excerpts from second seminar on the law of outer space)

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S.N., Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy, under the title "National Sovereignty in Space," said:

"Basically, our position is that the law of space should be based upon the facts of space; and that there is much more that we have to learn before we shall be in a position to say what shall be the legal principles applicable to activities in space.

"The one point I hope to make with you is this: If before we know the facts, if before we know what we want, we commit ourselves to a code of laws to be applicable out of this world, we may well prejudice the survival of freedom in this world. We lawyers have our magnificent dreams of the world rule of law and of world peace through world law, but I am sure that we do not propose to use these fine dreams as escape solutions, and thereby weaken the defense of the United States.

"We want no premature system of space law which would bind us, but be used by

the Communists to assist in creating new Hungaries, Latvias, Estonias, Georgias, Czechoslovakias, Polands, or other satellites—literal or figurative—of the Communist imperialists. We must make certain that we create no system of national sovereignty or control of space which will advantage the military power of aggressive imperialism.

"I must close with a warning: the land mass dominated and enslaved by the Soviets here on earth is vastly greater than ours. Their 13,385,368 square miles would swallow our 3,082,809 square miles. It gives them tremendous advantages in dispersal of ballistic missile launching sites that we cannot match in our own small land mass. To help insure our survival, we must therefore take full advantage of that freedom of the seas we have long fought to defend; and deploy substantial segments of our retaliatory deterrent power on and under the sea. The subpolar voyage of the *Nautilus* has shown us new sources and positions of strength. Second, because of our disadvantage in land mass on earth, we must be doubly careful not to handicap ourselves in space."

Loftus Becker, Legal Adviser to the Department of State, dealt with another area of sovereignty, extending his theme to "The Control of Space," saying:

"Efforts to declare or establish detailed rules at this time can be at best only fumbling in the dark and at the worst prove actual impediments to the rational development of outer space. Before seeking adequate solutions we must know the nature of the technical problems we are facing, the human conflicts that are to be resolved, and the environment in which solutions will operate. As we come to know these things, we can then proceed step by step on the pragmatic basis of actual experience to build an enduring and effective structure of rules and principles which will adequately reflect real interests and sensible solutions.

"The basic pattern of our existing foreign policy with respect to space is no different from that which we have with respect to international relations here on the earth. In conformity with our undertakings under article I of the United Nations Charter, it is our purpose to insure that—in space as on the earth—international peace and security are maintained and that international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace are adjusted or settled in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

"What of the question of sovereignty over celestial bodies, as contrasted with sovereignty over zones of outer space? Under existing rules of international law, may any one nation acquire exclusive sovereignty or 'ownership' over parts or all of such bodies so as to have the right to exclude or prevent other nations from exploring, occupying, or exploiting them? What will be the legal effect of successful lunar or planetary probes or, perhaps eventually, manned landings?

"As a general matter, it seems clear that international law at the present time furnishes no clear rules or precedents as regards this problem. Neither treaties nor international practice apply to it for the obvious reason that there has been neither necessity nor occasion for either to develop. We have, indeed, analogies to draw upon in the international law pertaining to the law of the sea and in rules and precedents for the acquisition of sovereignty over terra nullius. But these rules are far from well-defined. Moreover, there are very great risks in attempting to transmute a body of law based upon a determined set of facts on the earth into a body of law with respect to celestial bodies as to which the facts have not been determined and which are in all probability vastly different from anything in our experience. We must recognize that the choice of rules in this area will represent a major policy

decision for each of the various states—a decision outside the competence of any international body as the world is now constituted.

"Ultimately, to foster and guide the cooperative efforts that are possible, it would appear axiomatic that some appropriate international machinery be created. At this time, we in the State Department envisage no obstacles—political or technical—which would preclude the establishment of such an international system of cooperation or coordination."

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of January 23, 1959:

THE ALLEGHENY RIVER FLOOD—AND WHY IT WASN'T PREVENTED

The devastating flood that swept through the Allegheny Valley and came down into the Ohio was bound to happen. Every river expert knew it would happen, in time. The people who live along the banks of the river knew it, and feared it.

Why did it have to happen? For 21 years we've had a sound engineering plan to tame the river and prevent the worst effects of floods.

That plan calls for the Allegheny River Dam at Kinzua. It was proposed by the U.S. Army Engineers and authorized by Congress. The Federal Government wants to spend \$100 million building it. The various studies and plans have been completed.

WHY WASN'T THE DAM BUILT?

We have no flood protection on the upper Allegheny because the sound and practical plan of the Army Engineers was blocked by a fantastic series of attacks by pressure groups, bleeding-heart sentimentalists, self-nominated engineering experts and notoriety seekers.

Spokesmen for some sportsmen's organizations and others who call themselves "conservationists" opposed the dam. They said it would destroy an area now used for recreation and adversely affect wildlife.

Amateur engineers fussed over the U.S. plans and advocated impractical alternatives. Some wanted a series of smaller dams. Some wanted different locations. One highly publicized plan would divert flood waters to Lake Erie at greater cost for less protection.

The most effective lobby against the dam was in behalf of the Seneca Indians of New York State, part of whose reservation would be flooded if the dam were built.

That's where the bleeding hearts came in, and their work against the dam was all too effective. They said the Indians were a separate nation and that their lands were acquired by treaty, which the Federal Government should not break, even to protect the millions of people who lived downstream.

In vain, the U.S. engineers pointed out that Indians now are citizens, like all other Americans; that the Senecas would receive just compensation for their land; that courts repeatedly had held that the Federal Government can take land for public projects, whether owned by Indians or other citizens.

The Senecas, on their part, hired their own engineer to mastermind the U.S. engineers. They also hired a lawyer to take their appeal to the highest court.

We almost got a start on the dam a year ago when Congress—after a 20-year delay—voted the first \$1 million to begin construction.

That's when the Indians and their sentimental allies got in their work. Congress was induced to put a proviso in the appropriation bill that construction couldn't start until the court appeal of the Senecas was completed.

Two lower courts now have upheld the Government's right to protect citizens against floods, even if the Senecas lose some of their land. The case now is awaiting a Supreme Court test, and we have lost another year by this maneuver.

The people of the Allegheny Valley and other flooded areas have paid a heavy cost because of the irresponsible actions of a small but highly vocal pressure group which succeeded in preventing protection of the millions in behalf of a selfish few.

It's time we viewed this thing in its proper perspective—in the light of what is happening today in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It's time Congress ignored the special pleaders and acted in the public interest by taking the shackles off the plan for the Kinzua Dam.

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of January 25, 1959:

THE HIGH COST OF FLOODS

What is the cost of the recurrent floods in western Pennsylvania's river valleys?

You can get a variety of estimates and educated guesses. Perhaps the best guide is contained in a report given Representative L. H. GAVIN, Oil City Republican, by Col. H. E. Sprague, then district engineer for the U.S. Army at Pittsburgh. It cited a flood survey made by his office some years ago.

"At the time of that report the average annual direct flood damages for the four major damage districts involved (Wheeling, Pittsburgh, New Kensington and Kittanning) based on recurrence of natural flood stages of record and conditions and values as of June 1948, amounted to \$10,034,000." Colonel Sprague said. "At present day price levels (1956) such direct damages would amount to approximately \$15,600,000."

(The reader should note that this is an average every-year cost, and includes only direct damages, excluding such tangible values as loss of wages, business, and profits.)

The granddaddy of all floods, of course, was the devastating St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936. From Warren, Pa., on the Allegheny and from Braddock on the Monongahela to Moundsville, W. Va., this inundation did damages estimated by the Army Engineers at \$728 million (1956 prices).

Which brings up the next question, which is: How much damage would have been prevented if the proposed Allegheny River (Kinzua) Dam had been in existence?

Colonel Sprague estimated 2 years ago that the total average annual benefits of that dam would be (January 1957, prices) \$1,971,000, of which \$4,093,000 would be in

flood control, the balance in other stream control benefits.

He added that the dam would have prevented more than \$4,500,000 in damages from the single flood of March 1956, in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It may be assumed that the dam would have been at least equally effective in last week's flood.

The Kinzua Dam was first authorized by Congress back in 1933—21 years ago. It was deferred, delayed and postponed for various reasons, some financial, some because of priorities assigned to other flood control projects and some because of the vigorous opposition of certain groups who just didn't want the dam to be built.

Had the Kinzua Dam been built in 1938, the cost would have been well below the more than \$100 million now estimated, and at \$4 million a year in flood benefits, the project would have paid for itself by this time.

There are other real benefits to be derived from flood protection besides those dollars-and-cents figures of the engineers. The additional safeguard given lives and properties is worth an inestimable sum.

More, the completion of this key and largest unit of the plan for western Pennsylvania's flood protection would constitute a major improvement for the Allegheny Valley from Warren to Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley to Moundsville, W. Va. It would open the way to the long-delayed industrial development of the Allegheny Valley—a development which is bound to come some time and which would be hastened by flood protection.

By any account, the Kinzua Dam is an investment that would pay big dividends, in lives, properties and prosperity. Congress should order construction started as soon as possible.

Allegheny River Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 24, 1959:

FLOODS STRESS NEED OF KINZUA DAM

As angry, icy waters swept destructively through western Pennsylvania's river towns and on down the Ohio, the public was reminded again that the flood control program undertaken for this area 22 years ago is still incomplete.

In the aftermath of the historic flood of March 1936, the Federal Government planned a system of integrated dams and reservoirs extending into the headwaters of the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers.

Much of the work has been completed, with enormous benefits to the residents and industries along the rivers. Army engineers have constructed 10 dams and reservoirs in western Pennsylvania, 8 of them above Pittsburgh.

But one of the most important links in the chain of control remains to be forged. That is the Allegheny River Reservoir above Warren, more commonly designated as Kinzua Dam. Congress first authorized this project in 1938 and a year ago appropriated \$1 million to begin construction.

Work has been obstructed, however, by a long and tenacious fight against the project by various interests, including the Seneca Indians, who argue that the reservoir

would deprive them of land in violation of a treaty. Valuable time is being lost pending a Supreme Court review of lower court decisions sustaining the Government's right to take the land in the public interest. The Indians would, of course, be compensated like any other American citizens whose property is taken for public purposes.

We are not prepared to argue the extent to which the flood's crest at Pittsburgh—29.21 feet—or at any other point along the Allegheny or Ohio might have been diminished if the Kinzua Dam were in operation. That can be left to the estimates of the experts.

It is safe to say, however, that Pittsburgh and other communities would have suffered much greater damage this week if the Government had not undertaken its program 22 years ago. It seems equally plain that danger will remain until the program is completed.

The most important project in the uncompleted part of the flood control system is Kinzua Dam. Anyone who doubts the urgency or the importance of completing the system needs only to look at the swollen rivers rolling ominously through the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys.

Many Clerics Oppose Ties With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief story which appeared in the January 19, 1959, issue of the New York Times. The story reports on a very interesting survey made by the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The result is very significant, in view of a report, published at an earlier date, to the effect that the Protestant clergymen of America favored the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY CLERICS OPPOSE TIES WITH RED CHINA

More than 7,000 Protestant clergymen in the United States have signed a petition opposing United States recognition of Communist China or its admission to the United Nations, the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations said yesterday.

The committee said it polled a cross section of Protestant ministers, asking them to express their individual point of view on the question of United States relations with Communist China.

Representative WALTER H. Judd, Republican, of Minnesota, an originator of the poll, said it was designed to counteract a reported resolution adopted by a World Order Study Conference, sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. last November, proposing that Communist China be recognized by the United States and admitted to the United Nations.

Only 936 clergymen, he said, approved United States recognition of Communist China, in the poll.

The Social Ethic: A Social Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the age in which we are living seems to favor the group, the bare majority and organizations—all at the expense of the individual. The rugged individuals of yesteryear seem to be disappearing from the scene and with their disappearance go the material with which this Nation was built.

Anthony Harrigan of the Charleston News and Courier has written a thought-provoking analysis of this trend away from individualism in the December 19, 1958, edition of the magazine U.S.A.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "The Social Ethic: A Social Evil," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOCIAL ETHIC: A SOCIAL EVIL

(By Anthony Harrigan)

For a full generation, a large body of Americans have subscribed to the social ethic. They believe that group activity is more useful and important than individual activity; that group sanction is the source of the good life.

Adherence to groupism has resulted in theories of "adjustment to life," in hesitation or unwillingness to acknowledge inherent inequalities among individuals, and in a fantastic emphasis on team effort.

The social ethic has caused a devaluation of competition as a desired factor in school and in life. A pupil's report card isn't marked "F" if he fails. "Unsatisfactory" is the most severe penalty allowed by educationists subscribing to the social ethic. And in business organizations, decision making has become more and more a committee function, not an activity for the single, best-informed individual.

Because of the present climate in the world of ideas, it is very important to remember that the historic philosophy of the United States was not the social ethic. The men who founded this Republic and wrote its Constitution held to an individualistic creed. They did not believe that men were atoms useful only when joined together. Every great American to whom we look with retrospective respect—Washington, John Adams, Calhoun, Theodore Roosevelt—was a man who voiced an individualist philosophy, not the doctrine of "mass man."

MARXIST ILL WIND

The intellectual foundations of the social ethic were laid in the 1920's. The First World War had played havoc with civilized values. The seeds of western destruction, embodied in the totalitarian thinking of Karl Marx, were blown over the earth by the windy diatribes of our homegrown Marxists, who arrogantly rejected the unique thinking of their native land, and by European Marxists, who imported to America their resentments and prejudices.

A decade after the end of World War I came an economic crisis that touched off an explosion of disillusionment and left in many Americans the debris of spiritual fatigue. Rejecting the sound traditions of American life, a generation of writers and so-

called intellectuals turned to group thinking and collective ideals. They hailed the social ethic. Only in collective enterprises, they said, could modern man control and organize his economic life, thus finding security and spiritual satisfaction.

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Suddenly, there was an epidemic of talk about the little man, the underprivileged, and the exploited. The greatest group experiments in the social ethic was the New Deal. Freedom to regulate many areas of life in these United States was taken away from individuals and turned over to bureaucrats alleged to be the mind and voice of the people.

By the late 1930's, the American people had shifted from self-reliance based on individualism to dependence based on revolutionary group experiments in collectivist rule. Millions of Americans, born in the freest country on earth, had accepted the idea of a leader and of mass social experimentation and regimentation. The revolutionaries thought not of individual citizens and their individual rights, but of special groups and group rights.

Undoubtedly, World War II fostered more groupism and a more extreme social ethic. A new measure of regimentation was introduced into the lives of Americans. Millions of young men learned to think of the group before the individual, and to value teamwork above all else. For Americans not in military uniforms, there were the new restrictions of rationing, civil defense, and war work.

The postwar years brought a vast change in the living habits of Americans. There was a continuing flight from the farms and, inevitably, a move away from the independence of rural life. Suburban life, with its emphasis on conformity, brought social regimentation into greater degree. Sudden desire for home ownership resulted not so much in respect for property rights as in fear of economic changes that might jeopardize security. Big business itself, while stressing self-reliance in institutional advertising, began to heed the counsel of the social scientists. They instructed personnel managers to recruit men with a strong sense of group loyalty and good team attitudes.

THE FEARLESS FORTIES

In the late 1940's, group thinking became the rage. Laboratories stressed group research instead of work by dedicated individuals. The tax-exempt foundations gave their grants to persons engaged in group projects. The churches began to speak of Christianity as perfect group living, terming belief in God-man directness as the tenet of an incomplete faith. Journalism, as exemplified by the Henry R. Luce publications, became increasingly a faceless group activity wherein the individual observer and creative writer is submerged into anonymity.

It is profoundly ironic that Americans who have turned away from their free society which put a high value on individualism and individual aspirations, are now pitted in a great struggle against the ruling oligarchy of an enslaved nation where the official political philosophy is the social ethic.

SOVIET AWAKENING

Another irony is that despite the ideological framework of the Soviet Union, the masters there have come to realize the value of individual competition, especially in education. As the Soviets move away from groupism and the social ethic in education, the United States moves nearer and nearer to complete fulfillment of the ideals of this weakening philosophy. More and more, our teachers, writers, and preachers urge that in any conflict between the individual and the group, the wise and moral thing is for the individual to submit to the group.

There are Americans who resist the popular way. The rising tide of juvenile crime, the lack of good manners among young people and adults, and the absence of stern moral standards and high cultural aims have caused many thinking citizens to believe that the individual is being debased in our modern society. The social ethic has provided the weaker and lazier individuals with a massive array of excuses for failures and deficiencies.

Life is, of course, fiercely competitive. While a nation may fool itself for a while, reveling in its folly, it cannot continue to live by subjective standards in an objective world.

It is important to remember that the group way over our approach to life's problems can be weakened. Men forged the hold; other men can break it. The evil of the social ethic can be overcome. It is possible to create resistance to groupism. Regardless of the apparent strength of group thinking in the institutions of American life, opposing forces also have strength. America has educationists who would sunder schooling from traditional learning and the accomplishment of hard tasks. America also has educators who insist on strict and high standards, who do not believe that all change is good and that groupist life adjustment is the aim of education.

Happily, our country still has leaders who are aware that lust for legislation is not a fit substitute for maintenance of principles and the slow development of sound customs.

REALISTIC REAPPRAISAL

As a people, we must rid ourselves of silly enthusiasms and belief in panaceas. Historically and traditionally, we have been cold-eyed seekers after reality and we have admired independent men able to see things as they really are. In recent decades, we have allowed ourselves to drift away from realistic thinking into the unrealistic concepts of a comfort culture and an adjustment group philosophy.

But now reality impinges on us in the form of a struggle for survival against a ruthless competitor. This struggle is forcing us to reject what is weak in our own society. Surely, we will right our wrongs, remedy our ills, restore that which needs to be restored, alter what is inept, compose what is disorderly, and abandon what is illusory.

An essentially realistic, individualistic approach to domestic and foreign problems is the one best hope of our Republic.

Let us reject the social ethic and renew the faith of our fathers.

Industrial Development in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on January 15 the Anderson Daily Mail published its ninth annual edition of "The New South". This annual edition of this newspaper is devoted to industrial progress in South Carolina. South Carolina's recently inaugurated Governor, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, wrote for the Daily Mail a special article about the present and future prospects of industrial development in South Carolina. I

ask unanimous consent to have this splendid article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA

(By Ernest F. Hollings)

Throughout my campaign for Governor and since that time I have tried to emphasize the importance of industrial development in the economic renaissance of South Carolina. The year 1958 provided a clear-cut demonstration of what new industry can mean to our people.

Despite a recession which in some parts of the Nation created unfortunate conditions, South Carolina moved forward at a steady pace in its almost revolutionary strides toward better standards of living. While the recession was, of course, felt in our State, the effect was not nearly so great had we not had the growing balance that industry is providing for the economy.

Records of the postwar years show that South Carolina, on a percentage basis, has been at or near the top in the Nation in industrial development. The story must not stop here, however. There is still a challenge to be met, for the State still has hundreds of industrial locations which are not only ideal for industry but which would provide needed jobs in communities whose potential has not been fully realized.

It shall be one of the primary purposes of my administration to assist in any way possible to promote this growth in a vigorous way.

Experience has shown us conclusively that a sound, businesslike State government is of the utmost importance in seeking new industry. Our general assembly last year demonstrated its belief in this principle by enacting several proposals to better the business climate. This included an important modernization of the corporate tax laws which had long been needed.

A review of the past year shows that South Carolina continued, in spite of a recession which shelved many plans, to move forward in securing new industry and in the substantial expansion of existing companies. This growth was marked by diversification, toward which we have been moving more rapidly every year.

During 1958 approximately \$122,625,000 was expended or allocated for new plants and expansions. Of this total, about \$109,625,000 was devoted to completely new industry, while \$13 million went into existing company growth.

Both create new jobs, which is after all the aim of our development program. According to records of the State Development Board, approximately 5,300 new jobs are represented by the expenditures. Labor Department averages indicate that this will be about \$15,425,000 in new wages, a substantial addition to the economy.

It is particularly interesting to note the growth of machine work during the year. Several new machine tool and dye shops have been established, including one or two of the better known names in the industry. This brings to South Carolina operations which have been greatly needed over the years, and which in themselves tend to bring in new industries.

Among other diversified industries are plants to manufacture such items as TV tubes, plastic products, wood specialties, house trailers, toys, and a number of others.

It was also heartening to note that the year brought several very substantial power developments. Beginning with the announced enlargement to the Virginia-Carolinas nuclear powerplant at Parr Shoals, the list included some of the largest power projects of recent years by several companies.

Power must go hand in hand with industrial growth, and certainly our power sources have kept pace through the years and now offer further inducements to new industry.

Matching the growth of our industry is a vast ports improvement program at Charleston, Georgetown, and Beaufort. Substantial progress has already been made in this program under the State Ports Authority, and during the year Charleston enhanced its position as a leading Atlantic seaport.

To complement these developments, the State is experiencing a continued growth of diversification on the farm. With livestock steadily increasing and lands devoted to pasture growing rapidly, our farmers are building a better balanced agriculture with year-round rather than seasonal aspects. Accompanying these changes are higher and higher yields per acre as new and scientific farm methods are used.

As we seek a more stable economy and higher income for South Carolinians, we also realize the potentialities of the tourist business. No State has more to offer the visitor than South Carolina, and it behooves us to let the world know that fact. Already a substantial increase has been achieved in tourist revenue, with an income today of about \$200 million annually.

All these things indicate that South Carolina has an excellent opportunity to improve our economy in the years ahead, if the challenges are met.

Proposed National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the copy of a letter to the President from Adm. Neill Phillips, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, containing six resolutions adopted by that group regarding the proposed National Cultural Center. I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of a telegram from Robert W. Dowling to Admiral Phillips, commenting on the importance of the National Cultural Center, be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. President, on January 13 I wrote the President a letter, calling to his attention the importance of early appointment of the trustees for the National Cultural Center; and on January 16 the assistant to the President kindly answered my letter, expressing the hope that the trustees could be appointed in the very near future.

Again, I wish to urge the President to proceed to appoint the trustees under the authority of Public Law 85-874. I deem it unfortunate, if not inexcusable, that the administration has delayed so long in the appointment of the trustees. Under the bill, the trustees have only 5 years to raise the necessary funds for construction of the center. Almost 5 months have elapsed since enactment of this act, and nothing has been done. The task of the trustees in raising funds for the center will be extremely difficult. They will need sufficient time to accomplish their job.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PLANNING

AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., January 21, 1959.

Subject: Public Law 85-874, 85th Congress, enacted September 2, 1958, to provide for a National Cultural Center.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee of 100 on the Federal City worked hard for the enactment of Public Law 85-874, and recently has made a study of its current status.

The committee of 100 has passed resolutions as follows:

"1. Public Law 85-874 shall lapse if, within 5 years after enactment date, sufficient funds have not been raised to establish the Cultural Center; therefore, time is of the essence. Already more than 4 precious months have gone by and the board of trustees has not been set up and made into a functioning unit.

"2. The President therefore is respectfully and urgently requested to activate the board of trustees and particularly to:

"(a) Appoint the 15 general trustees provided for under sections 2(a) and 2(b) of the act;

"(b) Appoint a Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts provided for under section 2(c);

"(c) Obtain from the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House the appointments of Members of Congress to serve on the board of trustees as provided for under section 2(a).

"3. The act should be amended, or other steps taken, to provide immediate funds for office space and clerical help for the board of trustees and the Advisory Committee on the Arts; and for reimbursement of members for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in their duties, as permitted by the act. This is essential in order to permit the board and the Advisory Committee to set about raising funds and drawing up plans.

"4. Section 7(b) should be amended to provide, in case the act is terminated within 5 years due to insufficient funds being raised, that contributions may be returned to the donors instead of being transferred to the regents of the Smithsonian Institution. It is held to be an axiom of successful fund raising that donors be asked to give for a specific purpose, and not asked to contribute on a conditional basis as to employment of funds. If it is deemed impracticable to return a vast number of individual contributions, provision at least should be made to allow the donors an option as to how their gifts shall be disposed of in case the cultural center fails. The Committee of 100 believes that the necessary sum for the cultural center can be raised, but holds that the foregoing amendment is necessary for its psychological effect in the fund drive.

"5. The Committee of 100 pledges its continued enthusiastic support for the cultural center and its desire to work with other interested bodies and individuals, public and private, to that end. The Committee of 100 further urges that the overall project of the cultural center be given dynamic support by the executive and legislative branches, with strong guidance from the executive.

"6. The Committee of 100 enthusiastically endorses the views set forth by Mr. Robert W. Dowling in his telegram (copy enclosed) addressed to us at the American Planning and Civic Association. Mr. Dowling has been a successful leader in setting up the enormous project of the Lincoln Center in New York, and his support of the National Cul-

tural Center in Washington is of the greatest value."

Respectfully submitted.

NEILL PHILLIPS,
Chairman.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT W. DOWLING, PRESIDENT, CITY INVESTING CO. OF NEW YORK, RECEIVED BY TELEGRAM FROM NEW YORK CITY BY ADM. NEILL PHILLIPS AND READ BEFORE THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 9, 1959

Dear Admiral Phillips and members of the American Planning and Civic Association, it had been my hope up to the last few hours to come to Washington today and to have the pleasure of meeting with you. But a combination of virus and laryngitis will, I am sure, make my absence a pleasure for all of you. I would deeply appreciate having another opportunity to join with you.

My enthusiasm for the Cultural Center in Washington is unbounded. It may very well be the symbol for which our country will longest be remembered. The might and power of the armies of many civilizations have long since faded, but the influence of their cultures lives on. Few remember the names of Spartan and Athenian leaders who waged the Peloponnesian Wars. But the beauty of the Acropolis and the thoughts and works of those who people it are with us still.

New York has a distinguished and well-organized civic group who have made great progress toward the creation of the Lincoln Center. This modern Acropolis will contain an opera house, concert hall, dance theater, theater for repertory drama, and library and museum for music and drama. Two-thirds of their money has been raised, and there is no doubt of its success.

Washington must and can enjoy a greater and more esthetically satisfying National Cultural Center. It is proper that through the encouragement of the Federal Government's gift of a magnificent piece of land that the entire population of the United States should feel a sense of participation in providing the means to create the buildings and the endowments as well. While it would be hard to refuse millions from certain foundations, nevertheless, an ideal of American pride would be for each citizen to provide \$1. This would clearly demonstrate both at home and abroad the interest and affection with which our people hold American culture. I am confident through the newspapers, radio, TV, universities and schools, and the leaders of culture that more than enough money for halls, schools, and endowments will be provided. You have it in your power to achieve whatever you think is suitable and worthy.

Any manner in which I may be permitted to participate with you would remain for me the deepest privilege.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, at their monthly meeting on January 23, 1959, passed unanimously a resolution favoring the passage of legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. The distinguished delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN

BURNS, spoke at the meeting and enlightened the members with his firsthand knowledge of the islands.

The resolution illustrates the interest of the young men and women in further extending the rights and privileges of self-government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our fellow citizens in the Territory of Hawaii have repeatedly manifested to their countrymen in the United States, to the Congress of the United States and to the world their earnest desire to be admitted into the Union;

Whereas their economy, their culture and their traditions meet all the historical requirements for statehood;

Whereas they bore the first burdens of American participation in the late world war and their sons and daughters fought and died in the battles of that war with patriotism as great as that of their mainland comrades in arms;

Whereas the admission of Alaska into the Union makes Hawaii's petition more significant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, sympathetic because of the District of Columbia's voteless position, officially go on record in support of statehood for Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States urging that Hawaii be admitted into the Union as the 50th State of the United States.

West Germany's Import Tax of \$4.76 Per Ton on United States Coal Is Further Evidence That Foreign Nations Will Accept American Imports When It Is Principally to Their Advantage

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last week, the West German Republic announced that effective February 16, 1959, a tax of \$4.76 a ton will be levied on coal imported into that country. This tax will adversely affect the hard-hit coal industry of the United States and especially the normal export of 12 to 16 million tons of coal per year to Germany.

Frankly, the Nation's coal industry is about to receive another severe blow on the international trade front.

West Germany's arbitrary imposition of a prohibitive tariff on coal imports from the United States slams the door in the face of a salesman who has been able to deliver his product a distance of more than 3,000 miles and still charge less than producers within close proximity of this market.

This ability to put coal down in Europe at most attractive prices has been made possible through the dogged efforts of

an industry that has refused to rest on its laurels as the world's most efficient coal producer. Although output per man day in the United States is at least four times greater than that of any other country, coal management—with the approval and encouragement of the United Mine Workers of America—continues to invest in new methods and machines that are largely responsible for coal's price stability in a period when most commodities have spiraled upward at an alarming rate.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider the impact of this proposed tax levy on the coal industry which has been beset by economic distress for almost every one of the past 10 years.

Many mines in Pennsylvania have long since gone out of business. Others are holding on with 1 or 2 or 3 days a week of production—not enough to allow for normal owner earnings and certainly not enough to provide a respectable standard of living for workmen and their families.

Despite coal's economic ills, the industry has gone forward with its mechanization program. In some cases the necessary capital has been made possible because of firm contracts which the industry has been able to negotiate. Contracts to sell coal to West Germany were among those which some American companies utilized as a basis for attracting investment capital or for making necessary loans. The action of the Bonn Government in placing a duty of \$4.76 per ton on American coal entering West Germany amounts to a repudiation of such contracts, for obviously the tariff places an impenetrable cost barrier on U.S. coal.

The impact of West Germany's action will be felt not only among producers shipping overseas; much of the coal that would have been shipped across the Atlantic will, in seeking other outlets, bring further competition into domestic markets in a competitive struggle that the industry should not be expected to bear.

What has happened in Bonn is further evidence that foreign nations will accept American goods only when it is to their decided advantage to do so. In contrast, our State Department has insisted on continued decreases in our own tariff rates and has vehemently opposed quotas that would offer protection for the American coal miner against residual oil imports. The U.S. coal industry has thus been caught in the middle of an international tug of war. Our only recourse is for Congress to enact the legislation necessary to safeguard this vital industry and at the same time give our miners a chance to get back to work.

Incredibly Pleasant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the February 1959 issue of Holiday magazine

contains a fine article by Robert Carson entitled "West Coast Journey." It tells of the author's recent 3,000-mile trip through Oregon, Washington, and California in, as he notes, "a reexploration of the Pacific slope." It is beautifully illustrated by photographs taken by John Lewis Stage.

I hope each Member of this House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have the opportunity to read this article. Today I want to quote a small portion of it which concerns the Oregon coast, the most beautiful in the world, and half of which is in the district which I have the honor to represent in this House:

We had been told beforehand that the Oregon coast is the most beautiful in the world, and were prepared to resist; but after 2 or 3 days we were entirely conquered. Nothing in our experience compared to it, even the shores of the Mediterranean, Brittany, the Caribbean, the British Isles and Ireland, and the Pacific side of Central America. To a generation steeped in the wonders of Cinemas, and more inclined to look at Lawrence Welk, the region is a constant delight to the eyes. The unending and almost bewildering succession of sandy beaches, bold cliffs, towering forests, and clean little towns dressed for holidays, is incredibly pleasant. If one grows tired of sparkling water and the swell of bold mountains, it is easy to turn to fields covered with azaleas, rhododendrons, Canterbury bells, tiny white daisies, and yellow and blue lupine. Around Tillamook, fat cows ruminate in landscapes Constable might have painted, and in the cheese factory they make tasty yellow slabs of the Tillamook Cheddar, which is favorably regarded by connoisseurs. All along the fisherman is paramount, either on the beach or in the rivers and streams, in search of salmon and steelhead. And clamming and crabbing rate high in popularity.

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the weekly article of Sunday, January 25, by Mr. George Minot, distinguished managing editor of the Boston Herald, which contained a penetrating analysis of the fight against inflation:

IKE LAUNCHES ALL-OUT FIGHT

(By George Minot)

The big news of the new Congress was supposed to be the headlong clash between the economizers and the spenders. The pencil pushers told you wild-eyed Democrats would pour into Washington come the first of the year, hell bent to see how fast they could get to the job of spending more money on schools, airports, housing, rehabilitation of slum areas, and water resources, and bigger aid for the aged, the ailing, and the subsidy seekers.

It hasn't worked out that way at all, at least not in the first few weeks of the session. The very Democrats who yawned at the Eisenhower state of the Union and budget messages, still are terribly anxious

that they themselves don't get in the position of having the big spending label pinned on them.

MIGHT BOOMERANG IN 1960

It's obvious they believe a runaway Congress, one that turns on the spigot of spending and piles up another big Federal deficit, might easily boomerang in 1960. The cost of living is bound to be one of the major issues 2 years hence and the Democrats don't want \$2.50-a-pound steak, \$1-a-dozen eggs, or 30-cent-a-loaf bread tied around their necks. Keep one eye on this. There's going to be many unfulfilled promises in this session of Congress.

The professors expect a lot from these liberals who replaced stick-in-the-mud Republicans. There's CLAIR ENGLE, from California, succeeding Knowland. VANCE HARTKE sitting where Indiana's Jenner used to sit. STEPHEN YOUNG, of Ohio, replacing Bricker. HUGH SCOTT replacing Ed Martin in Pennsylvania, and EB MUSKIE sitting in Payne's Maine seat. There are others, but these will do for an example.

Their lot is not a happy one. On one hand the professional pundits, the theorists, and the star gazers harping at them that the population, the scientists, the Russians, and the economy all are running ahead of the administration and its plans for the future. They believe the pace of history is leaving General Eisenhower behind.

They are afraid the President will not gamble enough, explore enough, expand enough in his last 2 years in office, but instead will consolidate, solidify, and restrain. Thus, they tell the liberal newcomers and the country at large, we may fall behind in the race into space and allow the Russians to get ahead of us in some of the great undeveloped areas of the world.

ISN'T PRODUCTIVE AT ALL

They believe in a balanced budget, but they want it balanced at \$90 billion instead of \$77 billion. They believe that the way to combat inflation is to spend more, not less. They see the national production increasing by leaps and bounds, until by 1964 it is around \$600 billion and still on the way up.

The way to get there, they will tell you, is for the Government to spend more and more—for public works, for rivers and harbors, for defense, for foreign aid, and for aid to the States for education, redevelopment, medicine, and the other arts and sciences. This, in theory, brings that mysterious thing known as the gross national product to huge levels.

The fact that big Government spending often, even usually, isn't productive at all, neither alarms nor interests those who advance this line of reasoning. Nor do they deign to look at France of today and learn a lesson from just one of many countries that pay the penalty for a binge into inflation.

All these were arguments advanced after last fall's election. Many Members of Congress were lulled by them. In Washington they found a different atmosphere. They found Mr. Eisenhower pounding home a theme of fiscal responsibility. They had been told the President planned to take it easy in 1959 and 1960. Instead, they ran into the battle of the century, on the result of which depends whether this country continues as a republic or degenerates into a socialist state.

FEARS OF FALSE PROPHETS

They found Eisenhower launching an Operation Budget as the biggest issue in the country. When false prophets twitted this man as one willing to risk the country's safety by paring \$45 billion totals in the defense budget, they suddenly remembered that here was the Nation's Commander in Chief who led all the Allied armies in

Europe only a few years ago. Thus their fears became laughable.

In his annual budget message and his report on the state of the economy this last week, he got down to business. Here it was put into sharp focus. Here was the start of what is promised to be a house-to-house, street-by-street explanation of how much depends on the purchasing power of the pay envelopes of millions of Americans. Here, obviously, is a man to whom the people will listen.

If Mr. Eisenhower can rally public support for a reliable currency, then the cries of special groups will fade. It won't be easy. Labor unions, a certain type of professor and political stooges deny that the unending cycle of wage increases is a main cause in the steady increase in the cost of living. Ask the landlord, the grocer, the electric light president, the clothing merchant the reasons for his markups. He will tell you, and prove to you, it is largely the cost of labor.

NOT ANXIOUS TO ASSUME BLAME

It won't be too hard for the President to show the householder how this inflation raises havoc with his daily budget, but stopping it will be difficult. It will mean a fight with labor and all those beholden to it and with Congressmen who know that when they vote to cut an appropriation or abolish an installation or a service they will hear complaints from many voters. Congressmen seldom hear complaints when they vote more money for anything.

The President's great asset will be that despite the vote of last fall and the loud cries of zealots, the mood in the country is one of moderation. He will not have as hard a time with Congress as you may suspect. He won't hypnotize anybody with his talk of a balanced budget. He won't get away with dictating legislation or trying to hamstring it, but don't be surprised if he works very well and successfully with JOHNSON in the Senate and RAYBURN in the House.

You probably noticed JOHNSON in his first skirmish. He didn't align himself with the liberals of the North and West. He didn't care how spectacular were their victories. He and RAYBURN want no new inflationary spiral blamed on Congress. It simply wouldn't be good politics.

If the President goes through with this fight with the same vigor with which he started, it will be a corker.

A Trend in the Newspaper Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a free expression of opinion has always been a vital part of the American tradition.

The more citizens who speak their piece, the stronger the base of the democracy. This also follows with the means of transmitting those opinions, the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television.

Today monopolies are surreptitiously creeping into all of these mediums, a trend that is cutting down alarmingly on the number of people who are expressing individual opinions.

Ben Kuroki, the editor and publisher of the Enterprise, a weekly newspaper

in Williamston, Mich., comments brilliantly on this subject as it relates to the newspapers of our country.

I submit herewith his editorial:

A TREND IN THE NEWSPAPER BUSINESS

The big news in the newspaper industry 2 weeks ago was the sale of the Chicago Daily News to Field Enterprises, Inc., owner of the Chicago Sun-Times.

The Chicago Daily News belonged to the Knight chain and has been one of the top newspapers in the Nation. But the real story behind the news is the growing trend of consolidation in the newspaper business and of fewer and fewer newspapers.

This trend is alarmingly pointed out in the January 16 issue of U.S. News & World Report. In 10 years, 217 daily newspapers have disappeared in the United States by suspension, merger, or shift to weekly or semi-weekly basis.

Rapidly rising costs and labor relations were named as the two big problems of the newspaper business. For instance, U.S. News points out, "Over the last decade the average cost of getting out a newspaper has gone up more than 50 percent. Advertising rates have had to be increased. Subscription rates have moved up sharply. Yet more and more papers have found themselves unable to keep pace with rising costs."

The magazine adds: "Since 1948 the price of newspaper has risen from \$88.50 a ton to \$135."

Increasing competition from other forms of advertising—particularly television and radio—also has caused the disappearance of many dailies.

The trend toward consolidation and fewer newspapers also holds true in the weekly field. Rising newspaper and production costs have also been major problems in the profession.

The unfortunate thing is this trend is that there is less and less individuality in newspapering today. The whole concept of the freedom of the press is increasingly marred as ideals and views are subjected to greater control and monopoly.

The trend is not a healthy one in a democracy.

Legislation To Protect the Right of the Blind to Self-Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Federation of the Blind, I am introducing a bill intended for the protection of the rights and privileges of blind people, especially with regard to the right of self-expression. In order that blind people may be heard and given more opportunity to express their views with regard to matters that relate to them and to their Government, it becomes necessary they be assisted through representatives of organizations with which they are associated.

The bill is in two sections. Under the first section the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would consult with authorized representatives of recognized independent organizations of

blind people in formulating administrative programs to provide aid and rehabilitation to the blind. This section is also intended to recommend that State agencies formulate programs that will coincide and work with those provided under the Federal program.

Blind people are asking, among other things, that they be given a chance to present their views and their programs to agencies of Government that deal in particular with blind people. They claim that about the only way they can make themselves heard is to do it through recognized organizations that represent the blind.

Blind people of America want to be recognized as a part of our Government. They are interested in the management of its affairs. It is not just a question of providing funds for these people, but more especially a recognition that they can be of service to our country and be a part of the community by becoming self-supporting when afforded opportunity to do so. Providing funds is important, but not enough. The desire for emancipation from economic and social bondage must come from the people themselves. This desire is strong in the blind citizens of our country.

In 1940 a group of 15 or 20 blind men and women from 7 States met for the purpose of starting an organization which today has a membership of many thousands in 45 States. In our State we have the Kansas Association for the Blind. This association has won the admiration of the people of our State.

The Kansas association, along with other State organizations, is joined with the National Federation of the Blind. I am informed it is the only countrywide organization to which blind people belong. Members of the national federation seek and work toward improvement of their position in society. They expend their strength toward the attainment of a better and freer life for people who are blind. By their initiative and courage and by refusing to accept helplessness as their lot, these people have proven their claim that they be consulted on matters which affect the blind. They insist on their right to join organizations of their own choosing and that such organizations represent them in matters of particular interest to blind people.

Members of Congress, as well as people in general, have always been concerned with regard to our blind Americans. The American people will continue to see that the needs of the blind are properly protected. This is a problem of assisting people who want to help themselves. Blind people do not ask for charity. They ask for opportunity to permit them insofar as possible to make their own way.

This bill is intended, especially, to protect these handicapped people in their rights as American citizens and to afford greater opportunity whereby they may help themselves. They feel that under the terms of this proposed legislation they will be better fitted to cope with problems that apply in particular to blind people.

The Small Business Committee Helped the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is recalled that in the last Congress small and independent distributors and processors of dairy products complained that large distributors were using unfair methods of competition, including the making of sales at discriminatory prices and at levels below cost to destroy small competitors and gain a monopoly control over prices. The House Small Business Committee seriously studied and considered those complaints. A special investigating subcommittee was established to investigate the matter. It held hearings in Dallas, Tex., Kansas City, Mo., and Washington, D.C. Meetings were held with representatives of the dairy industry in Oklahoma City and other points for a discussion of the problem.

Our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] served as chairman of the special investigating subcommittee and presided over the hearings relating to these problems in the dairy industry. Out of the records of those hearings, a very excellent report was developed—House Report 2713—entitled "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products." That report has been acclaimed by many who are engaged in various segments of the dairy industry. Our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], has been commended highly for his conduct of the hearings and for the report on the problem.

I have just received a letter dated January 23, 1959, from the National Independent Dairies Association explaining how the dairy industry was helped by the investigations and studies made by the House Small Business Committee. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include a copy of that letter in the RECORD at this point. The letter is as follows:

NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRIES
ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1959.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small
Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have read with great interest the excellent report entitled "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products," recently released by the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The investigation, upon which the report is based, was a most thorough and comprehensive one, and the report brings into clear focus many reasons for the chaotic conditions existing in the dairy industry today.

The evidence makes it crystal clear that the independent dairymen are suffering irreparable injuries resulting from such sales practices as sales below cost. Small and medium-sized independent dairymen simply cannot cope with financial giants who

can afford to engage in price wars, selling their products below cost in one area while realizing handsome profits in other areas of the Nation. As a consequence, many independent dairymen have been forced to sell out to a competitor or face bankruptcy. Consequently, there exists not a creeping concentration but a galloping concentration of the dairy industry into the hands of a few giant concerns.

We cannot too highly commend you, Representative TOM STEED, the acting chairman of the subcommittee, and its other members for the outstanding work done in this connection. We well recall that the need for the investigation was apparently deemed to be so urgent that you and Representative STEED held the first hearing on December 31, 1957.

Enclosed herewith is a reprint of an editorial from the 1957 American Milk Review, a national trade journal, entitled "Destructive Competition," which, no doubt, will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

D. C. DANIEL.

The editorial which appeared in the June 1957 issue of the American Milk Review entitled "Destructive Competition," and which was referred to in the letter from the National Independent Dairies Association is as follows:

DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION

The failure of a fair trade practices bill in Ohio is a blow to the dairy industry's efforts to extricate itself from the morass of destructive competition in which it is mired. The respect enjoyed by Ohio gives it an influence that extends far beyond its political boundaries. Other legislatures facing similar decisions will, to a degree, be affected by the debate and action taken at Columbus.

The unfavorable vote was probably the least of the misfortunes that befell the dairy industry. Far more serious in our estimation was the division of the industry that was exhibited. Despite the fact that the bill had the support of the Ohio Dairy Products Association the active opposition of certain powerful segments of the dairy industry contributed to its defeat.

We can view the result only with distaste and foreboding. It tends to give substance to the basic evil in the competitive situation. The evil, expressed in terms of unjustified discounts, free equipment and services, extensive loans, and outright gifts of cash, transform competition from a contest based on quality, service, and efficiency into a contest of financial strength. The victory goes to the biggest bank roll.

Such a condition is bad for the industry and bad for the country. It breeds a cynicism, a corrosion of the moral foundations upon which society rests.

We visited a magnificent plant a few weeks ago. It represented the best in milk processing equipment and design. Here was industrial management at its best. Here were the old virtues of thrift, of sound financial management, of service, of quality plus enlightened labor relations, progressive merchandising, and a high sense of industrial responsibility. By all the standards of the free enterprise philosophy this plant was a model. Yet it was struggling. It was struggling because it did not have a bank roll big enough to meet the deals that some of its competitors were offering. Of what avail are integrity, merit, and quality against a 12-percent discount with a new car thrown in?

This situation is not a mere matter of business relationships. This touches the very heart of the ethical and moral concepts that are the basic framework of civilization. A bribe is a bribe whether it is used to buy a vote or a stop. The demoralizing influence of such practices upon the industry is sur-

passed by the shameful deterioration of moral standards that they represent.

Perhaps the Members will be interested also in a feature article appearing in the American Milk Review, January 1959, entitled "Injunction May Be Answer to Destructive Competition." That article discusses the problem highlighted in the hearings over which our colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] presided. Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include a copy of that article at this point. The article is as follows:

INJUNCTION MAY BE ANSWER TO DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION

The use of the injunctive process in meeting the thrusts of destructive competition should be developed in the dairy industry. Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, told 297 members and guests of the National Independent Dairy Association at a luncheon in Chicago on December 11. Declaring that he had found in the dairy industry certain trade practices "peculiar to itself," the Oklahoma Congressman said that although milk distributors often had protection under the law where destructive competition was concerned, too often "they find themselves out of business before their case is heard." As a solution to this situation Mr. STEED urged the use of injunctions.

A member of the House Committee on Small Business, and chairman of a subcommittee investigating trade practices in the dairy industry, Representative STEED spoke with authority on the subject of competition in the dairy industry. He reported that his subcommittee, on the basis of evidence taken at its hearing, would recommend several pieces of corrective legislation to the 87th Congress.

GOOD-FAITH CLAUSE

Principal features of proposed corrective legislation dealt with tightening up existing regulations governing competitive practices. One of these was the so-called good-faith clause in the section 2b of the Clayton Act. Courts have held that a price reduction made in good faith in order to meet competition is a complete defense against the prohibitions in this section. The corrective legislation would make reduction in prices in order to meet competition a complete defense provided the action does not destroy competition or tend to create a monopoly. The need for correction arises out of an abuse where a large distributor of goods with a substantial portion of the market uses the low prices offered by an extremely small distributor with but a very tiny portion of the market as a justification for cutting the price on the grounds that the price cuts were made to meet competition. It is a case of arguing that a small tail is wagging a big dog.

Representative STEED also proposes that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act be made a part of the Clayton Act. The Clayton Act provides treble damages for firms that have been injured as a result of violations of the antitrust laws. Selling at low prices to destroy competition or create a monopoly is prohibited under the Robinson-Patman Act. However, the courts have held that the Robinson-Patman Act is not one of the antitrust laws and, therefore, persons or firms injured as a result of violations of the Robinson-Patman Act cannot collect treble damages for injuries sustained through such violations. By making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, violators of this provision would become liable for treble damages.

VIGOROUS ENFORCEMENT

Two other recommendations from Mr. STEED's committee, while not exactly legis-

lative, are offered as areas for action. The first of these is a more vigorous enforcement of existing laws. It is in order to get this more vigorous enforcement that the preceding legislative recommendations are made. The loophole of the good-faith clause and the redress of treble damages coupled with the use of the temporary injunction are tools to be used in making enforcement more feasible and more effective.

A second and rather startling recommendation is a review of Federal milk marketing orders. Mr. STEED said, "There are some areas where they have been working a hardship on both the consumer and the distributor and have had the incipient tendency to foment price wars."

"In other areas we found that price wars were backslashing and actually working a hardship on producers made possible through the way the milk industry works."

The essence of Mr. STEED's work with his committee was summed up in two very succinct paragraphs.

"We have discovered in these hearings that unless something is done to make the situation more stable than it has been, that no man in this room can go home knowing that he has any security if some big competitor with a big enough bank roll takes the notion to drive him out of business."

"Now that is not a good way for a businessman to have to live. I don't think it was the way it was intended. The only fear you ought to have is that if a man can make a better mousetrap and the customers want it, that is a competitive fact you must accept, but I don't think you should be the victim of a boobytrap. That is fundamentally what we are trying to bring about in the work of our committee."

MEMBERSHIP UP

Prior to Congressman STEED's talk, D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association, described the growth of the organization and the work that it was doing. As of the time of the meeting, Mr. Daniel reported a membership of 307, an increase of approximately 100 over the figure reported at the first annual meeting in April.

Mr. Daniel listed four major functions of the organization. These were, first, representing the association before legislative committees and governmental agencies. Last year, for example, three out of five bills that the association supported were passed.

A second and very important area of activity is on-the-spot help for members hit by unfair trade practices, especially price wars. In these cases the association goes into an area where a violation of the law is taking place, enlightens people as to what the laws are and advises on the proper procedure. This has had a salubrious effect in most instances.

The association puts out a news letter or bulletin advising members of association activities and keeping them informed of significant legislative and judicial actions that affect their business.

The association also acts as a clearing house for evidences of violations of the laws on trade practices and is able to bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

The Chicago luncheon, which was a sell-out (in fact, some late comers had to be turned away), was further evidence of the deep interest that the matter of competitive relationships has evoked in the dairy industry. Some of the best independent operators in the milk business were present. The meeting gave the impression that some pretty solid citizens were trying, with considerable hope of success, to find a collective answer to a collective problem.

Why Latin America Distrusts Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a good account of the results of our mistaken policies in Latin America but it is further evidence of why both Houses of Congress ought now, through their respective committees, to conduct studies of Latin American policy in the hopes that it may be improved in the near future. Under a previous consent to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article entitled "Why Latin America Distrusts Us," by Thayer Waldo, from the Harpers magazine of November 1958:

WHY LATIN AMERICA DISTRUSTS US

(By Thayer Waldo)

When Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina told the U.S. Government, a few months ago, what it could do with some \$650,000 in proffered military aid, he was very angry—but not at all rash.

The one-time butcher's apprentice, who has run the Dominican Republic as his private hacienda for the past 28 years, could comfortably afford the gesture of spurning further arms shipments from this country. Since 1949, he had already received enough weapons—mostly obsolescent by Pentagon standards, but highly effective for Trujillo's purpose—to keep his 2,325,000 subjects in total subjection and to guard against any attempted invasion by Dominican exiles and their sympathizers.

The generalissimo's anger was, of course, occasioned by unkind congressional comment about the openhanded gallantries of his eldest son, Ramfis. That sportive yachtsman—who heads his father's air force although he does not fly—was forthwith appointed chairman of the Dominican joint chiefs of staff, apparently as a consolation for failing to get a diploma at the U.S. Army's Staff and Command School in Leavenworth, Kans.

The opera bouffe overtones of such goings-on tend to obscure a deeper and more disturbing fact. Trujillo is not the only Latin American dictator who has been able to keep the power he took by force, thanks almost exclusively to the military aid he has received from the United States. He is merely the first and most durable of a long line.

This point, painfully clear to the citizenry of other Western Hemisphere republics, seems to be lost on most Americans—including RICHARD NIXON. The charge that our policies in Latin America promote dictatorships was heard during and after the Vice President's hectic tour last spring; but the majority of us either discounted it as Communist propaganda or were simply nonplused by such a shocking accusation from our good neighbors.

The State Department helped to distract attention from the real issue by solemnly pointing out that any discrimination against dictators would be tantamount to intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. Yet many Latin Americans argue—with substantial evidence—that our recent practice of signing mutual defense pacts with, and supplying military aid to, any regime which takes the anti-Communist pledge is, in practice, the grossest kind of meddling.

When the Pan-American mutual security plan was launched by Secretary of State George C. Marshall at the Rio Conference of 1947, only three nations in the Western Hem-

isphere—Argentina, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic—were ruled by dictatorships. Even Perón had gone through the motions of a political campaign and general elections. The following year the U.S. Defense Department began furnishing arms, equipment, and training to the armed forces of the countries which joined the plan. By 1953, military men had ousted the legal governments and seized power for themselves in seven other Republics—all recipients of mutual defense aid.

They used American weapons to take over, then promptly demanded more to keep themselves in control. Such requests were nearly always granted. Cuba, which asked for and got less than \$150,000 worth of military aid in 2 years under the presidency of Dr. Carlos Prío Socarrás, received nearly 12 times as much in a like period after Fulgencio Batista grabbed the government. Colonel Marcos Pérez Jiménez, overthrown last January after almost a decade as Venezuela's dictator, was given warships, planes, tanks, and artillery valued at more than \$8 million. The 90,000-man Peruvian armed forces were completely re-equipped with quasi-modern armament between 1948 and 1955—the period when General Manuel Odría was ruling the country without benefit of civil mandate.

THE RED STRAWMAN

The pretext for the whole military-aid program is that it strengthens continental defenses against a potential Communist attack. Leaving aside the unanswerable questions raised by ICBMs with nuclear warheads, it is still astounding that such an argument could ever have been put forward with a straight face. Is it conceivable, for instance, that if the Soviet Union undertook to capture South America's Pacific Coast ports, from Buenaventura to Valparaiso, the invasion could be blocked, even momentarily, by the collection of antique gunboats, outmoded submarines, obsolete aircraft, and surplus howitzers we have shipped to that area?

As for native Reds, their number and influence have been vastly overstated. Mr. Nixon informs us that he learned that some South American labor unions are now being infiltrated by Communists. I have, as they say, news for the Vice President: many big unions throughout Latin America have been bossed by Communists for the past quarter of a century or longer.

Yet, generally speaking, the proportion of card-carrying Party members among the rank-and-file of those same unions is lower today than it was, say, fifteen years ago—except perhaps in Venezuela, Peru, and Colombia, where dictatorships, by suppressing the traditional liberal parties for long periods, have nudged some of the disenfranchised into the Red underground.

But even in those countries the totals are negligible and not likely to grow. Union members were conspicuously present in the huge crowds that demonstrated passionately in most Latin-American capitals in 1956 against the Russian rape of Hungary. Communism, as an ideology, has never won a solid foothold in Latin America—and in any case it can be fought effectively only with political propaganda and economic weapons, not with tanks.

What our blind insistence on carrying out the guns-for-generals program has actually done has been to create doubts about the United States in the minds of Latin American public figures who were once our staunch allies. The degree to which this has gone varies, naturally, with the man, his personal experiences, and what his country has had to endure. Thus Rómulo Betancourt of Venezuela is bitter on the subject, while Colombia's President Alberto Lleras Camargo merely views American policy with wary disapproval. Betancourt spent 10 years marking time in exile while Jiménez was dictator; Lleras went home from Washington and

spearheaded the movement that finally unhorsed Dictator Gustavo Rojas Pinilla.

Lleras, who held his first cabinet post at 27, served as interim chief executive of his country in 1945-46 and then took over the direction of the Pan American Union. With tireless energy, he pushed through reforms which converted that fusty, ornamental agency into the modern, functional Organization of American States.

As Colombia's President-elect, he was present at Bogotá's Techo Airport to meet the Nixons on their arrival from Quito, Ecuador, one day last May. The bone-thin, 51-year-old Colombian sat beside them as their car, creeping through the capital's narrow streets toward the Tequendama Hotel, was the target of boos, jeers, and contemptuously flung U.S. coins.

Lleras understood quite well what lay behind the demonstration—exceeded in hostility on that South American tour only by the rougher tactics of students at Lima's San Marcos University, 3 days earlier, and the explosive violence still to come in Caracas. A newspaperman by profession and an internationalist by long training, he knew just how much of his countrymen's antagonism was directed at Nixon, the political representative, and how much at the flag and fabric of the United States.

"You must remember that Colombians have been through a great deal in the past few years," he remarked, somewhat cryptically. The observation was double-edged—referring at once to the savage strife between Liberals and Conservatives which took upward of 200,000 lives in a decade, and to the hard fact that General Rojas Pinilla could never have kept himself in power for 4 years without the arms supplied by the United States.

Until that practice is radically modified, we cannot hope to enjoy the full trust of even such men as Lleras Camargo, a thorough-going democrat whose basic sentiments toward us are eminently cordial. We may already have lost permanently the good will of Betancourt, Venezuela's former provisional president, who returned to Caracas from New York a few days after the ouster of Perez Jiménez.

TAKING FRIENDS FOR GRANTED

A clever, cultivated politician, Betancourt organized Venezuela's major party—the left-of-center Acción Democrática—and conducted the one free election in the nation's history. That was in 1946. The Acción Democrática slate, running on a markedly New Deal platform, received 68 percent of the ballots cast—and 9 out of every 10 eligible voters went to the polls. Betancourt handed the reins of government to an administration headed by Rómulo Gallegos, the country's best known novelist.

Two years later, the government was overthrown by Perez Jiménez and his military cohorts. A 3-man army junta, acting under martial law, began a wholesale roundup of the legal regime's top executive and congressional leaders. As this got underway, the U.S. Department of State blandly announced "no interruption of normal relations" with Venezuela. And while the mass imprisonment of elected officials was still going on, U.S. oil interests operating in the Republic signed a new contract with Perez Jiménez & Co., incorporating the 50-50 profit split they had refused to grant the Gallegos administration.

In the years that followed, Venezuela's dictatorship used its \$2 million-a-day oil royalties to supplement arms shipments from the United States with the purchase of British military jet aircraft, and raised the pay scales and perquisites of the armed forces to seductive levels. Falangist experts were imported from Spain to organize and train a 15,000-man secret police force. Eventually the jails bulged with more than 18,000 politi-

ical prisoners, an estimated 20 percent of whom died behind bars.

Through all this, including the awarding of a medal by Dwight D. Eisenhower to Marcos Pérez Jiménez and public praise for his regime from other high U.S. officials—Betancourt held his peace. The greater part of his exile was spent in New York City, where he lectured at Columbia University and other colleges, wrote a variety of articles, essays, criticism, and poetry, and indefatigably directed resistance activities by the underground at home.

An intimate of Betancourt's during the final 3 years of his stay in this country credits him with originating the now familiar assessment of our official postwar position toward Latin America: woo your enemies incessantly and take your friends for granted—a conclusion reached independently by other prominent Latin Americans; several of them through harsh personal experience.

Military aid is far from being the only sore point in those relations. Another crucial issue—better publicized superficially, but still little understood here—is economic assistance. Take the case of Galo Plaza, ex-President of Ecuador and, more recently, chairman of the United Nations fact-finding commission in Lebanon.

Plaza, born in New York City 52 years ago, is perhaps the most knowledgeable, and surely one of the firmest, of this country's friends. Elected Ecuador's Chief Executive in 1948, largely on the strength of the popular belief that his close ties with the United States would bring the nation greater prestige and more help from Washington, Plaza found his solidly democratic, middle-of-the-road administration so benevolently regarded there that it was written off as safe to ignore.

Even the massive Ecuadorian earthquake of August 1949—one of the 20th century's major natural disasters in terms of human life and suffering—brought less financial aid from the U.S. Government than from those of Chile, Uruguay, or Venezuela. In the same year, the Export-Import Bank granted Perón's regime \$125 million to repay forced deposits by American firms operating in Argentina, which had been misappropriated.

Bitterly disillusioned by such contrasts, Ecuador's voters turned the presidency over in 1952 to a sworn foe of Plaza—a nationalist demagogue who disavowed communism but shrilly echoed its vilification of el imperialismo yanqui.

Nixon spent more time talking to Galo Plaza than to any other South American he met on his junket. He found the strapping former soccer star, bullfighter, and Grace Line deckhand as warmly disposed as always toward the land of his birth. (Plaza's father was Ecuadorian minister to the United States in 1906.) In part, this is because of his unique appreciation of what motivates peoples in both segments of the Americas; in part, because he understands and sympathizes with the U.S. struggle to become a first-rank power in more than name.

But he also told the U.S. Vice President bluntly that the United States would have to take Latin America's aspirations for economic development into account—and help provide material support for their realization—if it looked for more than grudging lip service to Pan-American ideals.

GO TALK TO WALL STREET

What he was referring to is easily illustrated. I was present at an informal news conference held by Albert J. Powers, a Commerce Department trade consultant (Chief, Caribbean Section, American Republics Division, Office of Economic Affairs, Bureau of Foreign Commerce), who headed a U.S. delegation to the 1955 International Industrial Exposition in Bogotá, Colombia. A Colombian reporter asked if there was any hope of getting money from Washington for development projects.

"It is the policy of my Government," Powers replied, "not to intervene in the financing of activities which should properly be promoted by private enterprise. It is up to you people to create business and industrial opportunities which will attract investment capital from the United States. Remember, too, that you must offer the possibility of greater profits than can be obtained at home. This is a time of exceptional inducements in my country for domestic financial ventures."

Nixon came home saying his misadventures had shown, among other things, that we would have to reconsider many of our policies and practices in Latin America. Yet he gave an answer almost identical to Powers' when he was queried in Uruguay about prospects for economic assistance from this country.

This laissez-faire notion has crystallized during the past 5 years. In the same period, contributions to development programs sponsored by governments in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East have been stepped up—in large part because of eloquent recommendations by the Vice President, following visits to those regions. Anyone who misses the connection between such incongruities and the hostile reception accorded Nixon in South America is as totally misled about the whole affair as those who sought to dismiss it all as a Communist plot.

A popular misconception among Americans is that any talk by foreigners about financial aid means that they are looking for handouts. This is simply not true in the case of responsible Latin Americans. Galo Plaza stressed in his conversation with Nixon that a judiciously planned program of loans is needed, rather than outright grants. And events over the past decade and a half make his argument plausible.

During World War II, all Latin American republics, except Argentina, cooperated more or less willingly in the production of strategic materials. If they made money doing so, they also had to postpone many development projects and let other activities lie fallow for those years. When, after hostilities ceased, they sought to spend their accumulated reserves on U.S. machinery, tools, and equipment, they found domestic priorities here holding up shipments interminably, and inflated prices forcing a sharp cutback in their calculations.

Then came the Korean war and another near-total hiatus in U.S. export trade. By then, European economies had recovered; Britain, France, West Germany, and Scandinavia showed interest in Latin-American markets and the means to cultivate them. Government banks floated loans for the construction of hydroelectric plants, steel mills, bridges—all built with materials bought in the countries financing the jobs. Interest rates on long-term credits average half of those charged by the U.S. Export-Import Bank on shorter ones. The total bill often came to less than 50 percent of what comparable equipment and services from American firms would have cost. And where necessary or desired, the sponsoring nation generally furnished technician-instructors at very modest salaries.

Still, all this was only piecemeal assistance, and the Latins had other ideas. With the Eisenhower administration in office, the Korean conflict ended, and U.S. industrial output burgeoning, they advanced their long-cherished, carefully thought-out plan for an Inter-American Development Bank.

At the Caracas Conference in March 1954, John Foster Dulles would not so much as read a draft of their proposals. A few months later, then-Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey attended a meeting of finance ministers in Buenos Aires, listened to an outline of the plan, and advised its backers coldly to stop dreaming. The Eximbank, he said, would always consider, within the limits of its funding authority, loans for

specific, conservative, self-amortizing projects; for the rest, look to private capital.

Following Secretary Dulles' recent consultations with President Kubitschek of Brazil, and Milton Eisenhower's return from his Central American trip, it was announced that the United States would, at last, go along with the development-bank scheme. This suggests that some valuable lessons were, indeed, learned from Nixon's troubled tour. (Incidentally, Milton Eisenhower urged, as long ago as 1953, after a quick look around South America, that we accept the bank proposal. However, that recommendation and several others—including a pointed reference to the need for improving the caliber of our diplomatic representation in Latin America—were quietly shelved. His whole report has now been dusted off for careful re-examination. The first results showed up at the September meetings of Latin-American foreign ministers in Washington, where a beginning step was taken toward setting up the bank.)

TWO SKEPTICS

If this apparent shift in U.S. outlook continues, it could lead to improved relations with at least two other influential South Americans who now view us with profound reserve.

Arturo Frondizi, the wily lawyer who took office as Argentina's president while Nixon struggled vainly through Buenos Aires traffic to reach the ceremony on time, was for years a participating witness of U.S. indecision and ineptitude.

After our 1946 interventionist fiasco in Argentina, master-minded by Spruille Braden, the State Department executed an artless U-turn and began courting the Perón dictatorship at every opportunity, apparent or invented. Frondizi, then a leader of the opposition Radical Civic Union Party, publicly attacked these maneuvers and their motivation. And despite his canny wooing of peronista support in his campaign, and a broad amnesty decree signed within 2 weeks of inauguration day, the new Argentine chief executive has not modified his enmity toward the exiled despot—or his cool distrust of Washington.

Argentines have never considered themselves full members of the Pan-American family, and their relations with the United States have traditionally been distant and formal. Above all, they want no part of any economic aid on a cooperative basis. Argentina was the only Latin-American republic to reject the point 4 program, just as she had previously declined assistance in the fields of health, education, and agriculture from the old Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

Loans and credits, with no strings attached, are a different matter. The Frondizi administration must get outside financial help before it can begin restoring the country's crippled economy. Indications now are that it might favor obtaining such funds through an inter-American agency, within which Argentina would seek to form an austral bloc—including Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru, and, perhaps, Uruguay—to counter U.S. influence on its policies.

However, Frondizi will probably prove easier to get along with than any Argentine president in the past 20 years. An extremely practical man, he is well aware that the present world situation offers choice opportunities for playing off the West against the Soviet sphere where aid and trade are concerned; but the same shrewd sense of values guards him against any illusions about which side is more apt to keep its commitments, once made.

Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, Peru's dominant political figure and probable next president, presents a different problem. Now 57, Haya has always been a mystic—high priest of a movement which combines Marxist agrarian-reform theories with age-old In-

do-American aspirations in a somewhat amorphous ideology that has attracted several million devoted followers of Indian ancestry and mixed blood.

The APRA party, which he founded, delivered better than 60 percent of the vote in the 1945 elections. Three years later, when General Odría took over in a military coup, it was outlawed. Haya was branded a common criminal and hunted throughout the land by men with no specific orders to take him alive.

One dark night, the fugitive slipped through the gates of the Colombian Embassy in Lima and requested asylum. For almost 6 years thereafter, he never left the Embassy grounds—which Peruvian security police watched day and night—and had no contact with party colleagues. Yet his organization maintained such solid discipline and loyalty that it was back in business within hours after the proscription against it was lifted, during the 1955 campaign.

Septuagenarian Manuel Prado, elected president chiefly with aprista votes, voided the trumped-up charges hanging over Haya. And Haya, freed the year before from his diplomatic prison through bilateral agreement, came home from Europe to a triumphal welcome.

Although he is a fervent admirer of Franklin Roosevelt's policies, Haya harbors no such sentiments toward those of the present Washington administration. A number of the hostile students who met Nixon at the gates of San Marcos University were apristas; but they had not been encouraged by their mentor to attack the Vice President. In fact, Haya, who abhors violence, personally ordered expelled from the party 2 youths identified as rock throwers.

Later, he is reported to have told an associate sorrowfully: "Even Gandhi could not persuade all his people to forswear aggression, as witness his own end."

The comment is characteristic. Although Haya does not pretend to be a spiritual leader, much of his program resembles the Mahatma's. He wants to promote self-contained village enterprises, not unlike Gandhi's "cottage industries." He feels, as the Hindu ascetic did about India, that Peru must help itself gain economic maturity and independence primarily by diversifying its production.

TIME RUNNING OUT

Haya, however, also recognizes the need for foreign aid in developing his country's natural resources. And since he does not believe in capitalist management of such enterprises, he would welcome long-term loans to the government, with technical experts brought in under contract to supervise oil exploration, expansion of mining operations, and the buildup of light industry.

The next Peruvian elections are scheduled for 1960. If Haya runs and wins—as he seems fairly certain to do—his orientation to the United States is likely to depend on events between now and then. A changed Washington policy toward relations with dictatorships and a liberalized outlook on economic aid are both vital issues from his liberal point of view. Haya would be the most difficult Latin-American chief of state for us to deal with if he held the post today.

A very real danger exists that we are not going to do enough, soon enough, to bring about a firm improvement of our position in the Western Hemisphere. The flurry of anxiety and self-searching that immediately succeeded the Nixons' encounter with spittle, stones, and slurs has simmered down. Once more we are perilously involved and deeply committed in other areas of the world. There is a tendency for our latent, unfocused feeling of contempt toward Latin America (cf. Stalin's cynical, "How many divisions has the Pope?") to reassert itself.

It may be worthwhile to ask how many of us believed, 4 or 5 years ago, in the possibility of a Middle Eastern crisis so grave as

to prompt our military intervention. The parallel is not idly drawn. The very sort of aspiring, aggressive nationalism which we now recognize among Arab, Asian, and African peoples has also become the most surging force in Latin America. Merely because these nations gained political independence from colonial rule, 60 to 135 years ago, does not mean that they have attained true freedom, as we understand the term.

Coffee and tin; copper, silver, iron, oil; textiles and agricultural products: these are the prime exports of the other American Republics, sold on world markets where fluctuating prices are determined largely by the volume of U.S. purchases. One-crop countries, such as Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Bolivia, and Cuba, find themselves caught in a network of recurring crises, which spur inflation, accentuate poverty, bring unrest and instability, and frighten off domestic investment capital. Unable to obtain foreign loans or credits of sufficient size, at any one time, to make a real start on industrial diversification, they are limited to stitching a flimsy patch on the raggedest spot of the economy—and then waiting helplessly for the next seam to split.

These are not, to be sure, the only things wrong with Latin America. A good many of its woes arise from an ossified caste system, particularly evident in the Andean lands. The Indian, the mestizo, and the citizen of pure European extraction are as inexorably segregated, one from the other, in Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador as are the Negro and Caucasian residents of Jackson, Miss.—though perhaps less obviously, to the casual observer.

Mexico is, indeed, the one American Republic that has achieved almost total integration. The cause-and-effect pattern surrounding that circumstance is noteworthy: Mexico brought about social democracy, in large part, by successfully diversifying its production, and the economic independence thus gained permitted Mexico, alone of major Latin-American nations, the luxury of refusing to sign a mutual defense agreement with the United States.

This is not suggest that unwillingness to subscribe to such pacts should be an ideal. Precisely the contrary; it ought to be a fixed goal of the U.S. Government to cement trustworthy alliances with countries as healthy and courageous as Mexico.

That is not going to happen as long as we provide tyrants—present or prospective—with the means to defy the popular will. Nor can a truly working partnership within the Pan-American system be expected to develop until the strongest, richest member state in the group is ready to take its responsibilities to its nearest neighbors more seriously.

A Continuing Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes one of the newspapers in my State of Michigan editorially wraps up a national situation with such effectiveness that I feel it should be a matter of permanent record in the annals of the Congress.

On January 22, the State Journal of Lansing, in an editorial called, "A Continuing Purpose" summarizes how travel taxes labeled "temporary" when im-

posed, during wartime emergency, have become permanent. Thereby penalizing both the taxpayer, and all phases of the transportation business. I go on record to say that I agree heartily with this stand, and will continue to work toward the removal of these deadweights around a vital phase of the American economy.

I submit here, Mr. Speaker, the article referred to above:

A CONTINUING PURPOSE

The public is accustomed to hearing of cases in which the word "temporary" means "permanent" when used in connection with taxes.

A prime example is the Federal transportation tax which was imposed at the beginning of World War II in order to discourage non-essential travel by civilians using common carriers—the railroads, airlines, and buses.

The Air Transport Association points out that the principle of taxing passengers during wartime was put into practice during World War I when a tax was levied on civilians using the railroads and buses which were needed for transportation of military supplies and personnel. This tax was repealed 3 years after the end of World War I.

The association also pointed out that Canada put a 15-percent tax on travel during the Second World War for similar reasons but repealed the levy just 3½ years after the end of the war.

Although World War II ended more than 13 years ago the travel tax imposed at its beginning is still in effect although reduced from 15 to 10 percent in 1954.

The levy long ago had accomplished its purpose of discouraging civilian travel in wartime. Yet it continues to discourage travel at a time when common carriers are able and eager to handle all the traffic they can find.

The trouble is that after temporary taxes, including the excise tax on automobiles, accomplish their original and special purpose, they are retained to serve the continuing purpose of producing revenue for Government in spite of their adverse effect on vital segments of the Nation's economy.

Report on Higher Education in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently the University of Pittsburgh prepared a very valuable and timely report on education in the Soviet Union.

Since this session of Congress will have a great many problems dealing with education, I feel that this report is essential reading for all Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following "Report on Higher Education in the Soviet Union."

REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report on higher education in the Soviet Union prepared by the heads of a number of American educational and research institutions. The group, lately returned from the Soviet Union, traveled as an official delegation from the United States under the recent United States-Soviet agree-

ment for the exchange of persons in scientific and cultural fields.

During its 15-day survey the group as a whole, or several of its individual members, visited 18 institutions of higher education including universities and research and technical institutes. The delegation conferred with educational officials at the Union, Republic, and local levels. It traveled 8,000 miles, visiting in European portions of the country the cities of Moscow, Leningrad, and Tbilisi as well as Tashkent, Samarkand, and Alma Ata in central Asia. Visits to teaching and research institutions were supplemented by visits to libraries, theaters, bookstores, museums, industrial and agricultural exhibitions, a technicum, youth camps, factories, collective farms, and a variety of other organizations representative of contemporary life in the Soviet Union.

This report is prepared primarily for those who are concerned with the problems of higher education in the United States. The limitations of the report should be clearly understood. In the first place, the delegation functioned under several severe handicaps. No group of this kind is in a position to verify the statistics with which it works. Language interpretation in any technical field makes for imperfect communication. The abstract terminology involved in the description of educational concepts is particularly liable to inadequate rendering in the relatively brief conversations that time permitted.

In the second place, we were unable to relate satisfactorily what we observed in higher education to the role of the governing elite in Soviet society, the Communist Party. Other brief observers of the Soviet scene, from time to time, have commented on the role of the Young Communist League in student life and occasionally in the classroom, the probable party role in the ideological content of textbooks and other instructional materials, the membership of university faculties in the party, and other similar considerations. These are but glimpses of the shadow. They tell us relatively little of the substance. Until an exhaustive study is made of the subject, our own experience would lead us to caution against drawing firm conclusions. However, it is our observation that all basic objectives and the nature of the pattern of higher education; as every other phase of Soviet life, are determined centrally for the nation by the party and do not necessarily reflect the thought and wishes of the faculties or administrations of the separate institutions. In such a society, there may be extraordinarily rapid changes in policies with a resulting flexibility necessary in the educational system as in other aspects of life. For instance, without an appreciation of this, it would be impossible to understand the rapidity with which an entire system of higher education could be significantly altered by an unexpected decision at central political levels that 80 percent of the students being admitted to the institutions of higher education should have 2 years of work in industry following the completion of their secondary education. Thus, we see the emergence of a new concept of learning in a manner which would be hard to understand in any nation other than one in which basic decisions are the exclusive prerogative of an isolated governing elite. Higher education, like all other parts of Soviet society, may be changed at any time, in almost any degree, and for any political reason which may appeal to the party. It is of primary importance to recognize that education in the Soviet Union is not a basic resource which undergirds the society, but a tool, fashioned, sharpened, and changed by the state in its own interests as those interests may be determined by the party.

It is perhaps pertinent to comment on the atmosphere in which our inquiries were made. In the first place, we had access to virtually all of the institutions, materials,

and areas which we asked to see. The one exception was the schools of higher education maintained for the training of leaders in the Communist Party. Little is known about these educational programs and we are unable to add anything. Since the U.S.S.R. is a one-party totalitarian state, the role of these Party schools and military academies, especially the former is vital. Of the present number of the Party Central Committee, only a minority have college degrees. All have attended Party institutions. Otherwise, materials, institutions, and areas were quite freely opened to us. Our freedom of action extended to the taking of pictures under most circumstances, talking freely to people on the streets, in the halls of the universities, in the museums, and at work in plants and on farms. We were left alone to explore the cities in which we found ourselves and, as far as any of us could tell, we did so without surveillance, and certainly without hindrance.

In the second place, we undertook our study in an extraordinarily friendly atmosphere. Whether dealing with officials in the Ministry in Moscow, rectors of the universities, members of the faculties, students in the schools, or the most casual passers-by, we encountered an open friendliness which was too consistent, too spontaneous, and too widespread to have been simulated. Many in the group who are well acquainted with Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin American observed that they had never before been in a nation in which there were not occasional unfriendly glances or bitter comments about Americans.

A great many of the large number of people whom we saw evidenced great curiosity about the United States. Most of these questions had to do with material aspects of daily living, but more frequently than one might expect there would be questions about American authors and about American music. We found less basic curiosity among the university officials with whom we dealt. While some of them asked questions, many did not.

We must also comment on the residue of anti-American propaganda which is still part of the thinking of a number of the university people we met. While no one was deliberately critical, questions nevertheless reflected the indoctrination received. We were asked about the education of the American Indian, racial segregation in public schools, the serious depression, reasons for prohibitively high tuition rates, why so many able students were never permitted to continue their education, whether we taught anything about Soviet law and related aspects of Soviet culture, and why we permitted use of poor textbooks. There were similar questions reflecting either a quite mistaken or an exaggerated view of the problems of American higher education. During our stay in the Soviet Union, a typically Government-inspired criticism of American higher education appeared in the New Times. It contained precisely the kind of misinformation, quotation out of context, and half-truth which provided the basis for the questions we received. It was replete with such phrases as "the schools, too, feel the effect of the huckstering commercialism characteristic of capitalism." We must place what we found in proper perspective. In view of the barrage of critical comment which Government-inspired sources have made of American higher education, it is probably remarkable that we saw and heard as little residual criticism as we did. Furthermore, that which we did find did not seem to alter the basically friendly attitude of the faculties and officials we met.

Finally, we must caution the reader, as we have repeatedly reminded ourselves, to recall that while we have been unable to avoid making comparisons between Soviet and American educational practice, the fact is

that there is an inherent difficulty in making such comparisons. Comparisons imply counterpart roles of similarly designated and motivated individuals and institutions. Whereas, in fact, the irreconcilable difference in the political foundations of the two societies means that no functional counterpart exists. Each comparison must therefore be examined in terms of the basic differences in the fundamental social structure of the two nations.

To summarize, this report is submitted to our colleagues in American higher education as a series of comments based upon what must necessarily be regarded as preliminary observations. They are not presented and should not be interpreted as definitive conclusions. Understanding of the Soviet Union will be furthered if they are accepted in this light.

II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The delegation noted a number of general conditions which give depth and context to some of our observations specifically concerning higher education. Many of these are fundamental matters of far-reaching consequence in Soviet society. Indeed, they are of so much importance and our opportunity for observation was so limited that they are set forth with caution. Nonetheless, they are significant as statements of some of the general conditions in society which influenced our more specific reactions to higher education.

1. Cultural affairs

In the first place, one cannot visit the Soviet Union without concluding that there is a very widespread interest in what would generally be regarded as cultural affairs.

Good theater is cultivated and widely appreciated. Ballet, opera, drama are not only well supported by the State but enthusiastically received by large masses of the population. In Tashkent, in Central Asia, we found a city of 400,000 people with six or seven theaters, one of which gives 200 performances of ballet and opera each year to a consistently filled hall.

Museums are crowded with audiences apparently representative of the population. Among the museum throngs are a noticeable number of young people avidly taking notes which they claim to be for their own development. As this was a time when school was not in session we gave somewhat more credence to this reply than we might have under other circumstances.

Book stores are crowded and interest in newly published materials is so great that, at least in Moscow, there is a black market in new paperback editions of both contemporary and classic works. Furthermore, statistics as to claimed holdings of general libraries are very impressive, although there is some question as to the interpretation of certain of the data supplied.

The point that must be made here is that whatever evidence our readers may find later in this report of general support of higher education and a belief in its importance must be placed in the context of a far-reaching interest in cultural and intellectual affairs. It is not possible for us to conclude how much of this is spontaneous interest of the people and how much may result from encouragement by the Kremlin for whatever reasons may appeal to it in its total strategic political design.

2. Intellectual isolation

A second general matter came as no surprise to us, and certainly will not startle the reader, but still requires noting. There is clear evidence in many parts of the Soviet Union of the intellectual isolation in which the people have lived for so many years. This applies not only to subjects in which Government indoctrination has replaced the facts of world affairs, but also to areas of study and thought which are not necessarily inimical to the Party's own convictions. For example, we could find little evidence of any

familiarity with recent developments in such a politically neutral field as administrative science.

If there should be a period ahead in which there is relative freedom in the exchange of ideas, it may well be that some of these serious shortcomings will be corrected. There are some among us who feel that a much freer exchange of people and materials will be forthcoming in the period just ahead because of a widespread conviction among Soviet officials and scientists that they have more to gain by having access to our ideas and our progress in science and technology than they have to lose by the "corroding" influences of a capitalistic society.

3. Dynamics of atmosphere

A third condition which may be noted in most aspects of Soviet life is what might loosely be referred to as "the dynamics of the atmosphere." There is a noticeable conviction as to progress, an apparent feeling of success, a pride and a sense of destiny which is inescapable. Whether the individual is right or wrong in feeling as he does, the fact remains that the prevalence of this dynamic provides a general stimulation for the people which is of tremendous importance. Anyone who has assumed a role of leadership in creating change in either a single institution or in a major segment of society is aware of the fundamental significance of the development of such a dynamic. Anyone who finds himself in a competitive relationship with the Soviet Union would do well not to underestimate this, whether it is with reference to higher education, industrial productivity, military power, or any other aspect of modern life.

4. Competition for progress

Closely related is a fourth consideration. That is the extent to which competitiveness prevailed in everything we saw. It is not always competition of individual against individual; often it is that of the group against an established standard. Whether it is one or the other, it is nevertheless ever-present. None of us had witnessed before a situation in which there was as far-reaching an articulated system of rewards and punishments. The rewards may be lapel pins, they may be pictures and notices in the public square, they may be better summer camps for the best elementary and secondary school students, excursions for the best members of the Young Communist League, organized free trips on a tremendous scale to Moscow for those surpassing quotas on the farm or in industry, or they may be monetary payments to professors for articles published in professional journals or books published on professional subjects. Children are introduced to competition at an early age—in grade school and pioneer camp, and in organized sports and recreation. As others have noted, one frequently sees posterized admonitions for Russians to equal and excel the United States.

Competition is measured not only against standards but against past performance. Every curve shown in charts in industrial and agricultural exhibits moves constantly upward.

In short, the use of competition of individuals and of groups against one another, against absolute norms, and against past performance is built into Soviet society as a way of stimulating ever-greater effort. Americans could not be more mistaken than to believe that competition is characteristic of our society and absent in the Soviet Union.

The relevance of this point to our specific study is that competition provides a motive for excellence in scholastic performance, for the investment of student effort, and for spurring faculty teaching and research. There is clear evidence of official Soviet interest in outdoing and outcompeting the

United States in the money, the buildings, the salaries, and the research facilities which they provide for their universities.

5. Role of women

One cannot help but be impressed by another universal in the Soviet system. This is the recognition of an important role for women in society. Women are in every field and at virtually every level within each field. This is particularly true in education and in the medical profession. Very generous arrangements are made for working mothers during child-bearing periods and at other times when they are needed at home.

We must be cautious indeed in drawing conclusions in this area, but several of us have the impression that the price paid in family life for this kind of professional participation by women may not be materially greater than that paid by American and British families who send their children away to school and who have them in camps during the summer. There does appear to be a real difference in the use of released time by the women in our different societies.

As far as higher education is concerned, there is no evidence of grave teacher shortage in the Soviet Union, and the very widespread employment and service of women may be one of the reasons why this is true. In the United States, where we are apprehensively contemplating a tremendous increase in our student population in institutions of higher learning and the consequent faculty shortages, we might well pay attention to the values the Soviet Union attaches to its womanpower.

6. Program of plant improvement

We must also note that there is a tremendous program of plant improvement underway in the Soviet Union. The Moscow visitor sees this first in the vast array of new apartment buildings extending for several miles along the highway from the airport to the city. He sees it again in the extraordinary number of trucks hauling construction materials all through the city of Moscow. But he sees it, too, in Tashkent and Alma Ata. In the former city, we were told that 90 percent of the population now lives in modern dwellings and only 10 percent continues to live in the ancient adobe structures of the old Central Asian city. We, of course, had no way of verifying this statistic, but we did see blocks of new apartment buildings which could certainly house a vast number—if not actually 90 percent—of the city's former adobe dwellers. Curiously, plant improvement goes on even in elaborate and costly restorations of historic churches and mosques which an antireligious state might be expected to ignore. New industrial plants of major importance are apparently developing in a variety of areas removed from the borders.

All of this is relevant to what we shall say later regarding plant expansion in higher education. It would be a mistake to think that the universities and the technical teaching and research institutes had been singled out for major plant improvement. Those improvements in educational plant are very great indeed, but on the other hand they must be weighed in terms of the commitment to plant improvement in industry, in domestic housing, in hospitals, and in a variety of other parts of the total society.

Furthermore, while this general improvement in plant is impressive in extent, we must most emphatically observe, first, that there is widespread evidence of shoddy construction which promises short life and high maintenance costs for many of these structures. Second, for all of their gains the Soviets are still far, far behind the United States in residential buildings and in selected other areas.

7. Planned society

Another general, yet crucial, observation is that most efforts that go forward in the

Soviet Union have a clearly defined utility and a specific plan and they are not undertaken unless they are pragmatically important. Men and materials are assigned arbitrarily to realize the plan. Ultimately this affects the direction of research and the character of instruction. We would guess that this makes for a social system which is immediately productive and useful, but it probably makes for one which is less provocative and creative than we would hope for our own society. So, too, the system of higher education is intended to serve the identified utilitarian needs of the state, not the unpredictable values involved in the growth of the individual human being.

8. Absolutism in thinking and living

Again, while there is nothing new in the observation that the Soviet Union is a society of absolute rather than relative values, we were not entirely prepared for the extent to which that absolutism influences the patterns of thought and daily living. Every problem has one and only one right solution. Just as there is one correct way of interpreting history, so there is one best textbook in each field for use by all classes in all universities in all parts of the nation. There is one correct content for a university education, and hence there is one curriculum, and it is ordained for all institutions in all parts of the Soviet Union. If the unity and the absolute character of truth make it logical to have but a single press and a single political party to express it, so, with equal logic, there being but one correct interpretation of Othello, of Dreiser, of the Industrial Revolution, the content of all courses is necessarily the same; the prescription is prepared in Moscow and repeated in the classrooms throughout the land.

Our Soviet colleagues simply could not understand why we would permit several textbooks to be used in similar courses when obviously there could be only one correct one and, therefore, not only no need for several, but an actual loss involved in the use of any but the correct version. The uniformity of institutions and their centralized control are thus functions of the desire to preserve a dictated "absolute truth" rather than primary values in themselves.

Obviously, this has very far-reaching significance in education both in terms of academic freedom for the faculty and the development of creative and inquisitive minds on the part of the students. We have grave concern about an educational system which, at its presumably creative levels, postulates an overbearing major premise for every academic value and practice.

9. Strong nationalism

Like most newcomers to the Soviet Union, we were surprised by the amount of nationalism we found in the outlying republics such as Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Georgia. Nationalism is evidenced by the use of national languages both in newspapers and in daily speech, by the pride the people take in their national music and local costumes, and by a variety of other ways. In higher education it is reflected by the predominance of the national language in the classroom, in the written classroom materials, and by faculties primarily composed of people drawn from the republic involved. We were aware of the historical tension between the Russians and the individual national groups, but we had little opportunity to judge whether this tension is growing or abating or, if constant, whether it is a serious factor or not.

10. Many visitors welcomed

We must call attention to the fact that the Soviet Union is virtually flooded with officially sponsored delegations from over the world. In two days' time we counted 17 different national groups from Europe, Africa, South America, the Middle and Far East

which were traveling in the Soviet Union as guests of the Government.

The office coordinating these exchanges reports directly to the council of ministers, and the program has a high priority in Soviet affairs. As to our own experience, we found that the top officials together with their associates were available to meet with our group. The Government is well equipped with staff and funds to do everything necessary to impress the visitors effectively. Planes are placed at their disposal, and guides and interpreters are assigned in abundant number. Factories, farms, schools, camps, theaters, national shrines, public works projects are on constant display to this stream of visitors whom the Soviet Government would impress, and the visitors enjoy the best of the nation's hospitality.

We commend this observation to our own Congress, both with reference to the numbers of exchange persons involved and to the realistic financial provisions which are made for appropriate care of the national guests once they arrive in the country.

11. Personal living standards secondary to public needs

We also think it pertinent to comment on the disparity between personal and public standards of living. Individuals live in meager to very modest homes and apartments, have relatively few clothes and personal effects, and enjoy very few personal luxuries. There is no comparison between their standard of living and our own.

On the other hand, they have quite extraordinary public facilities. The theaters are elaborate and in some cases most attractive. The drama, choral, ballet, and opera groups which perform in the theaters are very good indeed. Schools, libraries, museums, parks, and similar public facilities are distinctly superior. They are very extensively used and appear to be deeply appreciated.

Our point is that there is a pattern of consumption which is deemed to be in the interest of the public rather than the individual. In the scheme of values the large public cultural and recreational purposes receive a much higher priority than purely personal and material considerations. Such a value makes it easier for a nation to make the commitment to education which we shall describe in greater detail in subsequent sections.

12. Summary of general observations

Finally, we cannot say too often that both these general conditions and the more specific aspects of higher education on which we shall also report arise in a very different way than they would in our own country. The unusual role for women, the interest in "things cultural," the conviction as to the importance of "competition" do not arise from the exercise of discretion by the Soviet people. They, like the "dynamic" of which we have spoken, are the exclusive product of the Communist Party's thought and decision.

Dr. Alexander G. Korol of the Center for International Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology has wisely cautioned us against suggesting that we are "comparing choices made by the peoples of the two countries" for we are "in fact comparing American popular consensus with the fiat of the Soviet government (the Communist Party)."

The specific observations about higher education which are made later must be interpreted in the light of the general reactions to the pervasive conditions and trends which have been noted here.

III. STRUCTURE OF SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION

The detailed structure of Soviet higher education is set forth comprehensively in a variety of sources readily available to the reader. We will describe it briefly only to make our subsequent observations clearer.

1. Not parallel to U.S. education

Soviet higher education does not parallel that which we know in the United States. In general, the term "higher education" is used to describe a multitude of teaching and research organizations which offer programs beyond the 10-year (primary and secondary) school. For the most part, these are 5- or 6-year programs which, when added to the standard 10-year school, make a total of from 15 to 16 years of instruction. Since this includes professional work in medicine, law, and other areas at the post-baccalaureate levels in our system, the 15- to 16-year span is to be compared with our 16- to 20-year span. If one adds the 2-year work period now required before undertaking higher education, 17 to 18 elapsed years are involved, but the actual time in school remains less than ours.

2. Academic program limited

The Soviet universities have a much more limited academic program than American universities. They are normally divided into two groups, the faculties of the natural sciences and the faculties of the humanities. Humanities often includes faculties of law and journalism; and, in some of these faculties, heavy emphasis is placed on Oriental studies.

Most of the professional schools are separately organized in technical institutes. These include medicine, architecture, engineering, agriculture, mining, and metallurgy, and a variety of similar professional offerings which would normally be part of a total university organization in our country.

At the present time, there are 39 universities and 734 technical institutes. Two hundred of these higher educational organizations are part of the Ministry of Higher Education (not to be confused with the separate Ministry of Education which is principally concerned with the administration of the 10-year schools). The others are administratively tied to the ministry of most immediate interest. The medical schools, for instance, are in the Ministry of Health; the agricultural institutes in the Ministry of Agriculture. However, the admissions policy of such institutes, their curriculums, textbook materials, and a series of other policy matters are determined by the Ministry of Higher Education and not by the ministry having administrative responsibility for them. As we shall comment later, this results in a mass of isolated and highly specialized schools administered not by integrated educational institutions, but by a variety of different ministries.

The internal structure of the universities and the technical institutes is relatively uniform throughout the country. As with curriculum and textbooks, the structure is specified by the Ministry of Higher Education in Moscow. Course content, in large measure, is a matter of national prescription as well. Admissions policy and examinations are the same throughout the Soviet Union. Theoretically, each republic does have its own ministry of higher education and the rectors of the universities in those areas would report to their republic minister but, in fact, few of the republics have actually been given their own ministries and, in any event, all basic educational policy appears to originate in the Ministry in Moscow.

Graduate degrees are of two kinds. The candidate in science degree, which probably is a little less than the equivalent of our doctorate, represents approximately 3 years of work beyond the first diploma. It involves the defense of a thesis as does our doctor's degree. The doctor's degree in the Soviet Union represents a number of years of additional work, and satisfactory completion presumably involves a number of significant contributions to knowledge. The degree is not awarded by the individual institutions,

but by a national commission charged with this responsibility. It may be earned by a person with the candidate's degree who is either a member of a university faculty or of the staff of a technical institute or one of the several academies of sciences.

3. Academies of sciences

Related to the institutions of higher education are the academies of sciences. The oldest of these, founded in 1725 in St. Petersburg, is really the parent of all the others, including an academy for each of 15 other republics. Each of the academies maintains a number of research institutes, not only in the natural sciences, but in the humanities as well. This is quite consistent with the almost universal practice of referring to all areas of scholarship as science. (Statistical reports must often be read with this in mind.) Several of the applied fields, such as medicine, have their own separate academies. While these are primarily research organizations, in several respects they overlap the institutions of higher education. Some of the academies' research is undertaken jointly with the technical institutes or the universities, and there are joint appointments between the faculties and the staffs of the academies. A considerable amount of research toward the candidate or doctoral degrees may be undertaken in the research programs of the several academies. The academy in Moscow reports directly to the Council of Ministers, and its budget is, in fact, approved by the Prime Minister after he has personally conducted budget hearings and the Council of Ministers has given him its recommendation. It would appear that a very considerable importance is attached to these research programs by the highest levels in the Soviet Union.

4. Division of educational systems

Again, we must repeat that there are two quite separate systems of higher education. We examined and will speak about the one with which the largest part of Soviet society is concerned. However, one must never lose sight of the very important higher schools for the party leaders. We are not able to comment upon these institutions for higher political education. The educational system is as sharply divided as the society is divided, between the governors and the governed.

IV. SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Prestige

By all means, the most significant aspect of higher education in the Soviet Union is the prestige it enjoys and the consequent support it can command. It is held in the highest regard by all portions of society. Its importance is unchallenged by industrialist or bureaucrat. Attendance at a university or technical institute is a prized opportunity. Faculties enjoy prestige second to no other professional group in the Soviet Union. Higher education is viewed by the State as the principal method of channeling the abilities of the nation. It is regarded by the individual as indispensable to significant achievement in society.

2. Support

The most important single thing that we can say to our colleagues, to legislators, to alumni, and to others who support higher education in our country is that in the Soviet Union higher education is prized and those who prize it are prepared to pay the costs thereof. Some of these are monetary costs and some are investments in human effort, but both are given willingly (albeit by the state apparatus and not entirely by the people) in the interest of a value which gives a higher and more urgent priority to university education than our people give it.

If one seeks to be competitive, here is a real challenge. If one is fearful of the pre-dominance of the Soviet Union, here, indeed,

is cause for fear. To urge that this is utilitarian instruction—that it is more training than it is education—does not minimize the challenge; indeed, in the short run it may increase the reason for fear.

3. High faculty salaries

This overwhelming dedication to higher education is a stimulus for a whole series of circumstances which we can only regard as fortunate for the Soviet people. The first of these has been commented upon by other observers—the high monetary returns to faculty members. Basic salaries are among the highest in the nation. Perquisites in the form of larger housing allocations and payments for books and articles contribute to the effort to recognize scholarship and those who are responsible for it. The Soviets find it difficult to believe that we attach great importance to higher education when our faculties are among the lowest paid professional people in our Nation.

4. Excellent plant and equipment

The premium placed upon higher education also results in plant and equipment which, in terms of relative capacities to provide, is far in excess of anything done in the United States.

Let us cite a few examples. Construction of new buildings for the University of Moscow began in 1949. In the ensuing 9 years more than \$200 million, at the most cautious appraisal of the ruble, have been invested, and large-scale construction is still underway. The University stands on a hill overlooking the city and rises symbolically to a height exceeded in Europe only by the Eiffel Tower. In location, height, and extent, it effectively illustrates the high value which the Soviet Government and its people place upon learning. In the University at Alma Ata, an already extensive plant for a resident student body of only 4,000 has now been allocated \$27 million for additional facilities over the next 5 years.

The Minister of Higher Education claims total plant development in the next 5 years for a resident student population of constant size will exceed \$1.5 billion. These are significant statistics under any circumstance, but they take on new meaning when we realize that this investment in education comes at a time when the allocation of housing space is still 9 square meters or approximately 80 square feet per person. One may not agree to the standard of values, but one cannot escape the conclusion that it is a formidable competitor who will force this much personal inconvenience upon the individual in order to provide the best possible educational facilities for her future leaders in science, technology, government service, and industry.

5. High student regard

Students have a high regard for university education. Several times as many apply as are accepted. Those who are admitted have a minimum work week of sixty hours of classroom, laboratory, and study. In addition, they are expected to participate actively in student scientific societies and sports clubs.

We are not of one opinion as to the comparison between the actual amount of work done by students in the two countries. Some of us are inclined to regard it as significantly more in the Soviet Union in general, though this generalization would not be true of our students in science, engineering, and several graduate and professional areas. Others among us doubt that the Soviet student makes a substantially greater effort, and are inclined to minimize the value of some of the classroom work.

In any event, we have another illustration of a substantial investment—in this case a personal investment—which is made as a result of the high value placed upon university education. To make a comparison in terms

characteristic of our respective systems: in the Soviet Union the hardworking and superior student is regarded and spoken of as a "hero." Too often, on our campuses, and more particularly our secondary schools, he may be referred to as a "grind." As we commended the Soviet comparatively greater financial investment to those who have financial responsibilities for American higher education, so we commend this investment of student effort to student groups in our country for their thoughtful examination.

6. Extensive opportunities for women

We have noted with approval that higher education in the Soviet Union provides extensive opportunities for women. Thirty-five percent of the faculties of the universities and the technical institutes today are women. They are assistants, docents, professors, deans, and directors. Fifty-one percent of the students in institutions of higher education are women. In many fields, the percentage is higher. In medicine, for example, 69 percent of the students are women.

Even in such a traditionally masculine field as engineering, women comprise 39 percent of the student body. In Alma Ata, the capital of Kazakhstan, we found that women constituted 35 percent of the student enrollment in the faculty of physics and mathematics—probably a factor 10 percent greater than is common at an American university. We can only interpret this extensive use of women in the institutions as one more evidence of the deadly seriousness of Soviet intent to maximize its every human resource in its effort to achieve world leadership.

7. Significant relationship to industry

We have noted a very close relationship between the higher educational institutions and the work-a-day community. Many students work for a year or more after finishing the 10-year school and before entering the university. As a result of Mr. Khrushchev's recent announcement, this figure will apparently grow to roughly 80 percent of those who are admitted to universities and technical institutes.

After completion of the 5-year program, individuals who are going on to do graduate work are again urged, and indeed often required, to work in industry for another 2-year period. In industry graduate students are working in the areas of their specialization, whereas in the earlier period they were simply making their contribution to society, and presumably becoming more mature in the process.

In both cases, the educational theory of the Soviets rests on several considerations. In the first place, they believe that after work experience students are more mature and, therefore, more able to profit from the education they are given. In the second place, they believe that both a humility and a sense of reality result from work, and so the student emerges as a better balanced individual.

We pass no judgment on this thinking but would imagine that in the Soviet kind of society the practice has much to recommend it. The reader will make his own comparisons with the extensive summer and part-time year-round work experience which many of our own students have.

Further illustration of the closeness of relationship between the higher educational institutions and the community is the very large number of correspondence and part-time students who are working full time and who are taking work at the university level either by correspondence or in the evening. There are about 880,000 such students. Each is taking work toward a degree and following the prescribed patterns of study that are followed by the full-time students. The seriousness of their intention and of their industries' commitment to them is illustrated by the fact that each of them returns

to the campus for 2 months of study and preparation for examinations every year. Published reports in some cases claim a 10-day leave for entrance examinations, 30 days for laboratory work and yearly examinations, and 4 months' leave for preparation and defense of diploma projects.

We have calculated the significance of this amount of released time, checked it carefully with members of the Ministry and individual institution heads, and find that apparently about 250 million man-hours are made available by industry to enable these 880,000 students to return (with compensation and with all expenses paid) each year for their study and examination periods. If one wanted a practical illustration of the importance with which the Soviets view higher education, this figure of one-quarter of a billion man-hours of released industrial time is surely an effective example.

These several points have a reciprocal relationship. If industry is required to give up student time for higher education on the one hand, it is equally true that all students are expected to give time to industry either before entering the university and/or before going on with graduate work. All of this suggests a conviction about the importance of maintaining the vitality of the relationship between the institutions of higher education, on the one hand, and the working world, on the other. It may well be that this helps to dissipate the artificiality of being in college today and at work tomorrow and, after graduation, of maintaining an exclusively work-a-day interest without regard to any further university work. The Soviet system would suggest that work and study are closely related and should be related over a long period of time. This has significance for our society, which too often regards the two as separate and distinct, pursued at different times in life, and related only as the layers in a cake.

8. Extensive libraries

Further evidence of the seriousness of Soviet commitment to higher education is found in the size and the extensiveness of library collections. While a definitive appraisal ought to be undertaken by specialists, it would nevertheless appear that, even after making allowance for variations in terminology, the Moscow University collection is one of the largest in the world. It claims 5.5 million volumes and a capacity for 12.5 million. The University of Leningrad claims 4.5 million volumes and the large Polytechnical Institute in the same city with 11,000 students is said to subscribe currently to 600 foreign periodicals. A relatively small university in Georgia with 4,300 full-time students boasts of having more than 1.5 million volumes. The University of Central Asia in Tashkent, established after the revolution, has but 4,000 full-time and 1,000 correspondence students, but already has accumulated better than a million volumes.

We were unable to determine the seriousness of the gaps in professional literature covering the periods in which free exchange of information was made difficult by the Soviet high command. Nor were we able to verify or disprove the frequent American assertions regarding inadequacy of cataloging and incredible delays in finding and delivering books for use. We did see enough to know there is a very comprehensive coverage today of foreign literature.

Furthermore, in the Academy of Sciences in Moscow we saw copies of abstracts of foreign literature which many of us have urged upon our own national organizations for a long period of time without success. We would judge from what we saw of these abstracts that Soviet scholars have better abstract materials of foreign articles and books than are available to American scholars.

However inaccurate any individual statistics may be, the overall pattern is none-

theless clear; the Soviets place a high premium on libraries, are providing them for their scholars, and are paying the very high costs involved. We cannot say how extensively these collections are being used. This would take a different kind of study from that which our group was able to make. However, with the seriousness of intent which we found everywhere, and with the materials apparently available, we think there is relatively little question but that usage is substantial.

9. Extensive student aid

Educators are concerned that people of ability have an opportunity to utilize their abilities to their own maximum profit and to society's ultimate advantage. In our country we know well that a significant number of our most able students never go on to higher education. While this is, in part, because of lack of motive, some of it also stems from inability or unwillingness to provide the financial support which the student requires.

Without in anyway commending the way in which the Soviets achieve it, we must acknowledge that they appear to be extraordinarily successful in removing financial handicaps to persons seeking to continue their education. In the Soviet Union more than 80 percent of the students are assisted financially either in whole or in part, and the individual stipends are increased or decreased in accordance with demonstrated academic achievement. Many American families sacrifice personal convenience and pleasure in the interest of their children's education. On the other hand, many do not. Indeed, we are painfully aware of the unwillingness of the student and his parents to borrow from loan funds for educational purposes, although borrowing heavily for household appliances. The Soviets force on their people the sort of sacrifice made voluntarily by some of our families, in the interest of achieving the same objective for a total student population.

None of us would like to see a duplication of Soviet methods for bringing able people to universities but, on the other hand, we cannot help being envious of the consequence of their large stipends which provide the opportunity for virtually all the nation's most able people to have a higher education. At the same time we must recall that only 20 percent of those completing secondary schools are permitted to continue their education. This, indeed, is a parallel with the point we have made regarding the utilization of women. It is again an effort on the part of the Soviet Union to take maximum advantage of the human resources available to it, insofar as it may have need for them.

10. Size of classes planned

We raised questions as to the size of classes as this has bearing on the quality of instruction. We found a general conviction that large lecture courses were appropriate in the first 2 or 3 years of university instruction. On the other hand, in the seminars in the fourth and fifth years and in the discussion periods in the earlier years there appears to be systematic effort to restrict the size of the class to 25 or less. Their general ratio between faculty and students (1 to 10) is better than ours except in a few of our very wealthiest institutions.

11. Emphasis on language training

Others have commented sentimentally on the importance which the Soviets attach to foreign language instructions. There is no question of the accuracy of earlier observations on this point. In addition to the foreign language work which the student is required to take in the 10-year school, every student at the university and technical institute level is required to take 3 to 4 years of a foreign language. There is every reason to expect that as a result of this the next

generation of Soviet citizens will have a very large number of persons with fluency in English, French, German, or Chinese. In addition, it is extremely important to recognize that there will be a substantial number of people who will be able to speak a variety of Middle or Far Eastern languages which are regarded as so extremely specialized in our own country that only a handful of students are aware of them. In the Oriental Institutes found at several Soviet universities, language training is closely related to area studies which provide an intensive concentration on the foreign country's geography, culture, religion, government, institutions.

While the study of foreign languages is a matter of considerable preoccupation with Soviet educators and government officials, the intensity of their preoccupation and the extent of their pride should not be interpreted as having only academic concern. These are not people who are interested in culture for culture's sake and who think that fluency in a foreign language is of value because it suggests one's cultural attainments. We have already attempted to stress that this is essentially a utilitarian society, and its educational system is patterned after utilitarian values. We would suggest that the real significance of the emphasis upon foreign language competence is that the Soviets fully expect such a major role in world leadership in the years ahead that it will be incumbent upon their industrialists, their scientists, their government officials, their professional people generally to be fluent in the languages of the communities which they dominate or in which they exercise substantial influence.

In other words, foreign language instruction does not have the significance which we might accord it. Rather, it is, in their eyes, a measure of the extent to which their leaders will be able to discharge effectively their responsibilities in the days when they have even greater world hegemony. May we again suggest that if there is to be competition between our country and the Soviet Union, this is a very sobering consideration, even after allowance has been made for the fact that our need may be less since English is a second language in such a large portion of the world.

12. Speedup of professional study

Every educational system accumulates barnacles in the same fashion that other institutions do. We looked within politically neutral fields in the educational system to see whether the utilitarian interests of the new culture might have found ways of eliminating unnecessary time and motion. Evidence of Soviet ability to perform the same function in a more limited period of time was suggested by their experience in medical education. We are not prepared to draw a conclusion; but members of our group who had the best opportunity to observe the medical institutes and earlier visiting groups of medical educators suggest that the Soviets may educate their physicians as thoroughly in 6 years as we do in 8 years. Admittedly, this is at the expense of a liberal education, as we understand the term.

13. Physical education important

Whatever its commitment to the intellectual aspect of campus life, the Soviet system has not lost track of the continuing importance of personal physical vigor and health. None of the institutions represented in our delegation has as stringent a requirement in the field of physical education as is uniformly specified for the higher educational institutions in the Soviet Union. During the first 2 years every student is required to devote 136 hours to physical education. After that, he has options but is still required to do a certain amount of work to keep in the best possible physical condition.

Although we were unable to appraise the consequences of such a program, it is clear that the Soviets attach great importance to physical education and require substantially more of it than we normally do. This point has been treated here on the assumption that a well-considered physical education program is a significant addition to the intellectual work undertaken at the higher educational levels.

14. An example of accomplishment

We have attempted to outline some of the impressive characteristics of higher education in the Soviet Union. The question must remain as to the adequacy of the product. This is more than we could undertake to judge. However, as one measure of what can be accomplished by the kind of determination to which we have referred, the experience of the Republic of Kazakhstan will be of interest.

At the time of the revolution, Kazakhstan was a wide area inhabited by nomadic peoples. Illiteracy is alleged to have been at least 98 percent, but by any calculation was extraordinarily high. There were no institutions of higher learning, and there were only a handful of students from that area who traveled to other parts of Russia for education. Libraries were virtually nonexistent. Today, judged by almost any standard, a substantial amount has been accomplished. There are 27 institutions of higher education in that Republic. Of the 8 million people more than 55,000 are studying in institutions of higher learning today. Illiteracy, if not eliminated, has at least been reduced to the point of relative inconsequence in this 40-year period. We encountered professors in the medical school who had never been taught to read until age 16 and who have now made professional contributions which have been acknowledged in the outside world. The Republic's Academy of Sciences includes a large number of research institutes. One of them, situated high in the mountains, is the Astrophysics Institute which, among other programs, is analyzing the orbits of earth satellites. As we have noted elsewhere, it supports seven or eight theaters, has an excellent Republic symphony, which we heard, maintains its own ballet troupe, and has built a park system in its capital which would be the envy of any American city of 400,000.

Judged by almost any standards, there has been a most successful effort in the cultural development of the people of the Republic. With a conviction about the importance of cultural developments generally and higher education specifically, these people have allocated their scarce resources to these fields. The consequences are impressive. At the same time we are fully aware of the fact that the same state determination which accomplished these improvements also dictated the drastic collectivization and forced resettlements in this Republic which had very serious human consequences for large masses of Kazakh population.

15. Summary

As we look at the preceding pages and review our appraisal of the positive aspects of the Soviet system, we come to several general conclusions.

1. The Soviets attach a greater value to higher education and have adopted a more pragmatic approach to it than we have in this country.

2. They do so because they regard higher education as a vehicle for the improvement of their own society on the one hand and for the assumption of world leadership on the other.

3. In the interests of the two considerations set out in point two above, they are prepared to pay the human and financial costs involved in making the most of higher education.

4. We should recognize their accomplishments in higher education, anticipate future achievements, and be aware of the significance of these developments for our society.

5. If we must live in competition with the Soviet Union, every educator, legislator, alumnus, taxpayer, student, and parent must develop a deeper appreciation of the values of higher education and be prepared to accept a greater commitment of his financial resources to higher education.

V. RESERVATIONS REGARDING SOVIET HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Basic philosophy unacceptable

Most readers of this report are well aware of the basically different premises from which Soviet and United States higher education proceed. The former regards education as an instrumentality for the training of persons who will serve the defined objectives of the State. If scientists and engineers are needed, individuals will be trained in those fields. Were public health suddenly to become a matter of major consequence, quotas for health education would be suddenly and perhaps drastically revised. On the other hand, if a surplus should develop in any field or the costs of the training made too costly, the quotas for admission and the facilities provided would be systematically curtailed. The objective is to train people to staff the State's programs.

In our own country, of course, we are concerned primarily with the development of the individual. The educational system is created in order to enable him to develop his capacities and interests to the maximum extent. Fundamental here is our assumption that a dynamic and free society will be able to utilize fully every new resource that is thus created in the individual.

In one culture higher education becomes a means for the achievement of defined objectives through planned efforts to realize them. In the other it is an instrumentality for individual growth which is assumed to create a total resource which will enable that society to grow more rapidly and more fully than it could if it proceeded on limited definitions of objective. This difference in premise as to the purpose of higher education and, in turn, the concept of social organization and change upon which it is based explain many of the specific differences found in the two systems and the reason we find many of the Soviet conclusions unacceptable.

2. Many students rejected

The most obvious difference between the two systems, stemming from the varying premises, is in admissions policy. Every year over 1.5 million students graduate from the 10-year schools but only 440,000 (220,000 full-time and 220,000 part-time) are admitted to institutions of higher education. The Minister of Higher Education predicts that in the future an even higher rejection rate may be expected.

These young men and women are not necessarily refused admission because of inability to profit considerably from higher education, but rather because the State has no specific and defined need for them in the fields which it has decided are important. The quota for chemical engineers in any given year is determined by an analysis of the new industrial needs in that field 5 years hence, plus the expected rate of attrition due to death and other causes within the present ranks of chemical engineers, and by other pertinent factors. Once this determination has been made, the institutions are assigned their quotas, and they will admit students on that basis. There may be thousands of others who are capable of being chemical engineers and who could make a contribution to society, but the goals have already been defined and the number of positions required to realize them has been determined; hence, only a specified number of students is re-

quired. This is repeated throughout the system.

The justification of this practice on the ground that a completely ordered society has no choice but to so regulate its educational program only transfers the grounds of our criticism from the immediate field of education to the more fundamental question of the limitations on creativity which such a highly regulated society implies. Or perhaps, it would be as well to say that in this denial of opportunity for growth of a large number of capable individuals in their areas of natural interest, and their deflection into channels deemed more important by the state in order to serve the purposes of a regulated society, we have another illustration of the limitations of such social organization. If we are apprehensive because of the thoroughness of the training of Soviets in certain areas, we can take satisfaction in the fact that we are not losing the benefits of the development of hundreds of thousands of students whom we would permit to follow their own chosen interests but who are denied that privilege in the Soviet Union.

3. Overspecialization

There is a further consequence of the use of higher education as a vehicle for the realization of state objectives rather than for the development of the individual person. Once he has been admitted to an institution of higher education the Soviet student becomes a specialist. If he enrolls with the faculty of biology, an overwhelming amount of his work is taken in that or in closely related fields. If he is enrolled in engineering, he has 5 years of strictly engineering work as well as applied, but relatively little theoretical, work in the natural sciences. The objective of every faculty is to train people who are thoroughly acquainted with the subject matter of that individual faculty. A well-trained specialist is the objective because specialists are what the state needs for the fulfillment of its defined objectives.

In terms of our premise, the Soviet student is seriously overspecialized. We are aware of the fact that in the 10-year school a significant effort is made to give the individual work in literature, history, language, music, and other aspects of the humanities to perhaps a greater extent than we succeed in doing in our elementary and secondary schools. However good training is at the lower-school levels, it is, in our judgment, no substitute for a liberal education of the mature mind either immediately prior to or in conjunction with professional education at the university level. Required courses in Communist Party history and philosophy and in foreign languages taught for purely utilitarian purposes are no substitute for an adequate grounding of the mature mind in the humanities and in the social sciences. Returning to the basic disparity in premises, we may say that, judged by our premise, Soviet students are seriously overspecialized, but judged by their premise they are being effectively developed as individual staff units in a highly organized society.

4. Prescribed curricula

Higher education which proceeds from the Soviet premise has in it something of the quality of prescription filling. Having determined what kinds of specializations it requires, the ministry first settles upon the curricula which will most fully achieve this specialized training, then forwards to the individual institution for implementation both that curricula, the individual course content, the textbook materials, and related readings. This has an important consequence impact on the individual professor. His role is that of faithfully inculcating prescribed materials. In a large sense, then, he is denied the opportunity for innovation, for the development of new interpretations, or for the search for new insights, all that

we regard as essential ingredients of the inquisitive mind. Academic freedom in the affirmative sense (in which we too infrequently use it) is largely missing in Soviet institutions of higher education. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should encounter frequent comments about the mediocre and rote character of the classroom instruction.

An exception may be research in the natural sciences, though it is probable that this results largely from the absence of substantial conflict with party dogma. Where there has been conflict, as in genetics, dogma has replaced genuine academic freedom.

We postulate the importance of academic freedom as a guarantee to the individual faculty member that he may fully realize himself, and thus make his maximum contribution to his students, to the institution, and indeed to the world of scholarship as a whole. It parallels our concern that every able student have the opportunity to attend a college or university, to the end that he too may realize his full potential. To state it another way, in the Soviet system a large part of the faculty—and we must be careful not to overgeneralize this—would appear to be serving the prescribed ends of the state rather than fully realizing themselves as the interpreters and seekers of knowledge.

5. Serious gaps in subject matter

The same circumstances which militate against free inquiry by the individual faculty member and flexibility of curriculum development by individual institutions have resulted in serious gaps in the subject matter fields included in the university offering.

Because of a variety of aspects of Communist doctrine, and because of the pragmatic approach which demands a demonstrably utilitarian curricular content, one finds relatively little attention being paid to the social sciences as we know them. Economics is often buried under the heading "History of the Working Class." Social psychology is virtually unknown. Even the rudimentary psychology staffs are buried in faculties of law and philosophy. Sociology and anthropology as fields for objective inquiry are virtually nonexistent.

As we have noted elsewhere, there appears to be little awareness of the research undertaken in the behavioral sciences during the past generation in other parts of the world. Curiously enough, in a managed society we found relatively little interest in organization theory and related aspects of the field of administration. Although there is interest in cybernetics and operations research, in general we found little curiosity and no feeling of the inadequacy of their offerings in these fields. We did find one or two notable exceptions of individuals who were aware of what was developing in these areas in other parts of the world and who were at least intellectually curious about them. In one case we actually had a private admission that psychology, sociology, and anthropology would need very great strengthening in the Soviet Union in the years ahead. This, however, was a most exceptional point of view. In this connection we must note that we were seldom asked about new developments in thought in the outside world about fields other than the natural sciences.

6. Student development curtailed

Again we have reservations about the breadth of minds emerging from Soviet higher education. We are not speaking here of breadth of substantive material assimilated, but rather of the flexibility, the capacities for critical analysis, and the faculty for intellectual creativity.

The rigidity of the curriculum denies the student the opportunity to range widely in the development of his talents. Indeed, responsible Soviet administrators both in the ministry and in the institutions are themselves of the opinion that a rigidly prescribed curriculum and the desire that sub-

stantially all students obtain passing grades have discouraged the better minds from developing as much as they might. Here their complaints about their own higher education bear strong resemblance to the deep misgivings many of us have about secondary and elementary education in our own country.

But beyond the stereotyping effect of the curriculum itself there is the further point of the attitudes of instruction which appear to prevail in many faculties. Subject matter is passed to the students in what we judge to be a relatively doctrinaire way. Absolutist concepts which we have noted earlier as prevalent in the society as a whole discourage the student from critical analysis of materials placed before him. Most subjects appear to have an ordered frame of reference within which he is expected to do his thinking. We would judge that in a very substantial segment of higher education the student never has an opportunity to exercise his critical faculties with reference to first principles. As a consequence, we would suppose that the average Soviet student emerges from his university training with more knowledge, but with less of a critical faculty and with less analytical skill than the average student in our system.

Enough has been said to make it clear that what is called higher education is in fact training and not education. It is specific, pragmatic, concentrated indoctrination. It is not liberalizing, wide-ranging, thought-provoking intellectual development. Here is its short-run efficiency and its major threat to a competitor. But here, too, is its basic long-run built-in limitation.

7. Research limited

Research is not prescribed to the extent teaching is. There is a great deal of recognition of the need for the individual researcher to take the initiative in the development of his projects. However, once he has determined what he would like to do, his project is coordinated with work being done elsewhere in the nation through a series of regional and national reviewing bodies. He may in this way be assisted by information from other persons working in related fields. On the other hand, he may be denied funds with which to proceed and otherwise discouraged from working in this area in the event that the coordinating body is of the opinion that the research might be more effectively undertaken by some other person in some other institutional setting. To the extent that this represents coordination and communication, it is certainly helpful. To the extent that it represents centralized control, it again reflects the difficulty encountered by the individually creative mind which seeks to undertake research in its own directions by its own methods. It is consistent with the general pattern of utilitarian organization which may achieve monumental goals in prescribed fields but does so at the expense of what we assume to be the greater long-run good of unordered creativity.

8 Interdisciplinary and interprofessional communication lacking

We have grave reservations about the fundamental structure of higher education in the Soviet Union. Note has already been made of the fact that the concept of a total university is nonexistent. Professional schools are not organizationally related to the faculties of the natural science, humanities, and rudimentary social science disciplines. Medicine will be in one institution, engineering in another, law in a third, and the pedagogical institute still elsewhere. There does appear to be an occasional joint appointment which helps to mitigate the seriousness of this excessive separation.

Further fracturing of our concept of the university comes as a result of the establishment of a multitude of research institutions which undertake much of the basic research

which in our country would be undertaken on the university campus. This is research sponsored by technical institutions within the several academies of sciences, medicine, et al. Indeed, there is general conviction in the academies of sciences that the more fundamental research is very largely the prerogative of academy-organized institutes and not of the universities or nonacademic technical institutes.

We thus have a double fracturing of the concept of a community of scholars. In the first instance, it is fractured by separating the faculties into isolated organizations and, secondly, it is further divided by the extensive inroads which the purely research institutes make upon the research function of the several faculties. This is not a chance development, but was deliberately undertaken to achieve a specified objective.

Some of the Soviet universities were at one time real communities of scholars. However, they were systematically divided in the interest of achieving two things. First, the Soviets believed that a greater specialization resulted from separation, and thus that they had prospect of realizing their immediate goals more quickly and efficiently than if less specialization were achieved. Second, it was thought that there was practical advantage in associating individual faculties with the fields of their application. In other words, the colleges of agriculture would do better if placed in the Ministry of Agriculture than if placed on a university campus, and the schools of medicine would be of greater immediate use if made part of the Ministry of Health. The immediacy of the relationship has a utilitarian value which in their view is compelling.

9. Dangers in separation of educational units

In our view, this compounded fracture of the university community has a number of serious implications. We think that it denies the faculties in similar areas the stimulation which comes with constant association. The Soviets would like the physicists in the engineering schools to be exclusively interested in the applied aspects of physics for the immediate and practical results that are achieved thereby. We are inclined to believe that, in the long run, better engineers will be trained if their physics faculties are geographically and professionally close enough to the theoretical physicists, not only to assure their continued stimulation, but also to keep both groups immediately abreast of developments in each of the areas with which the two are concerned. We would make the same point with reference to many of the disciplinary faculties and professional schools and would urge the same point as between faculties of professional schools themselves. A community of scholars is tremendously important in the Nation's total intellectual growth, and it is made immeasurably more difficult of attainment in the Soviet Union than it is in our own academic world.

In our judgment, students also suffer from this fracturing. Any tendency of the student in a professional school to broaden his preparation by taking work in the disciplinary faculties will be discouraged when it means transferring from institution to institution and perhaps even from city to city. It is a structure, in other words, which digs deeper an already well entrenched tendency to excessive specialization.

But we believe there is a further danger which results from this kind of institutional atomization of learning. We wonder whether it does not discourage the development of new fields of inquiry and instruction. In other parts of the world we have noted the retarding effect which rigidly structured faculty organization has upon the growth of new fields of scholarship. To mention but a few: law faculties in Europe have systematically frustrated the development of the

field of political science; economics faculties in many parts of the world have discouraged the growth of independent instructional and research faculties in the field of business administration; the field of public health had difficulty in establishing its identity as long as it was dominated by faculties of medicine.

There is nothing unusual or reprehensible in this. Faculties, like all other social organizations, develop their internal cohesiveness in the protection of established views and values. They seek to protect the organism rather than to multiply it or to break off cells which will become new organisms with their own systems of knowledge. But it is part of the architectural role of academic leadership to assure a structure which is sufficiently flexible to permit the growth of new organisms when the need arises. We believe that this is a role which is best undertaken in the academic atmosphere of the total university community. We doubt that it may be properly assumed in the academically remote offices of a national ministry of higher education and in the substantial number of other ministries with technical institute responsibilities which are coordinated only through the Council of Ministers.

This fractured system of organization is also extravagant in its use of money and manpower. The separated institutions maintain their own faculties in the natural science and humanities disciplines rather than depend upon the services of the basic departments in a complex organization which can supply the needs of several specialties.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we must say that we would have preferred to digest and integrate our observations over a longer period of time; but we wanted to release this report within a reasonable period after our return. In many respects it has been a puzzling experience upon which we will enjoy rather extended reflection. Moreover, we certainly wish to be understood as being constantly aware of the reservations and disclaimers which were outlined in the early part of this report. On specific matters we do not pretend to bring back definitive answers. Rather, we return with tentative conclusions which we hope are based upon careful observation.

Whatever our caution may be about specific aspects of Soviet higher education, we are, nonetheless, reasonably confident of the overall pattern which appears to us to emerge. Affirmatively, we may say that the Soviets have achieved general recognition of the primary importance of higher education in any effective society, that they are prepared to support it with human effort and state resources to an extraordinary degree; that their overall approach is highly realistic and pragmatic; that their specialized curricula and institutional structure give promise of very impressive results in the specialized fields to which they have given attention, and that in the very large geographic areas which previously were underprivileged in education they have made astonishing progress in building the institutions, the facilities, the faculties, and the values of an effective system of higher education.

On the other hand, we return with an equally clear impression that the product of their educational system is overspecialized, less intellectually self-reliant, less competent in critical analysis, and probably on the average less intellectually creative than that which an institutionally dynamic and individually creative society requires in the long run. In other words, the Soviets profit from specificity of object and the specialization of their educational system but, by the same token, they may well suffer from the counterpart dangers of overdirection, lack of breadth, and lack of individual creativity.

Nuclear Testing and the Problem of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article by Henry A. Kissinger entitled "Nuclear Testing and the Problem of Peace," which appeared in the October 1958 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. I think it is very timely in view of the debate that has arisen regarding the controversial question of our abandonment of nuclear testing:

NUCLEAR TESTING AND THE PROBLEM OF PEACE

(By Henry A. Kissinger)

I

President Eisenhower's announcement of the suspension for 1 year of all nuclear weapons tests and his invitation to the Soviet Union to negotiate a permanent ban on tests has raised hopes all over the world that a beginning has been made in controlling nuclear weapons and that a big step forward has been taken in the quest for peace.

The hopes which have been focused on a nuclear test ban are intense and varied. Many thoughtful people concerned about the danger of radioactive fallout maintain that the quest for security must not be allowed to endanger the health of future generations. Others argue that the end of nuclear testing is essential to build confidence for more fundamental agreement, especially in the field of disarmament. It would prevent the diffusion of nuclear weapons to other powers. It would lessen the dangers of thermonuclear wars. And these arguments are reinforced by an insistent Soviet campaign to the effect that nuclear tests should be unconditionally prohibited and nuclear weapons outlawed.

The yearning for an end of the cold war reflects the deepest aspirations of the free world. So intense is it that we have been ready to stigmatize as more immoral than other weapons the weapon around which we have built our defense of that world. But the very intensity of our desire for peace may increase our peril. It may make us seek agreement for its own sake and thus set in motion a train of events which will divide the non-Communist world and undermine its resolution. The hopes which have been attached to a complete ban on nuclear tests are surely understandable. But they should not have been raised so high without a careful analysis of the political and psychological implications of such a step and its relationship to our defense policies and long-term goals. Instead we became preoccupied with technical problems of a test ban, which are by no means the most important. When we agreed to meet with Soviet scientists at Geneva, we clearly implied that if inspection was found to be technically feasible, we would be willing to discuss a complete ban. Therefore, when the scientists had made their report, we felt impelled to make a critical policy decision, although only its technical aspects had been fully explored.

This article questions whether a complete suspension of nuclear testing is desirable, whatever the possibilities of inspection. It argues that we should deal with the health hazard by ending tests which involve appreciable fallout but that we should agree to a complete ban only as part of a general dis-

armament agreement which includes conventional weapons. The desire to avoid a nuclear holocaust and to achieve a lasting peace should be taken for granted in any debate on this problem. At issue can only be the best means to achieve these ends.

II

Because of the emphasis laid on the technical aspects of ending nuclear tests, it may be useful at the start to discuss these and to point out some of the difficulties involved. It is generally agreed that surface nuclear explosions can be detected at considerable distances by equipment which measures radioactivity and shock waves.¹ The difficulty arises with underground testing, high altitude testing, and testing underneath the polar icecaps, and with the increasing civilian uses of nuclear energy.

With respect to underground testing it is argued that a system of inspection stations spaced 300 miles apart could detect all underground explosions of about 1 kiloton explosive power except in the seismic belt where earthquakes are more frequent, requiring inspection stations on a 100-mile grid. Nevertheless, serious problems remain. Methods of "buffering" explosions so that the seismic shock is weakened have barely been explored, but indications are that they can reduce the seismic wave by a very substantial percentage. Moreover, the seismic equipment can locate the shock only within an area several miles in diameter. Some, but not all, of the characteristics of an underground explosion can be distinguished from those of an earthquake. Conclusive proof can be obtained only by finding the precise location of the suspected evasion either by means of boring for radioactive samples or by discovering an entrance to the test site. This is a considerable task in an area which may cover more than 30 square miles. And the negotiators at Geneva agreed that the problem of high altitude testing was very little understood at this stage. The same difficulty may apply to testing underneath the polar icecaps.

Again, as the peaceful uses of nuclear energy become more widespread, other means of evasion may be developed. In fact, the United States explicitly and the Soviet Union by implication have both exempted peaceful applications of nuclear energy from their announced test bans.² One of the obvious applications of nuclear energy is in mining. It will not be easy to prevent a country from using devices for blasting which also have military applications, or from gaining militarily useful knowledge by checking the results with scientific instruments. To be sure, inspection teams could be invited to witness each peaceful use of nuclear explosives; but as the peaceful applications of nuclear energy grow more common, this will become increasingly difficult. A nation determined on evasion could overload the inspection mechanism by hiding test explosions among hundreds of ordinary ones.

In any event we must keep in mind that the best inspection system can guard only against presently known methods of evasion. In the nature of things it is difficult to protect against a contingency not yet imagined. And finally, evasion will be easier to attempt and to conceal in the Soviet Union than in the West. In the West a ban on nuclear testing will be largely self-policing, because public opinion will not countenance evasion and scientists will not lend themselves to it.³ No such inhibitions will exist in the U.S.S.R.

Yet the most vexing problem of inspection is not that of obtaining information, difficult as it is, but the political consequences to be drawn from whatever information does become available. Obviously a violation of the nuclear test ban is not a casus

belli. It may not even be a sufficient cause for the injured party to start testing again. Once nuclear tests have been banned, the free world will not abrogate its agreement easily, even in the face of strong provocation. Even if it reached a decision to do so, years might be consumed before tests could be resumed. For one thing, a nation like the United States which had observed the ban might by then have nothing to test. A ban extended over a period of years would almost certainly lead to the attrition of our weapons laboratories, whose ablest scientists would be increasingly tempted to concentrate on more promising fields. For another, the United States would have great difficulty reassembling its testing machinery. Present tests involve scores of installations and thousands of personnel. It would be impossible to keep these teams together once a test ban had been agreed upon. Even a strong indication of Soviet violation might therefore leave the United States at a serious disadvantage or at least without adequate recourse.

Moreover, there is a great difference between obtaining information which is technically reliable and establishing a similar degree of political and psychological clarity. It is often maintained that a violation of the test ban would have a catastrophic impact on world opinion. But this assumes a degree of certainty about Soviet intentions which is belied by all past experience. The Soviet Union has always been skillful in presenting its challenges in an ambiguous manner, partly by masking its own actions, partly by charging its opponents with similar transgressions. According to its usual tactics, the Kremlin, within a short time of signing an agreement to end nuclear tests, would quite probably accuse us of violating it.⁴ In the resulting atmosphere of recrimination it would be difficult to separate sincere charges from the customary exchanges of the cold war. The result might well be a further weakening of the will of the free world.

Finally, it is quite possible that a complete ban on testing would enable the Soviet Union to overtake us in the military applications of nuclear energy. Whereas a complete test ban would magnify our already great difficulty in inducing our ablest scientists to work on nuclear weapons, it would not prevent the Soviet Union from keeping its research teams together either by compulsion or by arranging appropriate incentives. Also, the Soviets may feel less dependent on testing in order to achieve scientific progress. The experimental method is instinctive to the West. Marxist dogmatism places much greater reliance on theory. For example, the Kremlin announced its first nuclear explosion several days before it took place. Thus even if the rate of scientific progress were the same, the Soviets may gain an advantage because of greater confidence in untested data. Or else they may use a temporary cessation to prepare tests of superior weapons.

Nevertheless, the deepest concern about a complete ban on testing does not arise from the danger that it may permit Soviet technical advances or from the political and practical difficulty of inspection. We must consider whether the basic motive behind Communist pressure for a complete ending of nuclear tests may not be the Soviet Union's conviction that it would gain a substantial advantage from a complete ban which it scrupulously observed. The wisdom of a complete end of nuclear tests so often advocated as a first step depends on the answer to the question "first step toward what?"

III

It may be argued that such a question is a symptom of the distrust which has produced the cold war. Unless both sides are willing to take some risks in the quest for

Footnotes at end of speech.

peace, it will be said, the world will be doomed to an indefinitely continued armaments race and eventual destruction. Since the death of Stalin, great changes have occurred in the Soviet Union, brought about by the appearance of a new bureaucracy, the increasing demand for consumer goods, and the creation of the entire apparatus of an industrialized society. According to this line of thought, the Russians' expressed desire for peaceful coexistence represents a concession to the pressures of these new forces. Given time and patience, the Soviet Union may evolve into a society not unlike ours.

Because these assertions derive from attitudes which have contributed so much to the stability and often the freedom of our society and that of many of our allies, it is difficult to contradict them. A status quo power always has difficulty in understanding a revolutionary state. All its instincts tempt it to accept peaceful professions and to refuse to believe in implacable hostility.

Were it not for this difficulty of understanding, no revolution would ever have succeeded. A revolutionary movement always starts from a position of inferior strength. It owes its survival to the reluctance of its declared victims to accept its professions at face value. It owes its success to the psychological advantage which single-minded purpose confers over an opponent who does not believe that some states may prefer victory to peace. The ambiguity which makes the Soviet challenge so deadly derives in part from the skill of the Soviet leadership; but the danger is magnified by the tendency of the free world to choose the interpretation of Soviet motivations which best accords with its own preconceptions. Neither Lenin's writings, nor Stalin's utterances, nor Mao's published works, nor Khrushchev's declarations, have availed against the conviction of the West that a basic change in Communist society and aims was imminent and that a problem deferred was a problem solved. It is only to posterity that revolutionary movements appear unambiguous. Thus a status quo power is never certain until too late that another state intends to overthrow the international system, especially as the revolutionary power will present each demand as a specific, limited objective, which often in itself seems quite reasonable. However weak at the beginning, it can substitute psychological strength for physical power; it can use the very enormity of its goals to defeat gradually an opponent who cannot come to grips with a policy of unlimited objectives.

This becomes a particular problem if the revolutionary power exploits this weakness systematically. In Soviet terminology, for example, the concepts war and peace are inherently confusing. Since, according to Communist theory, the social structure of capitalist states necessarily produces war, real peace can be achieved only by the worldwide triumph of communism. Therefore any act by the Soviet Union, however warlike on the surface, is pacific by definition and any measure by a capitalist state, however seemingly conciliatory, tends toward war. Thus the slogan peaceful coexistence has never had more than a tactical significance in Communist terminology. "Marxism-Leninism," wrote Mao, "does not allow concessions to be regarded as something purely negative. . . . Our concession, withdrawal, turning to the defensive or suspending action, whether in dealing with allies or enemies, should always be regarded as part of the entire revolutionary policy, as an indispensable link in the general revolutionary line. . . . To be sure, the protestations of peaceful coexistence have recently become more insistent;

but the reason is not very flattering to the West, since it consists in the assertion that war has become unnecessary in order to encompass the downfall of the free world.

The argument outlined here may not prove persuasive to the increasing number of people in the free world who desire an end to the cold war so intensely that they ignore the lessons of the past and the fundamental professions of Communist doctrine. But even the most optimistic should ask themselves why Khrushchev can be expected to deal any more gently with the countries of the free world than with his erstwhile colleagues in the Soviet presidium. What was the doctrine of collective leadership but the principle of peaceful coexistence applied among the Soviet leaders? Yet it was used ruthlessly by Khrushchev first to paralyze opposition by branding it contrary to the principle of collective leadership and then to defeat his opponents one by one. Khrushchev could not have succeeded domestically had he not been able first to convince his colleagues of his sincerity. Is it not at least possible that the men who arrested the leaders of the Hungarian revolution while negotiating an armistice with them and who executed them despite a promise of safe conduct are now seeking to apply these same methods to weaken the cohesion of the free world and then to destroy its members piecemeal? A wise policy will at least consider this contingency and will not risk everything simply for the sake of agreement.

Certainly the free world has a duty to seek to spare mankind the horrors of another war. It must strive for any agreement that offers such prospects. But a real relaxation of tensions can come about only if the Soviet leaders become convinced that they cannot use negotiations to induce us to disarm unilaterally, that any agreement must be mutually advantageous. We must consider, then, whether insistent Soviet demands for a complete ban on nuclear testing are not designed to paralyze the free world rather than to bring about peace as we understand the word.

IV

Rightly or wrongly, the free world has based its defense on nuclear weapons. We need not here review the circumstances nor analyze the motives that led to this decision. It is enough to note that nowhere in the Western World are there sufficient conventional forces to resist the Soviet preponderance in conventional strength; and nowhere is there any immediate prospect of developing them. Nothing now stands in the way of Soviet domination of Eurasia save the Soviet reluctance to pay the price of a nuclear war.

That is why the Soviet Union has systematically sought to paralyze the West's will to use the weapons around which its entire defense effort has been built. It has done this both by creating a substantial nuclear stockpile of its own and by seeking to have nuclear weapons outlawed. Appealing to the most basic fears of humanity, the whole apparatus of Soviet policy, from diplomacy to peace congresses, has sought to undermine our reliance on the most effective—or at least the only available—means of resistance to Soviet domination.

The free world should therefore have no illusions about the implications of a complete ban on nuclear tests. For if a cessation of nuclear testing is a "first step" to anything it is to an increased campaign to outlaw nuclear weapons altogether. If these weapons are too dangerous to test, so the argument will go, they are surely too terrible to use. That this is the aim of Soviet policy was made explicit by Khrushchev: "After the termination of nuclear weapons tests, it would be possible to raise the question of the powers making a solemn undertaking not to use hydrogen and atomic

weapons and henceforth to adopt a decision on the total prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons." In the present state of Western defenses such a prohibition is tantamount to unilateral disarmament. The oneness of our military establishment has deprived our diplomacy of flexibility. If the free world possessed a conventional force sufficiently powerful and mobile to blunt Soviet aggression by similar forces, the complete cessation of nuclear testing would not be so dangerous. But none of the advocates of a nuclear test ban has been prepared to champion—and many have actively opposed—a build-up of conventional forces sufficient to offset the grave risks which their proposals invite.

Nor will the weakening of the free world be compensated for by a victory in the battle for the minds of men. In the current atmosphere where all attention has been focused on the most cataclysmic uses of nuclear weapons and we have failed to develop or to offer a plausible alternative, a complete cessation of tests will merely serve to shift pressures to the banning of nuclear weapons. We must be sensitive to world opinion. But we have also an obligation to contribute to shaping it. We must succeed in conveying the fact that unless the free world is prepared to accept a settlement on Soviet terms, we must have a military establishment which we are prepared to invoke for our defense. If we are not willing to run some risks for the preservation of our values and our interests, the collapse of the free world is inevitable and no amount of rhetoric can eliminate this fact.

V

The willingness to run risks depends in part on the options afforded by our military establishment. We require more conventional forces. We must have a wider spectrum of nuclear weapons. We must stop pretending that we can have security on the cheap.

One of the penalties of being on the defensive is that the choices which we must make are more difficult than the aggressor's, if only because the dangers against which we must protect ourselves are more varied. The aggressor can choose his point of attack; he can select the weapons system which seems most promising; he can concentrate on the area where his opponent is weakest either geographically or in weaponry. The defender must be able to defend all likely targets of aggression and against any weapons system that may be employed. Two consequences follow: (a) at equal levels of military effort the aggressor usually has an advantage; and (b) the defensive requires a more advanced weapons technology than its opponent. The side which concedes the first blow must have a more mobile and better protected retaliatory force, for it must be able to withstand the attrition of the initial attack. Its weapons must be lighter so that they can be rapidly moved to threatened areas. It must possess a range of capabilities which deters the aggressor from tilting the scales by expanding either the area or the intensity of the conflict. The side which concedes the first blow therefore runs major risks if it compounds the disadvantage of the defensive by having a frozen weapons technology. This is particularly true in the present stage of weapons development.

The nuclear weapons with which we are most familiar and which are most fully tested are also the most destructive. Any war would have to be conducted in their shadow. Under present circumstances they even inhibit recourse to conventional weapons, for the danger of a nuclear showdown will be thought to be inherent in any conflict. This view has already been articulated in Great Britain where Lord Russell has insisted that even surrender is preferable to running the risk of war.⁷

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is therefore essential that we develop nuclear weapons of finer discrimination, less destructive power and greatly reduced fallout. This need exists regardless of whether we intend to rely on a conventional or on a nuclear defense. As long as the defensive effort of the free world is polarized between inadequate conventional forces and nuclear weapons of enormous destructiveness, the Soviet bloc will be able to pose the dilemma of suicide or surrender in a variety of forms. By engaging in or encouraging aggression with conventional forces it can force our leaders to choose between yielding or invoking a strategy which will involve catastrophic casualties. Even if we build up conventional forces and resist initially without recourse to nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union may be tempted to utilize a few weapons of low yield unless deterred by the knowledge that we have ample weapons of similar discrimination and superior technology. A conventional war can be kept conventional only if we are prepared with a wide variety of nuclear weapons.

This will be true whether or not the Soviet Union follows suit. The rhetorical question "Why develop clean weapons if they use dirty weapons against us?" is surely no more pertinent than the argument "Why rely on bullets if the opponent has nuclear weapons?" This reasoning would loosen all constraints and would lead to the continued elaboration of ever more destructive weapons. Moreover, the availability of clean weapons is of great importance for the protection of our own troops and also civilian populations, which may be endangered by fallout from our own weapons. But the essential purpose of having a wide range of clean and discriminating weapons is to give the free world an option which does not involve either immediate catastrophe or surrender. Possession of them will improve the plausibility of our deterrent and reduce the possibility of Soviet atomic blackmail which has been so central a feature of Soviet diplomacy in recent years. And they will provide a shield behind which to build up conventional forces if we are prepared to make the sacrifices. The difference in willpower between the Soviet bloc and the free world must not reach the point where we assume an unlimited willingness on the part of our opponent to run risks, while we recoil before the risks of even a limited defense.

In a revolutionary world rife with possibilities for upheavals, perhaps unsought by any major power, it is imperative to couple the quest for peace with efforts to mitigate the consequences of conflicts that may occur either by accident or design. If this effort is not made, the result must be an increasing pacifism which will produce appeasement if not surrender; or else, if a decision to resist is taken, it will lead to the most catastrophic kind of war. Is it not possible that Soviet leaders have been so insistent on a complete and unconditional end of nuclear tests precisely because they are aware of the paralysis produced by such prospects?

VI

Would not the end of nuclear testing avoid the diffusion of nuclear weapons among other powers? Of course, a nuclear test ban will serve only to inhibit the independent development of nuclear weapons by fourth powers; it will not necessarily prevent the distribution of nuclear weapons from the stockpiles of the major nuclear powers, nor will it stop them from turning over blueprints to an ally. Nevertheless a complete ban on nuclear testing will have psychological and political consequences which will make it difficult for other powers to acquire nuclear weapons, particularly in the free world. The issue of a ban on nuclear testing

is therefore inseparable from that of nuclear sharing.

The situation with respect to nuclear sharing can be summarized as follows: The Communist bloc possesses a decisive military superiority in all contiguous areas. The Soviet Union can threaten with nuclear weapons all peripheral areas and much of Africa from its own territories; Communist China is overwhelmingly stronger than any neighboring state in conventional weapons. In these circumstances the Soviet Union may have decided that it has little to gain and a great deal to lose from the diffusion of nuclear weapons. Indeed, in view of the political unreliability of some of the satellite regimes, it probably has a positive interest in keeping nuclear weapons out of their hands.

The immediate Soviet objective is therefore to prevent the development of a nuclear capability under local control on the European Continent, for then Western Europe and other contiguous areas will eventually become neutralized. Without a nuclear capability of its own, Europe will find it impossible to resist the increasingly bold Soviet threats of nuclear warfare, which have been a cardinal aspect of Soviet diplomacy in every crisis since Suez. Europe, should it want to be defended, would then become entirely dependent on the American assessment of its danger. In such a situation the Soviet leaders may well calculate that the United States would be reluctant to invoke its own destruction for the defense of Europe, or than even in an all-out war they could not be prevented from seizing Europe. For after the initial exchange of blows the Soviet Union would remain supreme in Eurasia.⁹ That the Soviet Union is concerned with making Europe impotent and not with the threat offered by a European nuclear establishment is demonstrated by the Soviet protest against the plan to equip the Swiss Army with nuclear weapons.¹⁰ By no stretch of the imagination can Switzerland be suspected of aggressive intent against the U.S.S.R.

In negotiating about a nuclear test ban we must therefore take care not to contribute to a climate of opinion which will make our position on the Continent untenable and a local defense of Europe impossible. Already influential groups in Britain argue for a unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons and considerable pressures exist in Germany against equipping German forces for nuclear war. In both countries the cessation of nuclear tests is considered as an initial move away from atomic weapons. The more the Soviet Union succeeds in building up a distinction between nuclear weapons and other weapons, while retaining full control of its own stockpile, the more it will undermine the will of the Western alliance to resist. Once the Soviet Union has succeeded in bringing about a divergence between our military establishment and that of our European allies, it may hope that our NATO partners will be paralyzed by their impotence and we by our unwillingness to risk all-out war.

If we permit a distinction to grow up between our military establishment and that of our NATO allies, our expulsion from Europe is almost inevitable. Further delay in the distribution of nuclear weapons to our European allies will give the Soviet Union more time to persuade Europeans that they will be able to escape involvement in any conflict by refusing to permit nuclear installations on their territory. Logically, this denuclearization of Europe will be followed by a demand that American troops withdraw, since their equipment is so obviously nuclear. At the very least it will expose us to great pressure to withdraw all our nuclear installations from the continent. Western Europe would then be impotent, at the mercy of Soviet Russia. NATO would cease to have meaning.

This is not to say that Europe must obtain nuclear weapons from its own production or that these weapons must be under national control. From many points of view it would be highly desirable if NATO's nuclear components were under NATO control, or if a European atomic force were formed on the model of E.D.C. Similarly it is not essential that nuclear weapons be locally produced, but only that there be European participation in their use and control. Before we go much further in the direction of a complete ban on testing, we should at the very least amend our Atomic Energy Act to permit wider nuclear sharing. And our approach to the question of nuclear testing should be based on premises which do not inhibit nuclear sharing and which will not give impetus to Soviet ban-the-bomb propaganda.

Will not the possession of nuclear weapons by our allies increase the danger of war? This would be true if our allies felt thereby encouraged to attack the Soviet Union, or if they were to use nuclear weapons in their own quarrels outside of Europe. But excessive adventurousness vis-à-vis the Soviet Union can hardly be considered a European failing. Even in the less preferred contingency that nuclear weapons were under national rather than NATO control, it is difficult to conceive the circumstances which would induce any European country to unleash a unilateral attack on the Soviet Union. The individual nuclear capability will remain so small, the disproportion in vulnerability is so great, that they could not, by any rational calculation, use these weapons for offensive ends. Their purpose would be to make the costs of aggression, particularly of local adventures, prohibitive, and to discourage Soviet atomic blackmail.¹¹

As for the use of these weapons to settle private quarrels outside Europe, this could be effectively forestalled by placing them under NATO or an overall European control. But even should they be under national control, the likelihood of their use outside of NATO is slight. The difficulty which the French army has in Algeria is not inadequate firepower but that of finding targets against which this firepower can be used. Atomic weapons have little significance in guerrilla-type operations.

But what of the uncommitted nations? Is there to be no end to the diffusion of nuclear weapons? First, it must be recognized that from a technical standpoint the diffusion of nuclear weapons will grow increasingly difficult to prevent, regardless of what decision is reached with respect to nuclear testing. As the peaceful uses of nuclear energy become widespread, more and more nations will become familiar with nuclear technology. The end product of many atomic reactors is plutonium, which is also the basic component of nuclear weapons. As nuclear energy becomes more familiar, its military applications will be very difficult to control. Nothing short of the original Baruch-Lilienthal plan seems capable of arresting this trend.

It does not follow, moreover, that because the diffusion of nuclear weapons must be stopped at some point it must be stopped at this point, or that the most effective method is a ban on nuclear testing. To be sure, the more nuclear powers exist the more difficult it will be to arrest the spread of nuclear weapons. But we must weigh this risk against the danger of collaborating with the Soviet Union in the neutralization of Europe. This would leave us without powerful allies. It would place us ultimately in the position of having to defend the whole Soviet periphery alone against Soviet nuclear attack or Soviet atomic blackmail. Bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to the exclusion of our European allies are fraught with danger. It would be much bet-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ter to deal with the problem of the diffusion of nuclear weapons directly rather than through the indirect method of a test ban, and to include our NATO allies as nuclear powers in any agreement, preferably through a European Atomic Community.

Of possible methods to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, a test ban is the most disadvantageous to the free world. In relevance to nuclear sharing is primarily that it will contribute to a psychological attitude in the West making it impossible for any of our allies to acquire nuclear weapons. Communist China will not be similarly inhibited from obtaining nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union. Even if reports that the U.S.S.R. has already agreed to give nuclear weapons to Communist China are premature it does not seem likely that the Soviet Union would in the long run risk its most important alliance by refusing to share nuclear weapons in any form. It is idle to argue that in these circumstances the United States would be free to give nuclear weapons to its own allies. By that time, the public opinion of our NATO partners would not permit the possession of nuclear weapons, especially as the direct threat to these countries is not markedly increased if China possesses nuclear weapons.

The difficulty with a total ban on nuclear testing is that it stakes too much on a measure which in itself is of problematical significance. It will build up worldwide reluctance to resort to nuclear weapons, the only means of defense now existing against Soviet aggression or Soviet military pressure. It will impede if not prevent the articulation of a strategy for the defense of Europe. It will increase the danger that any war that does break out will take the most catastrophic form. By freezing weapons development after only the most fearful applications of nuclear power have been fully explored, it will increase the possibilities for Soviet atomic blackmail without reducing the free world's peril. As a first step it goes too far and in a too uncertain direction.

VII

One of the difficulties the free world has had in dealing with the Soviet bloc is that we have been clearer about the things we oppose than those we stand for. This has given much of our negotiations with the Soviet Union the quality of a stubborn rear-guard action designed primarily to thwart Soviet overtures. It has enabled the Soviet leadership to define the issues in international debate, putting us in the position of respondent rather than initiator. World-wide pressures are built up against us before we have a chance to demonstrate our own purposes and values.

So it has been with the issue of nuclear testing. Our diplomacy has concentrated on problems of inspection or on belittling the danger of fallout. Whatever the scientific basis of the fear of radiation,¹ there is no question that we should respect the depth of that fear among many peoples exposed to fallout from tests outside their control and against which they have no protection. Control over radioactive fallout is therefore a requirement of any U.S. policy on nuclear testing. But the United States should not be asked at the same time to initiate the control of armaments by paralyzing itself and its allies without at least the beginning of a reduction of Soviet conventional strength and of some protection against surprise attack. The fact that the Soviet Union has proved obdurate on a general disarmament scheme indicates only that it wants to use negotiations to disarm us unilaterally, not that such a scheme lacks merit. If we negotiate only on issues the Soviets declare soluble, we can be sure that diplomacy will become increasingly a device to undermine the free world.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In the negotiations on a nuclear test ban which are about to begin, the United States should therefore propose that we are willing to address ourselves immediately to the problem of fallout but that a complete ban would depend on a comprehensive disarmament agreement. Pending such an agreement, we should propose that, while nuclear weapons are essential to the defense of the free world, we are prepared to take immediate steps to mitigate the effects either of testing or of using them. We should invite the Soviet Union to join a U.N. committee which would immediately set a maximum dosage of permissible fallout from testing well below the level brought about by recent tests. The U.N. committee should then assign a quota to the United States and its allies and another to the Soviet bloc on a 50-50 basis. (Since most of the potential "fourth" powers are in the West, this would be a considerable concession to the U.S.S.R.) For 2 years all powers would agree to register with the U.N. all tests which involve fallout and both sides would agree not to exceed their quota. During those 2 years the quota would be progressively reduced, ultimately to zero. Afterward, unless there were by then a general disarmament agreement, nations would remain free to conduct surface tests of "clean" weapons, underground tests, and tests in outer space, so long as they did not cause fallout. Technical experts from both sides would agree on an adequate inspection mechanism, which could be relatively simple.

While such an agreement would impede the arms race, it would not stop weapons development altogether. It would permit the continued elaboration of defensive weapons and of weapons which can be applied with discrimination, both in terms of fallout and in terms of yield. Indeed, it will put a premium on such development because these weapons can be tested most easily underground or within established fallout quotas. It will avoid placing the United States in the position of not trusting its allies with the development of weapons which are essential to their defense and which their opponent already possesses in quantity. At the same time, it will impede the too rapid diffusion of nuclear technology and thereby afford time for a careful study of this problem. The easiest weapons to develop are those with major fallout effects. The least complicated method of testing is above ground. Thus a limited ban could channel future weapons development into the least destructive channels. It would reduce and ultimately eliminate whatever health-hazard there may be in present testing.

Such a proposal would counteract the Soviet effort to elaborate a distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear powers or zones or warfare, a distinction which can only paralyze the free world. At the same time, it would call attention to a distinction between forms of warfare which are unnecessarily destructive and those which seek to confine devastation to the smallest possible proportions—a condition which is essential to make our deterrent posture plausible and to strengthen the will of the free world. If the Soviet Union rejected our proposal, we and our allies should impose a steeply decreasing quota on ourselves, thus forcing the Soviet Union into the position of being solely responsible for any health hazard in nuclear testing. In this manner, increasing pressure of world opinion could be built up against the most catastrophic use of nuclear weapons and in favor of a general disarmament agreement. This approach to the problem of nuclear testing would have the additional advantage that it would be much easier to inspect. Inspection could concentrate on one problem reasonably well understood: that of fallout. If no radioactivity were found, no violation was taking place.

A restriction of nuclear testing as outlined here would meet many of the fears of hu-

manity without exposing the free world to incalculable peril. It would be a first step which avoids most of the dangers of a complete ban and yet achieves many of its goals. If the limitation of nuclear tests proved workable, the inspection system could be expanded, reduction of arms might follow, and efforts could be made to reduce the danger of surprise attack. None of these measures is possible, however, as long as the Soviet Union is encouraged to believe, by the irresolution and evasions of the free world, that through skillful and persistent diplomacy it can break up the cohesiveness of the Western alliance and undermine the will to resist aggression with the only effective weapon now at our disposal.

VIII

It is widely believed in the West that the issue of nuclear testing is a touchstone of our sincerity. Many argue that the Soviet Union scored a major gain by renouncing nuclear tests and that we exhibited lack of imagination and the absence of a moral dimension by not following suit immediately. The reluctance to end nuclear testing, so the argument goes, is a symptom of the sterility and overconcern with military problems which have been at the root of so many of our difficulties.

There is no doubt that the Western World is in deep trouble. It has not been able to articulate either a philosophy or a program adequate to the challenge of the times. It has failed to identify itself with the revolutionary period through which we are living and it has not had the vision or the willingness to carry through a sustained program of world economic development. Because we have not been clear about our purpose we have often found it easier to concentrate on defensive measures than on those which might give a sense of direction to a world in turmoil.

But even in the military field we are inadequately prepared to deal with most of the issues with which we are likely to be confronted. We have insufficient strength for limited war. We are falling behind in the overall strategic equation. The answer to our political dilemma is not to be found in reducing our defenses—for even here more effort and imagination are required—but in injecting a greater sense of purpose into our overall performance.

As a Nation of specialists we like to believe that a problem is either political or economic or military. The challenge we face, however, is that contemporary problems involve a combination of all these factors. Our choice is not between working for the things in which we believe or attending to our necessities. If we cannot do both, we will not be able to do either.

¹ For a very good account of methods of detecting nuclear weapons testing see "The Detection of Nuclear Weapons Testing," by Jay Orear, in "Inspection for Disarmament," edited by Seymour Melman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), p. 85 f.

² The New York Times, Aug. 23, 1958.

³ For an interesting analysis of the degree to which public opinion in free world countries would support a test ban see "An International Public Opinion Poll on Disarmament and 'Inspection by the People': A Study of Attitudes Toward Supranationalism," by William M. Evan in Melman, op. cit., p. 231 f.

⁴ This process may already have started. See the Soviet charge that the United States "hid" 18 test explosions in the Pacific. The New York Times, Aug. 24, 1958.

⁵ Mao Tse-tung, "Selected Works," vol. 2, 1937-38 (New York: International Publishers, 1954), p. 263-4.

⁶ The New York Times, June 29, 1958.

⁷ Bertrand Russell, "Freedom to Survive," The New Leader, July 7-14, 1958, p. 23.

*The aggressor employing nuclear weapons against conventional forces will have a relatively concentrated target because massed firepower is difficult to achieve otherwise in a conventional war. He can therefore employ relatively crude nuclear weapons, having first dispersed his own forces.

*See Peregrine Worsthorne, "Our Bomb and Theirs: As the Russians See It," *En-counter*, July 1958. Also Raymond L. Garthoff, "Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age," New York: Praeger, 1958.

*The New York Times, August 9, 1958.

*For a fuller discussion of the problems of the defense of Europe see the author's "Missiles and the Western Alliance," *Foreign Affairs*, April 1958.

*The New York Times, August 18, 1958.

*See for example the recent U.N. report on radiation. The New York Times, August 11, 1958.

Bangor Celebrates 125th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand why Bangor, Maine, in the celebration of its 125 years of history, should seek to establish its claim to Paul Bunyan—both are grand.

I submit for insertion in the RECORD news articles from the *Enterprise*, which depict how the Queen City has laid claim to this kingly legendary personality:

BANGOR COMMITTEE WILL KEEP THE YEAR HUMMING—PROGRAM HAS BIG DOINGS OF ALL KINDS EACH MONTH

The 30-foot statue of Paul Bunyan has been erected in front of the auditorium in Bangor, and the Queen City is embarked on its year-long celebration of 125 years of history. From now until the end of the year, Bangor will be in festival, a program that started on New Year's Eve with a bonfire of Christmas trees.

SYMBOL

Paul Bunyan has definitely become the symbol of the frolic, although it seems this was not exactly the plan. Story comes that some citizens of Bangor think there is a ribald and indecorous tinge to the mighty Paul, and that as a symbol he is not precisely what the Bangor program ought to be, or will be. But Paul has always had a way of dominating anything he has to do with, and there probably is no point at this late date in fighting the thing.

Paul Bunyan is an American legend, the patron saint of lumbering, and the stories about him lie a mile high in all directions. He has long been associated with Minnesota and the Great Northwest, where his prodigious deeds are well known. Although the full legend makes him a native of Maine he has never been fully accredited as such until Bangor's 125th committee worked him in. Then the fun began. The Bangor News has been a clearinghouse for letters to the editor, including all sorts of incontrovertible proof that Paul belongs to Maine, and also dubious conclusions by experts that he was not indigenous. Nobody believes the latter, of course.

STOCKING CAP

Anyway, the 30-foot statue of fibre glass, the most magnificent of all those in existence, was ordered and set up, and the Paul Bunyan stocking cap became a Bangor commonplace. Paul Bunyan Days, from Janu-

ary 29 to February 1, are the winter carnival portion of the program, and high times and high jinks are in the offing.

If there's anything Bangor hasn't thought of to round out the year, the committee would like to know what it is. Some dates and events are still tentative, but other plans that will materialize haven't been mentioned yet. The committee has produced a printed program, and it may be had by dropping a note to the committee office, Bangor City Hall. Ask for the 125th program.

Calling it the big year to be here, Bangor lists the 1959 events with the following outstanding and ambitious dates:

PROGRAM

January 29 to February 1: Paul Bunyan Days, winter carnival, coronation of anniversary queen, contests, dances.

February 12: Lincoln-Hamlin Day.

February 23 to March 7: Regional and State basketball finals.

March 16 to 22: Ice Capades.

April: Circus, merchandising show, Oklahoma on stage.

May: High-school music festival, Armed Forces Day, antique car show.

June: Dairy Month do. Tourist tours start. Conventions.

July: Hurray for the Glorious Fourth. Big time.

August: 110th annual Bangor Fair. Pro football, first in Maine.

September: Softball playoffs. Labor Day stuff. Horseshoe. Big Shrine time.

October: Halloween fracas, banquets, business week, etc.

November: Historical pageant sine qua non.

December: Everybody pooped.

BANGOR FINDS BUNYAN BIRTH—CHANGES THINGS A WEE BIT

Bangor has played around a bit with Paul Bunyan's origins, and claims he was born there on February 12, 1834, the year the city was incorporated. The city clerk of Bangor deposed and stated a birth certificate is on file. They have further located a character designated as Lemuel, middle name Eliza, Chamberlain, now 125 years old and living at 37 Kalsar Boulevard, Bangor, who says he (she) remembers Paul as a boy.

Bangor also stipulates Paul was the son of "French-Canadian" parents, father's name was Jacques, mother's Sarah Marie.

Most of the stories say Paul was born at, or near, Machias. Having created the Fundy tides by rocking his floating cradle as a newborn babe, Paul obviously was cradled somewhere near the Fundy region. Bangor has changed that to "Penobscot tides." Does it matter?

A Tribute to Hon. Herman Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our dear friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Herman Eberharter, was a real loss to our State and the Nation. It was also a great personal loss to those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him here in the House.

His tireless efforts in behalf of more equitable tax legislation, social security

legislation to improve the economic status of our old folks, and other liberal measures earned for him the respect and admiration of his colleagues.

Herman Eberharter was a keen, active, and able legislator who possessed great courage and vision to see beyond the immediate aspects of a particular problem. He was faithful to his duties, sincere, and upright in dealings with his colleagues. We shall miss him greatly in the days ahead.

Alabama Press Association Denounces Washington Post for Refusing Putnam Ad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the Alabama Press Association, the membership of which is composed of all publishers and editors of daily and weekly newspapers in the State of Alabama, met at its 88th annual convention. One of the highlights of the convention was the adoption by unanimous vote of a resolution criticizing the Washington Post and Times Herald for its refusal to run the Putnam letter, which has received much publicity of late, as a paid advertisement. It is my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, a newspaper article which appeared in the Monday, January 26, 1959, issue of the Birmingham Post-Herald, concerning the meeting and adoption of the resolution:

STATE PRESS GROUP ATTACKS PAPER FOR REFUSAL OF AD

Alabama Press Association delegates, winding up their 3-day 88th annual convention, headed back to their editorial offices across the State over the weekend, but not before they'd fired a parting salvo at a Washington newspaper for betrayal of the press.

The association, representing 16 Alabama dailies and 116 weeklies, by resolution condemned and deplored the Washington Post and Times Herald for its refusal to publish the "Putnam Letter" as a paid advertisement.

The Alabama newsmen accused the Washington daily of obstructing the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue.

Before the resolution was read the newsmen elected William Stewart, of Monroeville, to succeed C. G. Thomason, of the Ensley Industrial Press, as its new president.

Post-Herald Editor James E. Mills was named first vice president. New second vice president is Harold May, of the Florence Herald.

Col. Harry Ayers, Anniston Star publisher, proposed the resolution flaying the Washington Post and Times Herald. That paper 2 weeks ago, with regret, had notified James Simpson, head of the Birmingham-based Putnam Letter Fund, it would not publish the letter, which expresses a general southern viewpoint, in a tract written by New Englander Carleton Putnam.

On the same topic of publicizing the "South's viewpoint," Lt. Gov. Albert Bout-

well, the convention's main speaker Friday, had informed the newsmen that an Alabama legislative committee would be formed to spearhead a States rights battle.

In another proposal, the conventioners had endorsed a resolution drawn by L. O. Brackeen, Auburn, to create a "Hall of Fame" for Alabama newspapers and outstanding journalists.

A five-member fame committee will report on the subject at the 1960 convention.

Jones Giles, Tuscaloosa, was reelected secretary treasurer and field manager.

New directors of the association are Tip Matthews, Mobile Press Register; Joel Smith, Eufaula Tribune; Porter Harvey, Guntersville Gleam; Jay Thornton, Haleyville Advertiser; Arthur Cook, Shades Valley Sun; and Arthur Slayton, Moulton Advertiser and Russellville Citizen Times.

Directors of the Alabama Newspaper Advertising Service also were elected. They are J. C. Henderson, Alexander City Outlook; Fred Elland, Cleburne County News; Tom Gardner, Brewton Standard; and Bob Bryan, Cullman Times and Democrat.

Labor and Industry Work Together To Save Hat Firm in Amesbury, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has a special interest in the news that the Merrimac Hat Corp., of Amesbury, Mass., will soon hum with activity. Threatened with liquidation, this 100-year-old firm faces a bright horizon as a result of a deep mutual understanding between labor and management.

For many years, it has been my pleasure to cooperate with the Merrimac Hat Corp., of Amesbury, in the consideration of its problems. During this period, I have observed a relationship between labor and management that was rare, enlightened and especially noteworthy because of a sincere spirit of cooperation and sharing of the difficulties that have faced the hat industry in recent years.

Discussions of the corporation's problems were frank and sincere and the viewpoint of the union's was strongly advanced by Mr. Frank Cynewski, the agent of the union. Yet, in the active and forceful presentation of views, there was a constant band of harmony uniting both groups.

It is a privilege, therefore, for me to congratulate the present and past presidents of the company, Mr. Hans Rie and Mr. Everett T. Brown, also Mr. Frank Cynewski, the representative of labor for their efforts which have been so much appreciated by the community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post and which presents this interesting story in detail:

NEW YORK, January 19.—The union representing the Nation's hat workers has bought controlling interest in an ailing 100-year-old Massachusetts hat concern in a unique rescue operation that may foreshadow a radical shift in labor's traditional role.

The United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers (AFL-CIO) announced over the

weekend it has taken over control of the Merrimac Hat Corp., Amesbury, Mass.

The move is designed to save the company from liquidation and reopen its plant which has been shut down since last November, idling 325 union members.

Alex Rose, president of the 35,000-member union, said he and 4 other union officials have been elected to the 9-man board of the company.

The union has bought the assets of Merrimac for \$200,000, he said and plans to invest an additional \$100,000, giving it a 60 percent stock ownership in the hat company.

The rest of the money to refinance the company will come from stock purchases by company workers, local merchants, and others in the community of 11,000. Rose said the plant would reopen February 2.

Rose emphasized that all present company officials will remain in their posts.

However, the union's action, apparently violates the AFL-CIO ethical practices code adopted 3 years ago which prohibits unions from investing money in or making loans to companies with which they have collective bargaining agreements. The ban was aimed at racketeers in the labor movement from enriching themselves through such deals.

Rose said he has written to George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, assuring him that no one in the hat union local will profit personally by the Merrimac venture.

Tribute to Management of Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, Dr. E. V. Edwards, manager of the Long Beach, Calif., Veterans' Administration Hospital, will retire from public service. Many letters of appreciation have been received by me from veterans who have been hospitalized under his supervision and care. His work has been outstanding during the 13 years that he has devoted his time to making the hospital a successful operation. The following letter I received from a veteran, recently a patient at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, is a real tribute to Dr. Edwards and his staff:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. CRAIG HOSMER,
Representative for 18th District of California.

DEAR SIR: As a recent patient at the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, I wish to thank you for your interest in the hospital and to assure you that interest is not misplaced.

I have had a serious illness for 5 years, and when I entered the hospital several doctors said I would have it the rest of my life. I don't know what the doctors did but my illness has gone. I used to cough so much I would disrupt the peace at the table, couldn't go to a theater, movie, or church; couldn't teach my class at Red Cross in first aid. When I got to thinking of the years ahead—of my trouble and embarrassment to others, I felt like going AWOL.

I can only say it was a semimiracle due to plenty of know-how that cured me. One other know-how—how to be pleasant and courteous—is used at the hospital. The sign "courtesy is contagious" has been well read and practiced as the hospital is one of

the most efficiently run and the most pleasant places—with the most pleasant people—doctors, secretaries, nurses, orderlies, nurses aides, and cleaners. They are all imbued with the idea to make the patients feel as if they were a long-lost brother.

The so-called heaven could not be more pleasant and have more pleasant people. So the management of the Long Beach Veterans' Administration Hospital must be efficient, nice people.

Sincerely yours,

ARCHER C. BEACH.

Protecting Sources of Information Is Protection for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Times of January 9 entitled "Protecting Sources of Information Is Protection for the Public":

PROTECTING SOURCES OF INFORMATION IS PROTECTION FOR THE PUBLIC

Miss Marie Torre, a TV columnist for the New York Herald-Tribune, now is serving 10 days in a Federal prison for contempt of a New York Federal district court. She was not plaintiff or defendant in the case at issue. She merely had been called as a witness in a preliminary hearing to a damage suit filed against a TV network by a once world-famous movie actress who flopped on the air.

Miss Torre had written and the Herald-Tribune had published a column in which she quoted an unnamed TV network executive as giving reasons why the actress flopped on the air, among them being a supposed inferiority complex. While suing the network, the actress did not sue either Miss Torre or the Herald-Tribune for libel, slander, or anything else.

Called on at the preliminary hearing to identify the TV executive, Miss Torre naturally refused to do so. The judge sentenced her to 10 days, the U.S. circuit court of appeals upheld the sentence, and the Supreme Court refused to review the case, thus, in effect, upholding the lower courts.

In sentencing Miss Torre, the Federal judge also lectured her, even going to the extent of dragging in southern desegregation issues by saying that she should set a good example to people in certain parts of the country who were defying the Federal courts. Since contempt is a continuing offense, when Miss Torre finishes her 10 days she can be sentenced to another 10 days, and this procedure carried on for the rest of her life if the judge so wishes and she continues to refuse to divulge the source of her information. No one expects that to happen, but at times it seems that almost anything can happen in Federal courts these days, and, according to press association dispatches, the sentencing judge was quite irritated with Miss Torre.

It takes a long imagination, indeed, to picture Miss Torre as intentionally defying the Federal courts by refusing to give information which she obtained in confidence—refusing at a preliminary hearing to a damage suit between two other parties and to which neither she nor her newspaper were directly connected.

Miss Torre is not the first newspaper reporter to go to jail for refusing to reveal

sources of information. Others have done so on back through the decades, although rarely have courts imposed jail sentences in such cases and, when they did, usually it was merely a token sentence of a few hours and not a matter of 10 days.

Newspapers in this country always have asserted, as their right, the privilege of refusing to divulge sources of information. This right is not specified in the Federal Constitution, but the Constitution does specify in its first amendment that there shall be no law abridging freedom of the press. And a "right" can be ethical or moral as well as statutory and constitutional; in this case, certainly ethical and moral and having at least an inferential constitutional foundation, although the Federal district, circuit, and Supreme Courts denied the latter.

The importance of the Torre case is not merely that a newspaper reporter has been sent to jail or whether a newspaper has the right to withhold sources of information from courts or other official bodies, such as investigating committees of Congress or of State legislatures. Freedom of the press was intended by those who wrote the Constitution to protect the freedom of the people to know what is going on in or out of their governments. It is not some special privilege for publications.

Newspapers and other means of communication do not make news—they merely publish it, whether in printed form in a daily newspaper, on the air, in a book, a pamphlet, a circular, or by any other means. Freedom of the press is simply a part of the whole constitutional setup of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and even freedom of religion.

The value to the American people of the self-asserted right of their newspapers to withhold sources of information in vital matters has been demonstrated over and over again. Many of the great scandals of city, State, and Federal Government which have come to light throughout the Nation's history—scandals of graft and corruption and stealing of public funds and public assets—were first brought before the public through investigations by newspapers and usually the revelations were possible because someone was willing to give newspaper reporters information under a pledge that identity of the giver would not be made public under any conditions.

The huge Teapot Dome oil scandals in the Harding administration came into full public revelation because the late Paul Y. Anderson, a Washington reporter for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was able to obtain confidential information which he passed on to Senator Burt Wheeler, prosecutor for the investigating committee, but without revealing the source of this information. The inquiry had come to a dead end, but with Anderson's information, Senator Wheeler was able to phrase questions to the president of a big oil company which brought replies revealing oil corruption all over Washington. Later the oil company president himself went to prison. A Cabinet member went to prison for accepting a \$50,000 bribe in connection with oil leases. Two other Cabinet members were forced to resign. Several persons committed suicide and numerous others went to prison in this and related Federal Government scandals of that time.

None of this could have happened but for the information Anderson obtained from official sources. Anderson could not have obtained the information but for realization on the part of persons giving it that he would protect their identity—protect his sources of information.

Millions of dollars in graft and corruption and stealing in an Illinois State administration in the 1920's running into tens of millions of dollars was exposed and brought to an end and public officials sent to prison be-

cause reporters for the Chicago Tribune were able to obtain private and confidential information under pledge not to reveal identity of those giving it. Only a few years ago, the State Auditor of Illinois was revealed as having stolen more than a million dollars from the public funds of the State—meaning from the people—and sent to prison as a result of investigations by a Chicago Daily News reporter who could not have gotten to first base but for confidential information obtained under pledge to protect the person giving it.

The huge scandals of graft and corruption and stealing in Pennsylvania during the days of the Vare Philadelphia machine were revealed by newspapers as a result of being able to obtain information confidentially. The terrible story of Tammany Hall in New York City and its thieving for decades came out in the same way, with the New York World (now out of existence) as the leader but with many newspapers taking part.

Here in Louisiana, the graft and corruption and stealing of State administrations in the middle and late 1930's became public when a New Orleans newspaper, acting on confidential information obtained through a pledge to protect the person giving it, printed pictures of State property being used for private construction of homes of State officials. This led to an almost endless trail of graft and corruption, bribery, kickbacks, and thievery.

The first revelations of the Dave Beck Teamsters Union graft and corruption and of the activities of Jimmy Hoffa came through publication by newspapers ranging from Pennsylvania to Oregon of data which stemmed from confidential information obtained under the pledge of protection of the person supplying it.

This could be carried on endlessly. The history of most of the great and independent newspapers of the Nation, large or small, is marked with fearless exposures of the type cited, made possible through exercise of the self-asserted right of newspapers, moral or ethical, to protect their sources of information.

Since the Supreme Court now has ruled that such protection is not constitutional, it is about time for Congress to make it so, through statutory action which Congress specifically is empowered by the Constitution to take—the enactment of laws specifying the appellate authority of the Federal courts. As things stand now, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a newspaper reporter must snitch on friends who supply information in confidence, but that an ex-Communist—in this particular case a nationally known playwright—need not name his fellow Communists of the days when he was a member of an organization pledged to seek overthrow of the U.S. Government, by force if necessary. In the latter case, the playwright was sentenced for contempt of Congress and the Supreme Court freed him, holding that he did not have to give such information.

Orderly Gains Noted in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include two articles from the January 26, 1959, edition of the Christian

Science Monitor. Writers Bertram B. Johansson and Thomas Probasco Wright bring encouraging words from the Cuban scene, words I am glad to bring to Members of the Congress:

CUBAN ORDERLY GAINS NOTED

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

WASHINGTON.—There is an increasing segment of responsible opinion here which holds that in spite of the aberrations of military trials in Cuba, the new Urrutia government is steadily consolidating its position and gradually, if slowly, bringing order out of chaos.

Certain news reports of the military executions, these sources hold, have tended to discolor and black out the new government's accomplishments.

Evidence from both United States and Latin-American sources confirms that a substantial start has been made in harvesting the sugar crop which supplies 40 percent of the white sweetener for U.S. tables.

ROADS, BRIDGES REPAIRED

The government and sugar firms are co-operating closely in repairing roads and bridges, so as to be able to transport cane from fields to the sugar grinding mills, and eventually from the mills to rail depots and ports.

In some respects, the Urrutia government has acted more circumspectly than the Batista regime in the matter of setting sugar quotas.

Under Dictator Fulgencia Batista, the Sugar Stabilization Institute, which sets the annual crop targets, had proposed a quota of 5,900,000 Spanish tons of sugar.

The Urrutia government, not wanting to handle matters in the same manner as the previous regime, set a quota of 5,800,000 Spanish tons.

AIMS TO AVERT GLUT

Several years ago, when a quota of 8 million tons was set and harvested, the glut of sugar this produced on the world market created a serious price depression in sugar.

It took several years before the effects of an overproduction of sugar were dissipated.

In the labor field a new awareness of the Communist infiltration threat has brought quick action.

Sources close to the Cuban labor movement state that Communist labor elements which attempted to make capital of the confusion attending the last months before General Batista's fall have been effectively shorn of their power.

A revolutionary labor front named FONU, or National United Labor Front, on which Communists had managed to gain several positions, has been summarily dissolved.

LABOR FRONT BUOYED

Responsible labor sources opine that a new council recently set up represents a definite defeat for the Communists who are charging betrayal and unilateral action by the 26th of July movement.

How vigorous the vigilance will be against Communist penetration into Cuba's labor unions remains to be seen, but labor sources here are cheered by first results.

The new Urrutia government is not without its many problems, as it strives to marshal up a program in the wake of the corruption of Batista dictatorship.

Financial problems are legion. The Batista administration, among other legacies, left a budget deficit of some \$50 million, and a huge national debt of \$1,500 million.

Not the least of the Urrutia-Castro government's problems is the fact that until now it has been a military organization.

Until it took power January 1, it had given no visible demonstration of a capability of establishing political unity. Military discipline and unity quickly established order among rival factions in the first

few days of the occupation of Havana, when it was feared wholesale slaughters such as took place with the fall of the Machado dictatorship in the 1930's might occur.

It has become apparent in recent weeks that the 26th of July movement, while effective as a military organization, still needs to learn the political skills of accommodation and compromise, and to establish a national economic program.

Latin-American statesmen, who know how deep the Castro revolution has cut into the corruption and cruelty that surrounded the Batista regime, are concerned lest it should falter now, for lack of political experience.

STATESMEN ANXIOUS

It can be stated authoritatively that these statesmen are so concerned about this that men like Gov. Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico; President-elect Betancourt, of Venezuela; President López Mateos, and ex-President José Figueres, of Costa Rica, are prepared to take Fidel Castro "under their arm" and teach him some of the political arts needed to preserve the reforms of the independence movement.

Currently, Major Castro is in Caracas, Venezuela, where he was invited to attend ceremonies celebrating the deposing of dictator Pérez Jiménez last January 27.

While there, Major Castro was highly critical of certain U.S. Congressmen and elements of the U.S. press which he felt had distorted the news from Cuba in recent weeks.

CUBA: OUT OF ITS CHAINS

(By Thomas Probasco Wright)

To one who has loved Cuba for many years, the news of its liberation from a brutal military dictatorship has brought a great relief and delight. But he knows that the words of Fidel Castro on entering Habana are emphatically true: "The revolution has only begun."

A glance backward at history to find how the ousted Frankenstein came into being will help to point the way to prevent such dark shadows from enveloping Cuba in the future, and aid in establishing the stable, democratic government under which that island's lovable people can realize their dream of happiness.

In all Spanish-oriented lands benevolent government is hard to find. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the Spaniard's innate view of life as pointed out by Thomas Madariaga in his definitive book "Spain" where he says that his countrymen are prone to look vertically up to God, disregarding their fellow men, while the Anglo-Saxon looks horizontally toward his fellow men, and is not so concerned with an unseen God. Outside his family group the Spaniard is not so socially minded, and this makes the self-sacrificing cooperation necessary for democratic government difficult to attain. No sooner does one strong man with his followers get to the top than another strong man with his backers is plotting to overthrow him—and incessantly unstable government is the result.

So it was with Cuba shortly before World War II, when a shaky President Machado was fighting off efforts to displace him, in a period punctuated by more than one political assassination and with the country in a turmoil. Cubans will tell you that at this point the Colossus of the North stepped in, in the person of Sumner Welles, who took up residence in the Hotel Nacional and, they say, worked with dissident elements for the removal of Machado. At any rate, the opposition mounted till Machado was sent packing to New York, and Fulgencio Batista, a professional army man, strode into power.

The writer was in Cuba during the early days of the war, when Batista had consolidated his rule and was running the country

in no uncertain terms. Businessmen there said that under previous governments they had grown accustomed to 10 percent political graft, but that the "take" had increased to 50 percent. Batista grew enormously rich, and after a number of years chose to step out for a breathing spell and enjoy life at ease in Daytona Beach, Fla.

In 1952 the lure of power and its golden fruits brought him back again in a military coup that came natural to Batista with his long-time army connections. And then, in place of the former smiling and comparatively mild boss-man, a new Batista began to emerge. Hemisphere defense had become uppermost in Washington's relations with Latin American countries, and military aid poured in to buttress Batista's army backing to a point where no civil opposition could make a dent in it. It enabled him to build up a military establishment of 65,000 armed to the teeth, with bases all over the island, in addition to heavily swollen local police units at every country crossroads, all tightly organized for their own and their jefe's benefit—while the Cuban people more and more bowed their heads and paid the mounting bill of personal subjugation.

The officers' clubs were like Arabian Nights dreams; the corporals and sergeants rode in new American cars while other ordinary Cubans drove old jalopies or walked; and the foot soldiers exerted petty graft on the harassed populace. Two years ago I traveled the length and breadth of the island by bus and taxi, from Pinar del Rio in the west to the Oriente in the eastern end, from north-coast Calbarien to southcoast Cienfuegos, and everywhere the feeling was the same: it was Batista and his army against the Cuban people. Those who objected were murdered and tortured by the now-grim Batista shouting, "Comunistas, Comunistas," over the radio in an effort to distract attention from his own bloody rule.

While I was there, the president of the student body was shot dead, unarmed, on the University of Havana campus, and one of the most respected judges was dragged out of his home and murdered by the soldiers. And the killing and raping and torturing mounted and mounted and mounted as the freedom-loving Cubans struggled against their pampered oppressors.

Against this seemingly invincible machine, one youthful leader with 80-odd men landed from Mexico on the wild, rugged shore at the foot of the Sierra Maestra Mountains in southeast Cuba. Just a handful of small arms and limited ammunition was all they had. They were a comparatively unknown group not connected with other opposition elements, but in 2½ years under the flaming spirit of their Fidel Castro they overturned the "butcher of Havana" and rode triumphant down the heart of Cuba amid the grateful cheers and tears of the liberated population. And the first thing Fidel Castro did after his victory was to turn over the presidency of the country to a civil leader. The words in his first speech in the capital will long be remembered by the Cuban people: "We are determined to give you love."

In the face of the present challenging situation in Cuba, and remembering recent history, what can America do to help our warmhearted, gracious neighbor to the south in its struggle to attain stable, democratic government? We can view its efforts with patience and sympathy, keeping in mind the fact that, unlike ourselves who have inherited an established tradition of constitutional government from wise forebears, the Latin Americans have no such tradition and must gradually work it out in the fiery crucible of political experience.

We can resist the temptation to meddle in their internal affairs. Cubans know what is best for them, and they have a right to develop their own destinies just as we have ours. But if at times it seems impossible

to refrain from interfering, let it never be on the side of dictators, which merely chains a Latin American country to the unhappy past and prevents it from going on to attain the democratic self-government we now enjoy.

It is impossible for one who has experienced the rich beauties of the Cuban landscape to end this article on a political note. Columbus is said to have described the island as "the fairest land ever beheld by mortal eye," and the modern adventurer through this "pearl of the Antilles" comes to agree with him.

But do not spend all your time in Habana. Visit the Valley of Vinales, which lies like a green sunken garden of the gods in the beautiful western mountains. Spend a few of the most restful days of your life at San José Del Lago in central Cuba, with its string of lakes and sprightly little Cuban horses to carry you up into luxuriant emerald hills from whose summit you can glimpse the hazy blue Caribbean far to the north. Wander through the unspoiled Spanish colonial town of Trinidad. It was from there that Cortez sailed to his conquest of Mexico.

Then head into the far eastern province of Oriente, the "wild west" of Cuba, and see sombreroed horsemen herding cattle on broad, rolling ranchos. This wide, open land has always been Cuba's Cradle of Liberty. You will see monuments all along the way to heroes of the War of Liberation from Spain. Then continue on to gloriously historic Santiago, and stand on the heights overlooking the bay where the Spanish Navy was trapped to usher in Cuba's independence. As you stand there raise your eyes to the towering, rugged Sierra Maestra range in the west where Castro launched his drive to free Cuba from an equally difficult foe.

Do all these things, my friend, and you will know what it means when you hear Cuban patriots singing their newly revived national anthem, and fairly raising the roof with a final "viva Cuba."

The 41st Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Ukrainian National Republic. It is fitting that we join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and with freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in commemorating this important date, and in expressing our deepest sympathy for the present plight of the Ukrainian people.

When the sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was crushed in 1920, the Ukrainian National Republic was one of the first victims of Communist expansion and aggression. Throughout the long years of enslavement, the people of Ukraine have kept alive a spirit of freedom and have preserved their strong national feelings.

Man and his sustained faith in eventual liberation are the most vital and potent weapons against communism. The human desire for freedom will survive all hardship, and will outlast the

effect of any technological or scientific weapons. We must not forget this basic truth.

The brave people of Ukraine must be encouraged to continue their undaunted determination to regain independent national status. We must again pledge ourselves to the goal that we shall build a better world in which all nations may live in peace, freedom, and justice. We will work toward this end, and trust that our determination to do this will bring added courage to the people of the Ukraine and the peoples of other Communist-dominated nations.

Davisville Boys 4-H Club News Report for Year 1957-58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I include the following to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of the members of the Davisville Boys 4-H Club and am pleased to submit the following report of the club's activities in order that others may become aware of the great work our 4-H clubs are performing.

DAVISVILLE BOYS 4-H CLUB NEWS REPORT FOR YEAR 1957-58

The Davisville Boys 4-H Club is now ending its first full year as a community 4-H club. We have had a full and interesting year and are proud of our record.

Our club placed first in the 1957 and 1958 Alabama-Florida fair held in Atmore, Ala. Our club also won first place in the 1957 and 1958 Interstate Fair held in Pensacola, Fla. Our club won first place in the district, however, because the boys are all under 14 years of age, they were not eligible to compete for first place in the State. They attended the State 4-H Camp at Lake Placid, Fla., for a week in August.

In 1957, Johnnie Godwin was a county winner in the 4-H boy of the month contest, and was also one of the top 10 corn producers in the county. This year Billy Franklin was a 4-H boy of the month, and was second in the top 10 corn producers making 102.9 bushels per acre yield. Both boys were guests at a luncheon given by the Kiwanis Club and Sears, Roebuck & Co. at the San Carlos Hotel in Pensacola.

Several of the boys won awards in the 1957 Scars corn show in Pensacola and Tallahassee. Our club members also won awards in dairy, meat, animal, and other shows—both county and State.

Four members won scholarships to Camp Timpochee, and many others attended the camp, including the adult leader, Mr. Morris Miller.

The 1957 county achievement medal and the dairying medal were won by Billy Franklin. Johnnie Godwin captured the medal for meat animals, and Bill Pigg won second place in the county lamp-making contest.

The Davisville boys, in cooperation with the 4-H girls, entertained members of the PTA at one of the meetings.

The fifth-grade boys won first place in the county basketball tournament.

Members of our club participated in community clean-up drives, various health and safety programs, a campaign to establish a recreational center, charity drives, and rode horses in the Atmore, Ala., Christmas parade.

Members made many field trips, including a tour of the city fire department, the city hall, the potato grading sheds, the local sawmills, the pole plant, and outstanding farms and forestry sections.

In the 1958 Scars corn show, now in progress at the fair in Pensacola, the following boys won blue ribbons for their corn: Junior Albritton, Billy Franklin, Johnnie Godwin, Eddie Seales, and Ralph Darby.

Second-place ribbons were won by Jeff Montgomery, Robert Montgomery, Billy Franklin, and James Lee.

Third-place winners were George Peters and Marvin Hollingsworth.

Officers for the 1958-59 year are: David Wilson, president; Eddie Seales, vice president; Billy Franklin, secretary-treasurer; Johnnie Godwin, reporter; James Lee, delegate; Albert Paulson, alternate delegate; Mr. and Mrs. Morris B. Miller, adult leaders; Mrs. Martin Franklin and Mr. Jean Wilson, trustees; and Mr. Calvin Winters, assistant county agent.

This concludes the report for 1957-58 of the activities of the Davisville 4-H Boys Club.

No Need for Good-Will Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Anastas Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, was reflected in varied emotions by the American people. All of us long for peace and in the minds of some, this occasion marked the advent of a new and hopeful gesture toward that end. But to those who have tired of this dangerous international game that the Soviet Union has played with mankind with its threat to civilization, the visit added further obstacles in the path of peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a highly interesting article by Col. Roland W. Estey, of the Salem Evening News in Salem, Mass., and with which I strongly concur:

ANGRY MR. MIKOYAN?

(By Col. Roland W. Estey)

We are not too sorry, Mr. Mikoyan, to learn that you are angry with us. Frankly, we anticipated that you would be, when it came time for you to return to your native land.

We tried to be good hosts to you on your trip to some of our more important industrial centers. While we didn't roll out our newest red carpet we did greet you with some degree of respect.

If you hadn't received our full approval of the things you felt you could jam down our throats then it is because you didn't have sufficient foresight to plan your trip properly.

You gave us too much advance notice of what you and your associate represent. We Americans are pretty well governed in our

thinking and judge an individual by his previous acts and reputation.

It was your past record, Mr. Mikoyan, that probably had more to do with your failure and the defeat of your aims and objectives than any other contributing factors.

The American public is standing back of the President and the State Department in their refusal to lower the barriers to Soviet-United States trade.

There has not been much, in recent years, that would lead us to believe in the good faith of yourself and your associates. This is basically the reason you were turned down and why the American public support the President and the State Department in these particular decisions.

Strangely, you created some degree of good will in your trip across the country. You were openminded most of the time and in some of your activities you appeared almost human. We give you credit for these touches.

But, your last few hours and your announcements, particularly those relating to your stubborn insistence of maintaining Soviet policies and position, erased the favorable reactions you had gained since your arrival in this country.

Your childish attitude during the last few hours of criticizing our unwillingness to budge simply backslapped into your face for this is exactly what you were doing. You didn't suggest a single "budge" on your part or on the part of those you represent.

Your country is supposedly outstanding in the use of publicity and propaganda and its effect on the world. However, you failed miserably this time.

You apparently forgot one thing about radio, television and newspapers in this country. When a person talks in this country, particularly a VIP from another nation, there is no censoring of his remarks. The air channels are open and the printed word is made free to all who wish to read and listen.

This was your greatest error, Mr. Mikoyan. You forgot you were in the free world. This is not Moscow.

In a sense, it is unfortunate you have gone home angry. By doing so, your trip has proved a failure and Americans are more convinced than ever that our skepticism and doubts are fully justified.

Heading for a Dead End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, since a great deal of consideration is being given now to the matter of the possible increase in gasoline taxes, the attached editorial from the Butler (Ind.) Record-Herald is timely. It is important also, I think, in that it represents the thinking of a number of people with respect to this whole problem.

IN OUR OPINION—HEADING FOR A DEAD END

It is likely that Congress will be asked to increase the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 5 cents a gallon, as a means of meeting anticipated deficits in the highway trust fund. And this probability is of very direct concern to consumers.

Motorists are already bearing an extremely heavy burden of special taxes. The State and Federal gasoline taxes combined now

average 9 cents per gallon—equivalent to 41 percent of the average retail price of the fuel. This burden is far out of line with that imposed on any comparable product in general use including luxuries.

Much of the revenue from special Federal taxes on motorists is being diverted. This revenue came to about \$3.6 billion in the last fiscal year. But only \$2.1 billion was allocated to the highway trust fund, while the remainder of \$1.5 billion went into the general fund of the Treasury. If all the revenue expected to be collected from motorists in coming years was to be dedicated to road purposes, there would be no need for additional taxes on highway users.

Major new road construction is not the concern solely of those who use the highways. For example, one primary reason for the multi-billion dollar highway program authorized by Congress is the needs of national defense. It is grossly unfair to expect one group of citizens—motor vehicle operators—to pay the whole cost.

Finally, where the cost of the highway program was originally estimated at \$27 billion, the current estimate is \$40 billion. There's every possibility that it will go up by many more billions as the years wear on. Maybe it's time that Congress took a fresh and hard new look at the whole program, with a view to revising it in the light of the Nation's actual needs and capabilities. Excessive taxation can lead to a dead end road instead of a network of superhighways.

St. Agnes Congregation of Fond du Lac, Wis., Observes Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, back in 1858 the Reverend Casper Rehrl, pioneer missionary to Wisconsin, founded the Order of St. Agnes in Barton, Wis. This month the congregation observed its centennial. At this point I request permission to extend my sincere congratulations to the present Mother General M. Rosita, C.S.A., and the sisters of St. Agnes Convent, Fond du Lac, and include in my remarks for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief history of the order as it appeared in the January 20, 1959, edition of the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter. The article follows:

ORDER'S FIRST MOTHER GENERAL JUST 16 WHEN CHOSEN IN 1858

History of the congregation of St. Agnes, currently observing its centennial, is one in which the pioneer nuns endured physical hardships and dealt with constant unforeseen difficulties and trials.

One of the highlights of the centennial observance will take place at the convent Wednesday when bishops, archbishops, clergymen, and representatives of various religious orders gather for a pontifical mass and a special banquet and program.

Order of St. Agnes was founded in Barton in 1858 by the Reverend Casper Rehrl, pioneer missionary to Wisconsin. First mother general of the congregation of Agnesian nuns was Mother M. Agnes Hazotte, who was appointed to that office by Father Rehrl when she was 16 years of age.

Mother Agnes was born in Detroit and died in Hays, Kans., at the age of 57. She had held office from 1864 to 1905, having been unanimously reelected three times.

In fact, when Mother Rosita, C.S.A., present mother general, visited Rome last summer and had audience with the late Pope Pius XII, it represented the first trip to the Vatican by an Agnesian mother general since Mother Hazotte visited Pope Leo XIII in 1884. Mother Rosita's visit and her meeting with the Pope constituted a major event of the centennial year.

At one time the little community of sisters at Barton was reduced to one blind nun before other candidates joined the order. Today there are 800 professed sisters in the order in this country and abroad.

It was on August 1, 1870, that the sisters decided to come to Fond du Lac. The mother house is on East Division Street at the original site of the convent.

The Congregation of St. Agnes is a papal institute. The three steps necessary for this distinction include a decree of praise, approval of the institute, and approval of the constitution or rules. Pope Pius IX issued the decree of praise on March 28, 1875, only 17 years after the beginning of the order.

Meanwhile, the Reverend Francis Haas, O.F.M., Cap., founder of the Capuchin order at Mount Calvary, wrote the rules according to which the sisters planned to live. The rules as well as the institute received the approbation of the then reigning pontiff, Pope Leo XIII, on July 11, 1880.

The sisters, while not a diocesan community, render complete submission to the bishops. Through the years the nuns have ministered under seven archbishops including the Most Reverend John Martin Henni, F. X. Katzer, Sebastian Messmer, Samuel Stritch, Moses E. Kilev, and Albert G. Meyer, now archbishop of Chicago.

Archbishop Meyer will be the celebrant of the pontifical mass at the convent Wednesday at 10 a.m. While here he will have opportunity to visit his sister, Sister Mary Theresa, C.S.A., registrar at Marian College.

Ormonde A. Kieb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a close personal friend who has recently resigned as Assistant Postmaster General, Ormonde A. Kieb.

Prior to assuming the very responsible office in the Post Office Department in February of 1953, he had been a very prominent realtor in Newark, N.J., had served as president of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, as national president of the Institute of Real Estate Management, and was one of the organizers and a charter member of the Society of Industrial Realtors. He had been active in the National Association of Real Estate Boards, having served as national director and as chairman of the public relations committee.

It was, therefore, with a fine background of business experience and real knowledge that he undertook the diffi-

cult task of the management of the Bureau of Facilities of the Post Office Department, which has jurisdiction over the real property management program of the Department, as well as the procurement and distribution of all supplies, equipment, and vehicles; the maintenance of the motor vehicle fleet, and the communications and physical properties of the Department's civil defense planning. The Bureau formulates policies and programs governing procurement, management, maintenance, and disposal of all real property, all equipment, all vehicles and supplies used in the postal service.

He rendered distinguished service and effected measures that led to the modernization of his department, reduced costs, reduced delivery schedule time, and streamlined procedures.

He received the Award of Achievement for the year 1955 in recognition of his outstanding success in introducing many methods of efficiency and economy. In 1956 the Postmaster General presented him the Distinguished Service Award of the Post Office Department in recognition of outstanding accomplishments.

As he returns to his profession of real estate it is a great pleasure for me, who has known him for many years, to testify to his high character, zeal, and his ability and, on behalf of his many friends, to wish him the greatest possible success in his future endeavors.

Consent of the Governed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because all of us serve in this Chamber through the will of the people, I feel that we must occasionally remind ourselves of this fact if we are to serve in the best interest of those we represent. For that reason, I found a recent editorial in the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat by a constituent of mine, Attorney Edmund Carroll, of Davenport, to be especially worthy of note. I ask consent that it be reprinted here so that its message can reach more public servants. The editorial follows:

THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

Thankfully, we are living in a nation that has evolved, by heritage and through its history, a theory of government in which all authority and power of public officials is derived by delegation from the people—each governing by and with the consent of the governed.

Public officials have certain responsibilities to the people from whom they derive authority, for the people have delegated, not abdicated, authority.

Acting in his official capacity, the officer has the obligation of honesty, of competency, of efficiency, and to be forthright, entrusted with the affairs of the people to which they are entitled, favorable or unfavorable, except

such as would give aid to potential national enemies.

The citizen has the right to assume that every public official will transact his duties in such a manner. At times, this is not the case. We have seen dishonest officials, lazy and incompetent officials and the withholding from the public of information unfavorable to them.

What can we do, as members of the public, to insure that public officials will meet the required standards?

Initially we can rely upon the various news media that historically have scrutinized public offices and officers. But we can do more.

The political stability of this Nation can largely be attributed to our form of Government and the fact that it has operated through 2 major political parties. Each of these is comprised of various interested groups and each of them contests vigorously in presenting candidates and positions to the people for selection. It is this contest that enable the citizen to reach his decision.

But discussion at the barber shop, on the street corners and at lunch although interesting and perhaps stimulating is only that. To be effective and to make his views productive, the citizen must participate within the framework of the 2 political parties.

This does not mean that the writer suggests that every person can or should become a candidate for elective office. It does mean that the citizen can participate in the party of his choice for only by so doing can he share in the selection of the persons and ideas who will prevail as local, State and national leaders and national policies.

Party caucuses attended by a handful of people give disproportionate influence in the selection of delegates to county and State conventions, and from these and only these are selected delegates to national conventions which present national leaders and establish national policies.

Truly in the affairs of Government, by the consent of the governed, large oaks from very small acorns grow.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, articles III and IV of George Todt's current series on "Psychopolitics" further delineate the battle for the human mind that is being waged by the Soviet Union.

III. MURDER OF HUMAN MINDS

"You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse among you the high incidence of foreign birth and training." Beria.—Address to American Quislings, 1936.

Yesterday, the question was posed: "What is a lobotomy?" How many people know the answer to that one? Perhaps not many.

And yet it is something the public ought to know about, dreadful and revolting as it may appear to be. Why should it be hidden from us?

Let's put the cards on the table for all to see. Possibly Joe and Mary Doakes will demand some answers for themselves. Why not?

Let me quote to you from the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. A bright young Congressman, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, in whose

congressional district I reside, sends it to me—and it often contains some real eye-openers. Imagine the shock, electric or otherwise, which I received when I read the following astonishing information which was given on the floor of Congress—with no reply or denial of any kind to follow it, incidentally—by Congressman Usher L. Burdick, of North Dakota, on Thursday, June 13, 1957. The extension of his remarks, entitled: "Beware of Psychiatrists" is given verbatim as follows:

"Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one way to destroy any people is to destroy their health. The destruction of the mind is less obvious and not an open act of murder, but the millions who have had their minds destroyed by this sly Fascist and communistic scheme of controlling the people are as dead as they will ever be.

"Listen to what Dictator Georgi Malenkov said when he succeeded Stalin: 'There will be no more lobotomies while I am dictator of Russia.'

"Now, let us see what a lobotomy is. First, the patient is strapped to an operating table. The straps must be tight and very strong. Then electrodes are clamped to the temples of the person about to be lobotomized. Next, three jolts of electricity are shot through the patient's brains—enough to start violent convulsions, which give way to an anesthetic coma. Now the doctor takes his leucotomes—picklike instrument—and inserts them under the patient's eyelids. With a hammer he then drives them through the eyesockets of the skull and into the forepart of the brain. Finally, with a few deft sweeping motions back and forth, the doctor severs the prefrontal lobes of the brain from the rest of it.

"Hitler used this method on millions of his subjects and Stalin had over 10 million slaves or prisoners operated upon and turned into mere beasts of burden.

"It takes only 5 minutes to perform this operation and the subject does not know what has been done to him. He loses his animation as a living object and becomes a zombie. His productive organs wither up and he is incapable of resistance.

"This same practice is used here in the United States on persons said to be mentally ill, and it is estimated that 100,000 persons in the United States have been subjected to this operation upon the advice of some psychiatrist. This is murder, per se, although the patient may be hopelessly incurable. It is another way of putting the patients to death under the advice of skilled psychiatrists.

"In the United States today a large percentage of the psychiatrists are foreigners, most of them educated in Russia. The percentage runs as high as 80 percent.

"What does this mean? Does it mean that the Russian finesse of human destruction is introduced in America to further weaken our people so that there will be less resistance to communism? It means nothing short of that."

In view of this damning indictment by an American solon before the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., over a year ago, it must appear curious that there has been no reply of any sort from the parties concerned or their friends? How come?

Is there really any answer besides what appears to be obvious and, if so, when will it be forthcoming to allay the fears and suspicions of an already aroused public? What's the score here?

IV. ANOTHER SAMPLE OF MIND ATROCITY

"By psychopolitics, create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies and bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known." Beria—To American Quislings, Lenin University, 1936.

Just as Rev. Kenneth Goff was about to say goodbye to me last week in Los Angeles, he suddenly turned and asked this question:

"Have you given your readers the contents of chapter 13 of the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics yet?"

"No, but I shall do so very soon," I promised him. "I think they are about ready to receive this hidden knowledge by this time; but I doubt that they will like it."

So here is chapter 13 of the Bolshevik travesty upon human decency called "The Recruiting of Psychological Dupes":

"The psychological dupe is a well-trained individual who serves in complete obedience the psychopolitician.

"In that nearly all persons in training are expected to undergo a certain amount of treatment in any field of the mind, it is not too difficult to persuade persons in the field of mental healing to subject themselves to mild or minor drugs or shock. If this can be done, a psychological dupe on the basis of pain-drug hypnosis can immediately result.

"Recruitment into the ranks of mental healing can best be done by carefully bringing to it only those healing students who are, to some slight degree, already depraved, or who have been treated by psychopolitical operatives. Recruitment is effected by making the field of mental healing very attractive, financially and sexually.

"The amount of promiscuity which can be induced in mental patients can work definitely to the advantage of the psychopolitical recruiting agent. The dupe can thus be induced into many lurid sexual contacts, and these, properly witnessed, can thereafter be used as blackmail material to assist any failure of pain-drug hypnosis in causing him to execute orders.

"The promise of unlimited sexual opportunities, the promise of complete dominion over the bodies and minds of helpless patients, the promise of complete lawlessness without detection, can thus attract to 'mental healing' many desirable recruits who will willingly fall in line with psychopolitical activities.

"In that the psychopolitician has under his control the insane of the Nation, most of them have criminal tendencies, and as he can, as his movement goes forward, recruit for his ranks, the criminals themselves, he has unlimited numbers of human beings to employ on whatever project he may see fit. In that the insane will execute destructive projects without question, if given the proper amount of punishment and implantation, the degradation of the country's youth, the defamation of its leaders, the suborning of its courts becomes childishly easy.

"The psychopolitician has the advantage of naming as a delusory symptom any attempt on the part of the patient to expose commands.

"The psychopolitician should carefully adhere to institutions and should eschew private practice wherever possible, since this gives him the greatest number of human beings to control to the use of communism.

"When he does act in private practice, it should be only in contact with the families of the wealthy and the officials of the country."

On such a note ends chapter 13 of the official Russian textbook on Psychopolitics. Reprints of this loathsome Red bilge may be obtained by my readers through writing to Rev. Goff in Englewood, Colo. Cost is \$1 in check or money order from. It may cause us to retch before we have finished with its contents, but it is something every alert and vigilant American citizen ought to see for himself or herself.

Called Brain-Washing: A Synthesis of the Russian Text Book on Psychopolitics, this little eye-opener ought to be the subject of a study group by every patriotic society in the United States today. Why not?

Pepe Figueres on the Cuban Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Jose (Pepe) Figueres, ex-President of Costa Rica, and one of the foremost Democrats in the hemisphere, comments on the Cuban trials in a letter which was published January 18 in the San Jose, Costa Rica, newspaper La Republica. It contains a point of view which is highly persuasive and which should be given more consideration in this country:

(Translated from the Spanish)

Sr. EDMOND WOODBRIDGE, San Jose.

ESTEEMED FRIEND: Thank you for your expressive telegram of January 18, which says: "You are the most qualified to interpret the humanitarian sentiments of the Costa Rican people by suggesting the cessation of the summary executions in Cuba. In this manner, as Cuba yesterday thanked you for your support in the revolution, tomorrow it will thank you even more for having tried to prevent violence from sulling the magnificent democratic triumph. All of the combatants who made the War of Liberations of 1948 with you are today harvesting the fruits of the clemency and justice which you stipulated for the losers. This memory is your best credential to take before Fidel Castro the matter which I respectfully suggest to you."

With such noble concepts, friend Edmond, you put me in a difficult situation with myself. How agreeable it would be for me to agree with your thesis! And how painful it is for me to disagree!

It is curious how the same event (the summary executions in Cuba) and a same desire (that of guaranteeing democracy in America) can stir up diametrically opposed reactions in different persons.

I am going to make public a letter I sent to Fidel Castro recently, before learning of the requests in various congresses of America asking suspension of the executions, and before knowing that the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, on the other hand, had turned down, by great majority, a motion aimed at sending the same request for clemency to Fidel Castro.

I have learned that the North American association, ADA, has addressed you asking clemency for the Cuban war criminals.

The ADA is a very estimable liberal group. Many of its members are friends of mind. They are the ideological allies of the Latin American democrats. And the petition which they make to you could not be better intentioned, nor more authorized.

This petition, in my judgment, complicates even more the rough matter of sanctions, in which it is so difficult to decide with certainty. It has its pros and its cons, of short and of long term.

I consider it a duty of other Americans to share with you this prodigious responsibility, at the risk of also committing an error. For this reason I dare to offer you this unsolicited opinion, in a matter that seems to be Cuban, but is American.

In my country capital punishment does not exist, nor has the necessity for it been felt in this century, fortunately. But each society and each historical moment has its own necessities of survival, which are wont to be the least of various bad possibilities. In Cuba's present circumstances, which I

know well, severity can be a lesser evil and impunity.

Disgracefully in our America today, to be a democrat you have to risk life. This will not end until it is universally understood that you have to risk your life to be a hired assassin.

Yours respectfully,

JOSE FIGUERES.

Permit me to repeat the idea contained in the last paragraph of this letter to Fidel Castro, because it expresses my conviction, very sad, very lamentable, but one which I should not hide: so long as in several countries of our America it is necessary to risk one's life to fight for freedom, and so long as there is not the unquestionable certainty that to be an instrument of tyranny also means that you have to risk everything, there will be no end to the temptation on the part of bigtime adventurers to seize power and on the part of irresponsible citizens to back the seizure and to benefit from it by torturing their fellow countrymen.

There is an American minority, composed of politicians and military men and their henchmen who see in the governments of the countries a field in which to satisfy their appetites. Those people are always ready to take over a government by any means, and to hold it by blood and fire. They help each other, in a real alliance, and declare war against the democratic forces.

It is necessary that their soldiers know that they do not go to war simply to kill, but also to die. If it is not so, they will continue to hold all the advantages of aggressiveness and the lack of principles, and the good people all the inhibitions of decency and morality.

It is demonstrated that it is almost impossible, when a dictator is overthrown, "to catch the fat fish." Those always find the way to escape with their millions. Those who remain behind pay their debts. This injustice, superimposed on all the others, should serve as a warning: He who lets himself serve as a paid assassin of a tyrant should know that it is own life which is in danger, and not that of his master. The day when there are no instruments there will be no tyrants.

Society should protect itself by methods adequate to the circumstances. If the circumstances are extraordinary, the social defenses should also be extraordinary. No one who knows the barbaric extremes to which the recent torturers in Cuba, Venezuela, and other republics, arrived will be able to deny with his conscience that the corrective methods should be extreme, keeping relationship with the magnitude of the crimes and the propensity to commit them.

For the well-being of society, the law of vengeance cannot be recommended: eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth. The torturers should not be disrespected or tortured. But capital punishment, summary execution, turns out, in these extreme cases, by a cruel paradox, to be a civilized way to repress delinquency.

It is almost inconceivable the level of cruelty which the political delinquency in the 20th century has reached. Civilization needs to resort to the most painful

methods to detain the tide. This spectacle of our times led a penalist of the stature of Jimenez de Asua to declare, a short time after World War II, that he would prefer the revolutionary justice in whose name the Italian people simply hung by the feet Mussolini and his lover, to the type of cold, slow, judicial process which was adopted in the Nuremberg trials.

Those who today favor that the Cuban war criminals be tried in common courts are not in touch with the present circumstances. There is no doubt, in every city and in every town, who were the principal murderers. Poor Cuba. It would be a tragic comedy to present proofs. The proofs are not even in the cemeteries. The corpses are in, the wells, in the sewers, in the basements. And, just as happened in Venezuela, those who did not reach the relief of death from the tortures will be in insane asylums for the rest of their lives.

If the provisional Government does not rapidly execute the most notorious criminals, public passion, indignant at the impunity or the delay, will overflow, and then the number of deaths will be many, many thousands.

If there is not an exemplary punishment which leaves an impression in the memory of the country, the assassins will soon be organizing invasions, with the millions of dollars removed by the tyranny, in order to impose it again.

The Cuban people have suffered great disillusionments. I hope that today's revolution will not disillusion them again. For the time being, the severity of the punishment seems to me a salutary measure, however distressing. I believe it my duty to back it, in spite of the fact that I consider capital punishment repugnant, inadmissible, in other circumstances.

Inflation Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the prevalent and persistent problem of inflation for which the Government and business are trying to find a satisfactory solution is everybody's business.

The average citizen can help stem the tide of inflation just as effectively as big business or big government if he realizes that every new service he asks the Government to perform comes from his tax dollar.

The following statement by Jesse W. Tapp, a prominent banker in Los Angeles, Calif., reveals the responsibility of the average citizen in curbing the inflation spiral about which we are all concerned.

INFLATION CONTROL NEEDS RESTRAINT ON GOVERNMENT DEBT

(By Jesse W. Tapp)

The Federal Government is faced with a deficit which may reach \$12 billion by the

end of the current fiscal year. This prospect has greatly complicated the financing problems of the Treasury and has raised many questions about public debt management and the possibility of renewed inflationary pressures.

One question accompanying the numerous thorny problems of Government debts, however, should give us particular concern. It is a question which is not very amenable to a productive study by economists, technical commissions, and national authorities.

UP TO THE PEOPLE

It is a question which can be solved only by the people themselves, by studies which each individual citizen makes within his own mind. It is a matter of private preference and, one might even say, of private morality—these are qualities which cannot be legislated; rather, they determine legislation.

I am referring to the following question: Has the public faced up to the consequences of demanding from their Government so many services for which they are unwilling to pay by current taxes?

Now I am not suggesting that the Government should never go into debt. For instance, local communities appropriately will continue to issue school bonds for the construction of classrooms to be used by the children of citizens not yet on the tax rolls.

Nevertheless, I wonder whether we, as a people, have become so accustomed to red-ink finance by governments as to forget that bills must be paid.

IT'S EASY TO BE LAX

Have we become too lax in our scrutiny of governmental expenditures on the local, State, and national levels—under the illusion that the funds for the less urgent activities are coming from somebody else's pocket, either by inflation or by taxation in some remote future?

Have we even urged our representatives to support projects that we would be unwilling to pay for if the terms were cash on the barrelhead?

One aspect of governmental debts, therefore, is the possibility that it weakens our resistance to governmental services that are pleasant but not feasible at the moment without adding to tax burdens or inflationary pressures.

Only a citizenry awakened to this problem can limit governmental functions to those for which they are willing to pay without inviting increases in governmental debts at a rate which will promote inflation.

Call in the Cookie-Pushers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article appeared in the New Republic magazine of January 26, 1959. Written by Gerald W. Johnson, the article points out that the American public is kept as uninformed as this administration can possibly keep it. However, Mr. John Q. Citizen should not feel too bad about being kept in the dark. Members of Congress fare little better.

Mr. Johnson's article follows:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT—CALL IN THE COOKIE-PUSHERS

The American with no inside information who must judge by the superficial aspect of

things now has to choose one of two theories, both unpalatable. He must believe either (a) that the administration really had no inkling that lunik was going up and that Batista was coming down, or (b) that, possessing the information, it deemed it unimportant to give the American public the slightest warning of these impending events.

Since there is evidence to support either belief, it is admissible to confess a preference, and I prefer (a). If the Government really didn't know what was happening, that is evidence merely of an incompetent spy system. But if it considered it inadvisable to inform the people of highly significant events simply because the information might be somewhat alarming, that is evidence of incompetent government; and it is obviously easier to reform the spy system than to reform the Government from top to bottom.

The principal evidence supporting the more dismal theory (b) is, in fact, merely the prevalence of the Madison Avenue mentality in Government circles. That mentality holds as an article of faith that what the customer does not know will not hurt the advertiser. This principle seems to be the only logical basis for Mr. Dulles' persistent refusal to permit American newspaper men to find out at their own risk what Red China is actually like and is actually doing.

On the other hand, the swift resignation of the American Ambassador to Cuba supports the other theory. It is clear enough that Washington is not filled with love and admiration of Mr. Smith; and it is easy to understand why if he let Washington get caught in an embarrassing position when the Batista Government fell. The event occurred between two editions of the Baltimore Sun. The morning paper carried dispatches from Habana asserting that the revolt was practically crushed; the Evening Sun, of the same day, announced Batista's flight. Editorially, the paper has remained grimly silent on the subject, but it can hardly be pleased at having been made to look foolish. No more can the Associated Press and other news services, when the merest hint from the State Department would have enabled them to cover themselves with a paragraph explaining that the earlier dispatches were only what the Batista Government said.

The prompt disappearance of the Ambassador suggests that remedial steps are being taken, but it is not proof that they are sufficient. If the gentleman is, as various commentators have been cruel enough to suggest, merely a fat cat who owed his appointment to heavy campaign contributions, still that doesn't account for the Embassy staff, the lads that used to me derisively called the cookie-pushers. In the old days, if a revolution had been boiling under his feet, even a second-rate cookie-pusher would have discovered it and would have tipped off Washington long before the bullets began to smash the Embassy windows.

One is bound to suspect that here is a delayed reaction to the disastrous pilgrimage of Cohn and Schine, those fantastic stooges of Senator McCarthy, who trailed through Europe half a dozen years ago, shattering the morale of the Foreign Service. It was discovered then that any cookie-pusher who reported to Washington an opinion, however well founded, that displeased a Senator was liable to be kicked out of his job and blasted as a Communist sympathizer; so, not being imbeciles, they quit reporting such opinions. But important news quite commonly comes in first as a rumor without confirmation, and if the State Department isn't informed of those rumors it may be caught flat footed.

In any event, whatever the reason, it is evident that the American public is not being given early and accurate information of what is going on beyond the boundaries of the country. As regards the Russian satel-

lite program there is some excuse, for gathering accurate information about that is extremely difficult. But when we are completely misled about the course of a civil war raging in an island 90 miles from Key West, our system of information is definitely breaking down badly.

Perhaps it is impossible for a man who served his time in newspaper work in the editorial, not the advertising, end to form a just appreciation of the Madison Avenue mentality; but I am persuaded that one of the chief failures of this administration is due to its inability to grasp the enormous difference between selling soap and gathering early and accurate information. Both, to be sure, are phases of public relations, but their methods are widely dissimilar. Roosevelt and Truman understood this, and F.D.R. was the great master of the art of making a hostile press serve his own ends. The cookie-pushers may have their comic aspect, but as a class they are intelligent and to a man they know that in ordinary affairs half a dozen first-rate American newspaper correspondents can get them more information than a platoon of hired spies and can get it sooner.

Is It Humiliating To Proclaim Loyalty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I wish to place in the RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 26, 1959.

The editorial follows:

Is It HUMILIATING TO PROCLAIM LOYALTY?

The American Association of University Professors is urging the repeal of the provision that recipients of Federal scholarships and student loans should be required to sign an oath pledging allegiance to the Government and Constitution of the United States and an affidavit declaring he did not believe in or support any subversive organization. The association says this provision is humiliating.

The presidents of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton Universities have protested this provision in the National Defense Education Act. Recently the Oberlin College student council took similar action.

President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale, wrote to Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that oaths and affidavits of this sort are at best odious, at worst a potential threat to our profession and that they are especially distasteful when they are required of young people who are just entering upon the most important phase of their educational experience.

If this reasoning is correct, we suppose then that the pledge of allegiance to the flag should be abolished. Even kindergarten children are taught to repeat it, and who can say what odious effect it will have upon them in later life? Likewise, the oaths required of public officials, from President on down, to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States should be relegated to the ash heap. A man elected to the presidency who had spent his lifetime in public service might find it humiliating to swear on the Bible that he did not intend to violate the Constitution or disregard the laws.

What is so special about students, especially those who apply for a handout from

the Federal Government, that they should be exempted from taking an oath of loyalty to the Government that is about to provide them with the handout? If some students find such an oath distasteful, or if they fear they might incur the penalties for perjury by taking it, let them refrain from applying for Federal loans and scholarships, the money for which, after all, is being provided by the taxpayers, and that includes all of us.

Pills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to me from Elizabeth Hall, president of the Iowa Directors of County Relief, together with an editorial from the Malvern Leader, Malvern Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, Congress best see to it that we go not one step farther toward socialized medicine. England, tried it, and failed miserably. The people soon learned that the government official in charge of socialized medicine considered them, and treated them, as we would treat, and think, of a sick pig—by number only.

The letter and editorial follow:

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I note in the evening paper that the President has at last realized the fallacy of the Federal Government taking over local welfare programs.

It would have saved a lot of grief to Iowa, if this had been thought of before the last social security bill was passed, sending the State department of social welfare \$6 million to be used where it is needed most. Rather than use the money to improve existing programs, this great State bureaucracy used the money to start a new State medical program, taking over a program that was already adequately provided by the counties.

(Please read enclosed excerpt from the Malvern Leader.) The old folks are really having a ball running to the doctor and buying pills. The local medical societies are furious.

Since 1951, the old-age assistance cases have decreased by 12,384 cases. Eventually all old-age assistance and most of the aid to dependent children cases will be taken over by social security. The counties could then pick up the few remaining cases and there would be no need for an expensive State agency. Yet this State agency is continually being built up with Federal subsidies, requiring matching State and county funds that, in the end, cost more than entire programs operated on a local level.

When the President appoints this advisory committee, if you were to send me their address, do you think they would be interested in information from as far down in the grass-roots as Sidney, Iowa?

My best personal wishes to you.

Mrs. ELIZABETH HALL,
President, Iowa Directors of County
Relief, affiliated with, Iowa County
Officers' Association.

[From the Malvern (Iowa) Leader, Jan. 8, 1959]

BIG RUSH TO THE DRUG COUNTERS IN MILLS COUNTY PUTS HEAVY DRAIN ON PILL SUPPLIES

The new look in social welfare arrived in Mills County along with 1959—causing much concern as county officials and citizens associated with the new procedure.

In brief the State of Iowa has taken over and, as one member of the board of supervisors remarked: "It just sums up that the county welfare board doesn't have much to say about it."

Recently the State department of social welfare sent a notice with their checks to old-age pensioners. This read in effect that henceforth all bills would be taken care of by the State.

An immediate effect was a rush for medicines. Druggists in Mills County have been pushed almost to the limit in dispensing medications. Some have been so swamped that they were running out of certain kinds of pills.

But the fact that old folks are now taking more pills than they used to has aroused dander in many quarters.

It has brought charges from the county relief directors' group that many who now are not totally disabled and need only occasional help would under the State program with alleged lax eligibility requirements quickly become totally disabled and then would receive a monthly cash grant from which any income from work would be deducted. Since there is no supervision over spending of this money, the directors charge that incentive for rehabilitation is taken away.

"The county will be required to pay a share of this cost which will amount to more than they are now paying to take care of the entire program," they added.

It was pointed out that \$6 million was given to Iowa under the new Social Security Act to be used where needed most. It was used, the directors continued, to start a new State medical program taking over cases that were being cared for adequately by the counties or relatives, and the counties will lose all control of them.

"It is a well-known fact that within the next few years the social security program of the Federal Government will absorb all of the old age assistance and most of the aid to dependent children cases.

"The county relief program is administered more efficiently and more economically on a local level, under the supervision of the board of supervisors."

Alabama Press Association Condemns Be- trayal by Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, when the Washington Post and Times Herald refused to accept as a paid advertisement the Carleton Putnam letter to President Eisenhower, a wave of protest swept through the American reading public. For Americans, like no other citizens anywhere else in the world, demand and defend most vigorously their

right to know all sides of a story and to decide for themselves how they will react.

Dean Walter Williams, of the Missouri School of Journalism last year wrote a "Journalists' Creed," and part of this creed stated:

I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of a lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust.

Certainly the Washington Post did not act in the public service when it decided to suppress an advertisement whose contents disagreed with the editorial policies of the newspaper. Of course, every newspaper has the right and the duty to take definitive positions in its editorial columns, but when a newspaper's obsessions bring it to spill these positions over into the advertising and news columns it cannot help but arouse the public's mistrust.

That this is an affront to the entire fourth estate is realized by the Alabama Press Association, which at its meeting in Birmingham last week adopted a resolution condemning the Washington Post and Times Herald for its untenable betrayal. The resolution was drawn up by Col. Harry M. Ayers, publisher of the Anniston (Ala.) Star, who also wrote an editorial on this subject in the Star of January 26, 1959.

There follows an Associated Press story on the Alabama Press Association resolution and the editorial to which I have just referred:

STATE PRESS GROUP HITS LETTER MOVE—
CAPITAL PAPER IS CONDEMNED

BIRMINGHAM.—The Alabama Press Association Saturday condemned the Washington Post and Times Herald for refusing to carry the Putnam letter as a paid advertisement.

A private Alabama group is publishing the letter in northern and western newspapers as an expression of southern views on racial segregation.

A resolution adopted by the association at its annual convention said the APA "does deplore and condemn the betrayal of the press and of the right of the people to know all sides of a public issue."

COMMENT IS DECLINED

The Post and Times Herald declined comment in Washington on the association's resolution.

Carleton Putnam, a retired executive of Washington, wrote the letter to President Eisenhower in criticism of U.S. Supreme Court decisions requiring racial integration of public facilities. He was particularly critical of the ruling that racial segregation in public schools is unconstitutional.

A committee of prominent Alabamians launched a fund-raising campaign aimed at getting the letter published as a paid advertisement in northern and western newspapers.

TO APPEAR MONDAY

To date it has been printed in the New York Times and the committee says it will appear in the Washington Star Monday.

[From the Anniston Star, Jan. 26, 1959]

OUR RIGHT TO KNOW

It is pleasing to note that the Alabama Press Association, in session at Birmingham

last week, sought to rebuke the Washington Post and Times Herald management for its refusal to publish even as a paid advertisement the well-known Putnam letter, which sets forth in clear and measured language some great social truths.

The letter in question was originally addressed to President Eisenhower, but Ike never answers any personal letter that is not pleasing to his vanity. His latest offense in that direction was his snub of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, who had questioned Ike's generalship in the Monty book.

It could easily be understood, therefore, why the Putnam letter, which was written by a noted author and business executive, failed to get the attention that it deserved at the White House.

But it was a different question entirely so far as the Washington morning daily was concerned.

For the executive editor of that paper had served as chairman of the committee on free speech under appointment by the president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and had fought valiantly to break up the growing evil of secrecy and censorship in the conduct of the people's public business.

In his fight with Charles I, one of the most tyrannical of the Stuart kings of England, old John Milton, in 1644, addressed a letter to the Parliament under the title, *Areopagitica*, in which he said: "Give me the liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all other liberties."

King Charles lost his head largely because he denied that freedom, and any other government or agency that tries to hide the truth from the people will not long survive.

In fine, the Washington Post has done irreparable damage to the right of the people to know all the facts about a historic debate and has played into the hands of the censors throughout the country. This fact was ably set forth by Representative GEORGE HUBLESTON, of Birmingham, in a speech on the floor of Congress a few days ago.

The organized press and other agencies of free expression, or the right of the people to know, were making great progress, even in Congress, before the noted Washington daily betrayed its fundamental creed. But now we shall have to apologize for Post's default in every fight for freedom we undertake.

Economic Grounds Said Key Factor in U.S. Welfare—Banker Urges Diligence, Honesty in Club's Toast to President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of an article which appeared in the Saginaw News of January 2 and which contains the text of a speech presented by Mr. R. Perry Shorts, one of Saginaw, Michigan's most respected citizens. Mr. Shorts' excellent address was given on the occasion of the Saginaw Club's 47th annual toast to the President of the United States.

ECONOMIC GROUNDS SAID KEY FACTOR IN U.S. WELFARE—BANKER URGES DILIGENCE, HONESTY IN CLUB'S TOAST TO PRESIDENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Members of the Saginaw Club and their sons yesterday heard the

counsel of one of Michigan's wisest business patriarchs when he gave the Saginaw Club's 47th annual toast to the President of the United States.)

It was given by R. Perry Shorts, chairman of the board of Second National Bank and one of the club's oldest and most respected members.

The New Year's Day toast ceremony at The Saginaw Club is one of Michigan's finest Yuletide holiday traditions. Mr. Shorts gave the toast once before, on January 1, 1921.

In his message, Mr. Shorts urged his attentive audience to consider the inherent greatness of the United States, oppose forces which would tarnish and dissipate the great heritage of American freedom and private enterprise.

He bade the young men, especially, to be diligent in their work and honest and thrifty in their habits.

He called out against improvident Government spending and warned against the menace of pressure groups dominating our standards of living.

Mr. Shorts labeled inflation as one of the foremost foes of the U.S. economy.

He praised President Eisenhower for his "untiring efforts even beyond his physical strength, to the promotion of peace on earth, the preservation of free enterprise for our people and efficiency, solvency and morality for our Government."

The Saginaw Club's invitation to give this year's toast was extended to Mr. Shorts several months ago. Some time after he had accepted it, he learned about plans, then underway, for the civic luncheon which was given in honor of his 79th birthday last Tuesday. He felt embarrassed about all the publicity the two events would bring to him in so short a space of time. But he could not stop the plans for his birthday party and was told it was too late to change plans for the New Year's toast.

The text of Mr. Shorts' address:

Having been a resident of this great country for 75 years, protected by its laws, educated by its schools, inspired by its institutions, and prospered by its industries—I eagerly grasp the opportunity this occasion affords to publicly thank God for the United States of America and to pay deserving tribute to its leadership. And it seems to me most fitting that on this patriotic occasion, we fathers should inform our sons on some of our national problems and urge them to take active part in their constructive solution.

AMERICA—A LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

Surely, we are living in the grandest Nation in the world. To our sons present and to every young man I would say—you don't have to be exceptionally brilliant to make a good living here. Our country is a land of opportunity where every man has a chance to rise and win his share of its manifold blessings to mankind. All you have to do is to use your God-given brains and follow the simple formula of thrift, hard work and old-fashioned honesty.

If you can't save money, boys, you haven't a chance of much success. Every fortune you see is proof positive that somebody worked and saved. What you earn is not so important—it's what you save that counts. Also, hard work is essential. Every outstanding man in every trade and profession is a hard worker—make no mistake about that. And you must be honest, in order to maintain a good reputation. Nobody will trust you far or long—unless you are honest.

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM

And the grand thing about it all is that the great majority of our people have always been thrifty, hard working and honest—and their combined thrift and labor and integrity throughout the years, coupled with free enterprise, have built up the strongest Nation in the world. Critics may attack our free enterprise system, but no one can suc-

cessfully attack the standards of living it provides—broadest ownership, highest wages, and greatest abundance of the good things of life. Back in ancient times, Horace, the wise old philosopher, said, "If a better system is thine, impart it; if not, make use of mine." This is America's challenge to the world today.

And don't let any politician tell you that our low income groups can't share in our prosperity. The top men in scores of our large corporations today were once poor boys who saved their money, bought their companies' stock and then worked like beavers to climb to the top. Any man who has saved \$100 can now buy shares in almost any business corporation in America. Right now, we have an economic system that beats statism and socialism and communism a mile; where our workers themselves can even buy control of their own corporations—and do it without any bloody revolution. All they have to do is to save their money and invest it wisely. They will then be running their own lives—and not slaving for a dictator or a group of bureaucrats.

Every young man should quickly learn that the only allurements that socialism has to offer is a promise of greater abundance in exchange for freedom—but history shows that abundance and freedom for the people never go together. There just isn't enough abundance to go around. He should also soon discover that the Government hasn't any money to hand out to people, except what it collects in taxes from the people themselves, unless, of course, it manufactures it against Government debt, or simply prints it—and that kind of money spells trouble.

The true welfare of our people rests on economic grounds. When business prospers, we have prosperity—more wealth, more factories, more goods, more jobs—and every law that hurts business hurts everybody. There is more danger in big Government than in big business. It is free enterprise that promotes our industries, furnishes our jobs, and passes prosperity around. And so surely, it is our patriotic duty to preserve free enterprise in our Nation and not permit Socialistic philosophies to weaken its structure or divert its ideals.

PRESSURE GROUPS

After the Revolutionary War when the American colonies had finally won their independence, Benjamin Franklin said, "You have won your freedom—now keep it." And in 1857 (over 100 years ago), Macauley, the great English scholar, expressed the opinion that while our democratic form of Government was ideal in theory, "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor." He then predicted that pressure groups would gradually pressure our Government to give up its seed corn for their special benefit and thereby bleed and weaken its structure and constitute a dangerous threat to its survival.

These predicted pressure groups are now growing by leaps and bounds. There are veterans' groups, farm groups, labor groups, pension groups, education groups, foreign-aid groups, and a host of others—and they are constantly demanding from the Government more and more costly benefits. They practice the slogan of the old horse-and-buggy days—"The wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the grease"—and few lawmakers have the courage to refuse to spend taxpayers' money when large groups of votes are at stake. In the last 5 years, Government spending on agriculture alone has more than doubled and now amounts to over \$1,000 for every farm in the country.

And then there are cooperatives and mutual associations (hundreds of them of every nature and description) transacting billions of dollars of business per year and being allowed hundreds of millions of dollars of unfair tax advantages over our full taxpaying businessmen, against whom they compete. They are not concerned with the Govern-

ment's loss of revenue—but only with retaining their freedom from taxes. The pressure groups increase our outgo, and the co-ops decrease our income—and the ones who suffer are the full taxpaying citizens. Millions of members belong to these pressure groups and co-ops and they are working day and night to increase their representation in our legislative halls, both State and national. Isn't it about time we put an anchor in our laws to prevent discrimination and restrain the power of organized minorities?

Furthermore, these spenders on the one hand and tax-advantage-seeking co-ops on the other, are not Jeffersonian Democrats (for Jefferson advocated Government economy and pronounced "public debt as the greatest of dangers"), and they are not Lincoln Republicans (for Lincoln stood for equal rights for all)—and yet they are demoralizing both parties and threatening the stability of our Government. If democracy means anything surely it means tax equality and equal privileges for all. I have no fear of our ability to meet and defeat any foreign foe—it is group attacks from within that worry me.

SOUND MONEY

And in the financial field, I believe our greatest problem of the day is the defense of the dollar. Even the Communists work on the theory that the quickest way to ruin a country is to destroy its currency. Never before has our U.S. dollar been worth so little as it is today—and never before has our debt been so large (and socialistic ideas usually grow as a nation's debt grows). Monkey with the nation's currency and you jeopardize all values. Our Government started this inflation when it took us off the gold standard in 1933, and began its "pump priming" and spending sprees—and it can never stop it until it restores sound money again and quits spending more than it takes in. Only the Government can start widespread inflation—and only the Government can stop it.

Inflation is the politicians' cocktail to keep the people happy while it ruins them—and yet these spenders know that every time they vote another pension, another bonus, or another price support (without providing means to pay for it) your hard-earned dollar goes lower and lower. If our money today were depreciated since prior to World War I as much as France's money now is, \$100 would buy about 2 pounds of hamburger. But, of course, the politicians don't like sound money because it restrains their spending. The tragic thing about it all is that this basic immorality which makes our Government's promises worth less and less is rarely ever considered by many of our politicians today. My earnest hope is that someday before it is too late our Government will declare and enforce as a national policy free and fair competition resting upon sound and stable money, and thus permit our country to sail proudly on to ever-enlarging strength and freedom and progress.

Here, then, are some of our national problems which you young men are facing. Study them carefully, protest against the wrong and fight for the right, always keeping in mind that famous warning: "To sin by silence when we should protest makes cowards out of men. The human race has climbed by protest." And also remember the words of Edmund Burke: "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing."

NATION'S LEADERSHIP

And now let us consider the leadership under which our great Nation has developed. Thirty-three men have occupied the Presidency of the United States—and only three are still alive. Today we are toasting our present leader.

It is one of the tragedies of American history that the greatness of our greatest men

has not been fully recognized until after death had closed their careers. So it was with Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln—and so it will be with President Eisenhower. It seems that greatness cannot be discerned except from a distance. In its presence our eyes are dimmed. You cannot see a mountain if you stand too close.

As in business, a man's net worth is measured by the surplus of his assets over his liabilities, so in history, a great man's net worth must be measured by the excess of his accomplishments over his failures. War heroes are made by war, peace heroes by peace and world statesmen by world issues. Carlisle has said "Great men always come when they are needed." To my mind, President Eisenhower has been a great war hero, a great peace hero, and a great statesman in the cause of world-peace—and I believe that a few years hence, when political prejudices have been forever washed away by the purifying waves of time, history will record him as one of the outstanding great men of our day—and one who came when he was needed.

His whole life has been one of unselfish service—first to his country, and then to the free world at large. In the early forties, when the chief business of the world was war, and the vast battles had thus far gone overwhelmingly in favor of the Axis Powers; when the Allies decided as a last resort to pool their European forces and launch one colossal attack against the enemy—it was Dwight D. Eisenhower whom they selected as the supreme commander of their combined armies and navies and air forces. The voluntary concentration of such stupendous faith and power into the hands of one man had never before been known. This battle was, no doubt, the greatest physical conflict in the history of mankind for on its outcome rested the continued life of 47 Allied nations throughout the world and the freedom of hundreds of millions of people (including you and me)—and the result was unconditional surrender of the enemy.

After World War II was over, Dwight Eisenhower came home. In 1952, he was elected President of the United States, and from that time on has devoted his untiring efforts even beyond his physical strength, to the promotion of peace on earth, and the preservation of free enterprise for our people, and efficiency, solvency, and morality for our Government.

And now, Mr. Chairman, just one more thought and I am through. At this crucial time, when our whole system of government is being challenged by a foreign power, let us not adjourn a large meeting like this without rededicating our lives to our country and its ideals of freedom—the noblest cause we know. Though our vision may now be obscured by the turmoil of the times and our spirits sorely tried by the apparent strength of evil, yet we have faith that the dawn is surely breaking on the day when the free nations of the world will stand together to establish and maintain enduring freedom for mankind.

"Ye who have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise

The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given to you the priceless dower

To live in these great times, and bear your part

In freedom's crowning hour;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take—

"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight;
I saw the morning break."

Gentlemen, I give you the President of the United States.

Speech of Hon. Arthur Winstead at the Mississippi Products Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit herewith a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, on the occasion of the Mississippi products dinner on December 6 last at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

It will be recalled that the Dixie Darlings and the band from Mississippi Southern College, located in my own congressional district at Hattiesburg, Miss., were honored guests on this occasion. The next day they put on one of the best half-time football shows ever exhibited in these United States on the occasion of the pro football game between the Washington Redskins and the Pittsburgh Steelers. The menu at the dinner consisted of delicacies from Mississippi.

Mississippi Southern College, although a comparatively young institution, has achieved an outstanding record among the colleges of the Nation in the short period of its existence. It is famous not only for its outstanding prowess on the gridiron and its Dixie Darlings, but for the enviable record in the scholastic field that it has achieved.

The speaker on the occasion of the Mississippi products dinner given by the Mississippi Day Committee was my distinguished colleague, Congressman ARTHUR WINSTEAD.

His speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. George Marshall, ladies and gentlemen, this is a most happy occasion. Personally, I feel that we Mississippians in Washington are greatly honored by the visit of the Dixie Darlings, the pride of Mississippi, the marching band from Mississippi Southern College, officials of Mississippi Southern, and the many fine people who have come to the Capital from our State to be with us on this great occasion.

As an alumnus of Mississippi Southern, I feel also that our fine institution has been honored. Of course, our Dixie Darlings and band deserve the honor. They were chosen this year as the outstanding college drill team and band in the Nation and will perform tomorrow over a national radio and television network between the halves at the Washington Redskins-Pittsburgh Steelers football game. We are proud of the fine achievements of Mississippi Southern, which is the fastest growing institution of higher learning in the South.

We are proud that this great institution was honored when its band and Dixie Darlings were chosen as star performers at our first annual Mississippi products dinner in Washington.

Now, I know that Mississippians in Washington try to keep up with what is going on back home. However, I would like to call your attention to some of the outstanding achievements of Mississippi in agriculture and in agricultural industry, dramatized here tonight.

Up on Capitol Hill here in Washington we often find outstanding proof of the popu-

larity of gulf coast shrimp. Several times a year our friends on the gulf coast send up shrimp for seafood luncheons and dinners. And none of these congressional parties ever go begging when we let our colleagues know we are having a shrimp feed. Every first-class restaurant features gulf coast shrimp. To add to this tasty cocktail, Jimmy Love has supplied his delicious sauce. Jimmy has made this remoulade sauce, perfected by the Buena Vista Hotel, famous throughout the Nation.

You have not enjoyed real gumbo until you have tasted Pascagoula crab gumbo. Hermes Gautier, Pascagoula's ambassador of good will, is here tonight to enjoy with us this wonderful gulf coast delicacy.

We often hear that so-called western beef makes the finest steaks in America. But did you know that often top grade Mississippi beef sells on the Memphis market at prices higher than the same grade of western beef sells at the same time in Kansas City, Chicago, and Omaha? We are honored tonight by the presence of the world's No. 1 polled Hereford cattleman. I refer, of course, to my good friend, "Hot" Moore of Senatobia. Each year for the past 17 years, Mr. Moore's Circle M Ranch has staged the top cattle sale in America.

Last February, he sold a champion polled Hereford bull for \$55,000, and that is the world's record price for any bull. We are proud of the fine achievements of Mississippi cattlemen and farmers in bringing our State to the forefront in livestock production.

Now, over in my district, in Scott County, we have the world's No. 1 poultry processing activity.

The chicken breasts that you will enjoy here tonight were supplied by my personal friend of Morton, Benny Rogers, who has one of the biggest chicken processing plants in existence. I stopped in to see Benny while I was in Mississippi this fall. As I parked in front of his plant a big truck, loaded with Mississippi chickens was pulling out for Los Angeles. Our Scott County chicken industry supplies poultry throughout the United States and many foreign countries.

The vegetables you are enjoying tonight were supplied by Wally Wright, one of the Nation's biggest wholesale grocers. He has wholesale stores throughout Mississippi and is interested in similar operations in other States. You will enjoy the lady peas, cooked southern style, and the delicious baked potatoes served you here tonight.

Mississippi has always been a leader in the production of dairy products. Mississippi Dairy Products Association shipped to our dinner pure creamery butter produced in our State. The Hattiesburg Creamery has surprised us with the addition of about 200 gallons of Hattiesburg ice cream to give you a choice of desserts.

But, before we come to the dessert, permit me to call to your attention to the wonderful deviled egg salad, made from the recipe of Mrs. L. E. Burnett, whose husband is the head of an organization known as "Better Eggs, Inc.," at Jackson. Mississippi grocers no longer find it necessary to import eggs to meet the table demands of our people.

Then, of course, we are enjoying wonderful Stafford Springs mineral water. Stafford Springs is also in my district. Stafford Springs water is most pleasant tasting, as you have already noted, and has very fine medicinal qualities.

Now, we come to the dessert. Many Mississippians contend that molasses pecan pie originated in our State.

The molasses in the pie here tonight is the very finest Marion County blue ribbon cane syrup. Lester Williams, nationally known weekly newspaper publisher who also owns the radio station at Columbia, was responsible for the syrup.

South Mississippi pecans were supplied by the Funsten Pecan Co. of Hattiesburg and the Natchez Pecan Shelling Co. of Natchez. The pecan industry also contributes substantially to our Mississippi economy. At this time of the year, they are in demand in all parts of the country, for pecans are essential in any good Christmas fruit cake.

We are most grateful to Mr. George Marshall, of the Washington Redskins, and to Philip Morris, sponsors of the National radio and television show for tomorrow, for helping us make possible this occasion.

Now, let's all have a good time and join in telling our friends in Washington about what a great State we have in Mississippi.

Oh, yes; before I sit down I want to ask a very pertinent question. My question is directed to Ole Miss and Mississippi State. Why don't you play Mississippi Southern?

Undue Banking Concentration Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me before the Wisconsin Bankers Association at the Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis., Monday, January 26, 1959. The address follows:

I am very happy to be here with members of this distinguished group which has been in the forefront in seeking to maintain a sound, vigorously competitive unit banking system in this country and to arrest the trend which is slowly concentrating our financial resources into fewer and fewer hands. The members of this association are well aware that the healthy growth of independent banks is of vital importance for the preservation of our traditional, free enterprise system. That system is premised on a diffusion of economic power and depends upon economic activity being controlled by the market and not manipulated by a handful of men.

It is for these reasons, I think, that the American concept of banking traditionally has been based on community banking which provides the widest range of financial services to the people in the area. In my judgment, independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed, not only act as a necessary balance wheel to offset the power of big business, they tend to provide a much healthier basis for effective community organization than does the absentee ownership of mammoth banking institutions. In fact, it is the independent bank—not the giant financial house—which in many cases provides the new ideas from which widespread innovations originate.

During the last 35 years, however, events have transpired in the field of banking which have severely transformed the entire structure of the Nation's banking system and have threatened to alter fundamental assumptions underlying the deposit and credit structure of the economy. In the last 35 years, the banking population of the country has been more than halved notwithstanding that the business transacted by the commercial banking system has multiplied many times. In 1921, there were over 30,000 commercial banks as compared to approximately 13,500 at the present time. True, a large share of the Nation's losses occurred prior to 1933 because of the depression when

approximately 9,000 banks were forced to suspend operations during the 4-year period between 1930 and the end of 1933. However, since 1933, the merger movement has been the major factor in the gradual decline in the total number of banks. For example, in the period 1950 through 1958, some 1,330 of the Nation's commercial banks have disappeared by way of mergers and consolidations. Many of these consolidations, I would hasten to add, have been primarily the outgrowth of a deliberate effort on the part of certain banks to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy.

This depletion of the ranks of the country's banks has lessened competition among banks in many communities. Over 76 counties in the United States have no commercial banking facilities whatsoever, while more than half the counties in the United States have only three or fewer banks serving the needs of the community. Hundreds of small, rural American communities have become bankless towns and many others are served by only one bank in place of the two or three which existed in the 1920's.

Other important trends have accompanied the demise of many of the Nation's banks. In the first place, banks have gradually been increasing in size. A bank that was considered large in size in the thirties is now a relatively small institution. Smaller banks have become fewer in number, the big banks greater in proportion to the banking population.

In addition, the banking system has become characterized by a high degree of concentration of financial resources where a few large banks control a disproportionate share of total loans and deposits. Today the 100 largest banks control more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. In 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. Furthermore, in nine of these financial centers, two banks own more than 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. Again, in each of the 16 leading financial centers, the first two banks own more than 40 percent of all the commercial assets, the first four banks, 60 percent.

Another aspect is concentration through bank holding companies which exercise a high degree of control over banking facilities in many areas. In Massachusetts, for example, holding companies control 48.5 percent of all commercial banking deposits; in Minnesota, two bank holding companies control 45 percent of commercial bank deposits; in Montana, the same two companies control over 44 percent of the commercial bank deposits; in Oregon, one company controls 42 percent of the State's bank deposits; in Nevada, the same company holds 78 percent of the commercial bank deposits. And here in Milwaukee, one bank, controlled by a holding company, has 48.3 percent of all deposits in the city.

The increase in banking concentration has been coupled with a comparative contraction in the credit extended to borrowers by the banking system. As banks have grown larger, they have tended to have fewer dealings with smaller businesses. A study conducted by the Federal Reserve Board several years ago shows that the very large banks with deposits of \$500 million or more had the least number of loans with small business of all classes of banks, the next to lowest dollar volume of loans with small business, and the smallest percentage of dollar volume of all loans with small business. Considering the decrease in the proportion of small banks in the financial community, the overall drop in credit extended, and the frequent resort to Government agencies for funds, it seems likely that the increasing trend toward concentration has at times entailed credit shortages especially for smaller enterprises.

There is increasing awareness, I believe, that additional precautions are essential to

preserve the banking competition that still remains and to prevent banking credit from becoming dominated to an ever-increasing extent by a small tightly knit group. Successfully resisted in New York State last year, for example, were bills which would accomplish the following: First, permit bank holding company expansion throughout the State without regard to bank branch district lines, thus ending the freeze on bank holding company expansion except in accordance with branch geographic limitations; second, obliterate the branch district line between New York City and the suburban areas hence permitting bank expansion throughout the entire new district.

As I pointed out to Governor Harriman, adoption of such legislation not only would have the gravest consequences in respect of the State's future banking structure, but would bring banking monopoly closer into being. It would also have had the gravest repercussions throughout the Nation, since what happens in New York in the banking field frequently sets the stage for numerous other States.

Adoption of the first proposal, I indicated, would enable a bank, via the holding company device, to circumvent branch district lines and enable the same management, which is restricted in its operations under a bank charter, to acquire through a holding company a unit bank in the State of New York regardless of where situated and operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated. It was my position that this proposal would accomplish indirectly what is prohibited by the State in establishing branch district lines and would have effectively dissolved branch limitations. Beyond that, it seemed crystal clear to me that the proposal could have ignited what might have been the greatest chain reaction in recent banking history, the effects of which threatened to go to the very roots of the entire banking structure of New York State.

With respect to the proposal to obliterate the branch district line between New York City and the suburban counties, I emphasized that these district lines were drawn to protect independent banking from encroachment of the giant money-market-institutions in New York City, and that it was of even greater importance now to guard against such encroachment.

In my several communications to Governor Harriman, I also emphasized that to adopt either proposal would be to yield without justification to a few powerful financial institutions in New York City, which have, for years, sought to achieve dominance over the banking system of the entire State of New York.

The Independent Bankers Association, of which your group is a constituent part, played an important role in mustering effective opposition to this legislation. It is to be commended as is Governor Harriman who, recognizing the importance of unit banks, maintained unrelenting resistance to these measures.

I am sure the sponsors of this legislation will renew their efforts to secure passage of these proposals. I trust that the new Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller, will act with the same dedication to the public interest in opposing such measures as did his predecessor.

Also noteworthy this past year was rejection by the Federal Reserve Board of a plan by the First National City Bank of New York, the second largest in the city, to evade New York State statutory limitations preventing banks in New York City from establishing branches outside the boundaries of New York City. This it tried to do by applying to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to form a bank holding company with the initial objective of acquiring control of the County Trust Co. of White Plains, N.Y., the dominant commercial bank in Westchester

County. In opposing this plan, I testified in detail before the Board that its consummation would be contrary to the competitive standards of the Bank Holding Company Act and in violation of the Celler-Kefauver act; that its effectuation could mean the end of branch district lines in the State; and could mean basic alteration of the State's banking structure completely without the approval of the State's legislature. My good friend Mr. Ben DuBols of the Independent Bankers Association, likewise testified in opposition to this proposal and, I might add, presented most persuasive arguments. It is gratifying that the majority of the Board recognized the serious competitive implications of this proposal and rejected it on that basis.

No less significant are the proposed mergers between the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and J. P. Morgan & Co. and between the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Trust Co. There is little doubt that consummation of either of these transactions would result in an undue concentration of banking facilities in the city; spur a further wave of bank mergers; and ignite a chain reaction that could have the most profound repercussions on our banking structure.

In view of the apparent impact these transactions would have on the competitive situation, I have communicated with the Superintendent of Banks of New York State whose approval is required, together with the Federal Reserve Board which also must approve in the event either of the continuing banks establishes branches at locations of former offices of the absorbed institution. In addition, I have written to the Department of Justice which has jurisdiction under the Sherman Act which prohibits any combination in restraint of trade, attempt to monopolize, or monopolization.

With respect to these merger proposals, it is relevant that 3 years ago the New York Superintendent of Banks, Mr. George A. Mooney, testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee:

"It has been my policy as superintendent of banks of the State of New York to follow the spirit of the Celler Antimerger Act in determining whether or not to approve mergers of banks that come within my jurisdiction. That is to say, if after analysis of all facts, I find that the effect of a proposed bank merger may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any locality, I will unhesitatingly withhold approval."

Mr. Mooney's term expired a few weeks ago. In the circumstances, it is vitally important that his successor who will be appointed by Governor Rockefeller adhere scrupulously to the above policy in scrutinizing the Guaranty Trust-Morgan and Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust merger proposals. I would also note that before leaving office Mr. Mooney advised me that his Department was undertaking a thorough investigation of the Guaranty-Morgan proposal.

I hope that the new Superintendent not only continues that investigation but broadens it to include the Manufacturers Trust-Bankers Trust transaction. I trust that the Superintendent will, in addition, consult with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Reserve Board as to the competitive aspects of these mergers. Furthermore, I believe it necessary that the Superintendent hold public hearings on the proposals so that all interested persons may be afforded an opportunity to present their views.

Let me make it clear that as chairman of the Antitrust subcommittee, I will keep a watchful eye on all developments.

On the positive side, additional Federal legislation dealing with bank mergers is imperative if we are to stop undue concentration and keep a unit banking system in this country. For there is little doubt that present Federal law on this subject is grossly inadequate.

Under the National Banking Act, approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required for any merger between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank, where the resultant institution is a national bank. In addition, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act requires that approval of certain mergers must be obtained from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, or the Federal Reserve Board, as the case may be, but only where the capital stock or surplus of the resulting bank will be less than the aggregate stock of the two institutions combined. Also, approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is required for mergers between insured and noninsured banks. None of these Federal banking statutes applicable to mergers deals substantively with competition in the field of banking, and in no case is the competitive impact of the merger a necessary element to be considered by Federal banking officials in deciding whether or not to grant approval.

Bank mergers are also circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibit combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition; it is immaterial whether the merger was accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act of 1914, on the other hand, deals specifically with corporate and bank mergers and bans those achieved by stock purchases where there is a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Responsibility for enforcing the section insofar as banks are concerned is vested concurrently in the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board.

Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. However, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of various antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of the Celler-Kefauver Act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission.

Beyond this, most bank mergers are accomplished by asset acquisitions. For this reason section 7 of the Clayton Act has limited value in coping with the mounting trend of bank merger activity.

Against this background I believe it necessary as a first step that Section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act be amended in the following respects:

First, the provisions of existing law should be expanded so as to require prior approval by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency for every merger or consolidation involving insured banks;

Second, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be prohibited from approving any bank merger or consolidation where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly;

Third, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be required to give notice to the Attorney General of a proposed merger and enable him to intervene or offer his views respecting the competitive phases of the transaction;

Fourth, the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency should be required to give notice with opportunity to be heard to the appropriate supervisory authority of the in-

interested State in the event the transaction involves State banks;

Fifth, an antitrust savings clause should be adopted for bank mergers similar to that governing bank holding companies which would make it clear that applicable provisions of the antitrust laws pertaining to banks are not to be superseded.

In addition, the loophole in Section 7 of the Clayton Act should be closed and Federal enforcement agencies should be provided with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisition as they have to move against bank mergers consummated by way of stock acquisitions.

It is important to note that amendment of the banking laws in this area is not inconsistent with amendment of the antitrust laws to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions. Indeed, adoption of the approach that I have outlined would mean, in effect, that the antitrust statutory provisions pertaining to bank mergers would be essentially similar to provisions presently applicable to bank holding company acquisition of banking facilities.

The Federal banking agencies, while recommending amendment of existing laws so as to require prior approval of all bank mergers, feel that in granting or withholding consent, they should be required only "to take into consideration whether the effect (of the proposed transaction) may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly." They oppose the approach recommended above that would require them to disapprove a merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly.

Under the suggestion of the banking agencies competitive considerations would be only one of the various factors that would have to be taken into account by the appropriate Federal banking agency in scrutinizing a proposed bank merger. Moreover, they would have Congress adopt an entirely novel test, namely, whether the acquisition may lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly. Indisputably this proposed standard is far weaker than that of section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act which applies to other businesses and prohibits any merger where the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly. Nor are the characteristics of the banking industry so unique as to justify such departure.

The term "substantially lessen competition" has been imbedded in Federal jurisprudence for some 35 years in the course of which it has received judicial content through numerous court interpretations. If we discard this standard for the vague and novel standard of "unduly," we will find ourselves in a sea of trouble. It took years and years to determine through court interpretation what the term "substantially to lessen competition" means. Should the banking agencies' proposal be adopted, not only would the courts have to start all over again in interpreting a vague and untested term, there would be created—and without justification—a dual standard, one for banks, another for nonbanking corporations.

Also, it must be recognized that if the Congress should adopt the standard proposed by the banking agencies and proscribe only bank mergers which tend unduly to monopoly, then the Congress in effect would be placing its imprimatur of approval on mergers which tend to monopoly. Stated otherwise, adoption of the "unduly" standard would mean that it is the policy of Congress that a bank merger which tends to monopoly is in the public interest; that only if it tends unduly to monopoly should it be banned.

The short of the matter is that, as a former Assistant Attorney General in charge

of the antitrust division testified, "the banking agencies' proposal does little if anything, to insure competitive enterprise in banking. Any pretense that it does seems to me hardly more than sham."

More than that, the proposal of the banking agencies would weaken the competitive standards which the Comptroller of the Currency now professes to follow with respect to bank mergers. It will be recalled that approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required in all cases of mergers between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank where the resultant institution is to be operated under a national charter. I point out that the Comptroller has stated on numerous occasions that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in sum, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act.

The conclusion is inescapable, however, as the Attorney General has testified, that the office of the Comptroller has tended to give little or no consideration to the question as to whether or not competition would be substantially lessened.

It is important that legislation in this area require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to give notice to the Attorney General. As the Department of Justice has observed, "Failure to insure informed advice on competitive factors could have effects far beyond the banking field. Without (the Department's) right to intervene in bank mergers there might be as many different views of section 7 standards and scope as there were agencies charged with this enforcement. The result could well be disparities in view, which, in turn, spell real enforcement inequities. Enforcement effectiveness as well requires some procedure for (the) Department's intervention. Otherwise in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement . . . outside of the banking area, the Department would be bound by bank merger precedents (it) had no voice in picking or shaping."

In these circumstances, it would be little short of folly to require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to obtain the views of the other two banking agencies, as the agencies have recommended, but not impose the same requirement in respect to seeking the informed advice of the Department of Justice—the one agency possessing the necessary competency to make an informed recommendation respecting competitive implications of a proposed merger.

Furthermore, on the basis of past experience, unless a requirement of mandatory consultation with the Department is written into law, there is little, if any, likelihood that the Federal banking agencies will seek the informed advice of the Attorney General.

The foregoing considerations are equally applicable in respect to obtaining the views of the appropriate State banking supervisor when the continuing institution is to be a State bank. In such cases it is as necessary to obtain the views of the appropriate local official as it is the views of the other two Federal banking agencies since the State supervisor usually will have special knowledge of local banking and other matters, factors which are of the highest degree or relevance to a determination as to whether final approval should be granted or withheld.

Amendment of existing law is essential in another respect: to prohibit holding company acquisition of banks within a State except within the area within which branches of banks are permitted. Such provision, it will be recalled, was incorporated in section 5(c) of the Spence Bank Holding Company bill (H.R. 6627) which was adopted overwhelmingly by the House in the 84th Congress, though the section was later deleted in con-

ference. Subsequent developments have only served to underscore need for its enactment. Absent such provision, State geographic limitations have been and can be avoided by the simple expedient of forming a holding company to acquire control of banks throughout a State without regard to district lines. To my mind the conclusion is inescapable that despite all that has been said about the distinction between bank holding company groups and branch banking systems, both accomplish the same thing—the operation of a number of banking units under one control and management. Through the corporate device, holding companies still can be used to evade branch banking laws and defeat the declared policies of the State regarding branch banking. This should not be tolerated.

Bear in mind that the overriding purpose of the Bank Holding Company Act and of State branching restrictions is similar: to safeguard against banking monopoly by minimizing the dangers inherent in concentration of economic power through centralized banking control. Yet, the Bank Holding Company Act, by permitting the piercing of branch district lines through the holding company device, is now serving as a convenient vehicle for fostering just that banking concentration which it is designed to prevent. I can think of no greater anomaly.

The legislation I have recommended above is the minimum necessary to preserve competition in the banking field. I shall do everything possible to see to its enactment during this Congress and I am confident that with the help of your association and other like-minded organizations, it will be approved by the present Congress.

TV Booster Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution from the Legislature of Nebraska:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission on December 31, 1958, announced a decision prohibiting the operation of low power television broadcaster repeater stations on very high frequency channels and requiring existing stations to apply for conversion to licensed ultra high frequency translators by April 1; and

Whereas the cost of conversion to an operation of ultra high frequency translators would be prohibitive in the sparsely settled areas in Nebraska; and

Whereas because of the distances involved in the sparsely settled areas of Nebraska the use of repeater stations on very high frequency channels does not interfere with licensed operations using the same channel; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled—

1. That this legislature respectfully requests the Federal Communications Commission to reconsider its decision of December 31 insofar as it applies to Nebraska and permit the continued operation of low power television repeater stations on very high frequency channels in this State.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Federal Communications Commission and to each of the Members from Nebraska in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate.

Physicians in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record an article listing the physicians who have served in the American Congress from 1774 to 1959.

This interesting article was prepared by Mr. Jaroslav Nemec, the librarian of the Washington office of the American Medical Association.

I am sure that Members will find this information unusual. I congratulate Mr. Nemec on his scholarship and effort devoted to this work.

This is the story of the 361 physicians, who, over the years, have helped to shape the destiny of the country as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

The story is interesting and in some ways revealing. For example, at least 13 also were State or Territorial governors, and 3 States selected men from this group as their first governors. If the report does nothing else it will document the point we have been making for years. There is nothing new, unusual, or improper in doctors taking an acting part in the National Government; they have been doing so from the very beginning of the Republic.

We are not offering this as a complete or definitive historical work on doctors in government. It deals only with those who served in the House or Senate. Obviously we can't touch on all of them, but we have said something about more than 50 whose careers seemed to us to be particularly outstanding or unusual.

The basis for this report is a complete listing, extracted by our librarian from historical documents, of all physicians who have served in the National legislature. It shows their name, party, dates of birth and death, years served in Congress, and occasionally other information about them.

DOCTORS WERE IN ON THE GROUND FLOOR; FIVE SIGNED DECLARATION

In 1776, Josiah Bartlett, physician, was 46 years old, a confirmed and vigorous patriot. So it was natural that as a New Hampshire delegate to the Continental Congress he signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4. Perhaps it was only an accident, but he was the second person to sign the engrossed document at the formal ceremony on August 2 of that year.

For Dr. Bartlett, that was only one incident in a long and brilliant public career that successively saw him as a signer of the Articles of Confederation, judge, member of the Constitutional Convention, Governor of New Hampshire.

Dr. Bartlett was not the only physician to sign the Declaration. There were four others: Drs. Lyman Hall, Benjamin Rush, Matthew Thornton, and Oliver Wolcott. All except Dr. Wolcott were in active practice at the time; while trained in medicine, he had given it up for law.

With all the others who signed the document—the lawyers, the statesmen, the soldiers, the businessmen—these five doctors were to achieve a degree of immortality. They are also symbolic of the strong interest the medical profession has taken in national legislation over the years.

DOCTORS IN CONGRESS THROUGH THE YEARS—BY STATES, BY PARTIES

Dr. Bartlett had been one of four physician members of the Second Continental Congress in 1775. The next year the Colonies sent eight doctors to the deliberations. In the critical years of 1783–84, 11 doctors were in the young Congresses that struggled to keep the States united. It is a tribute to the versatility of the profession that in the 181 years since 1775, doctors have sat in every Congress.

Research by this office carries down through nearly two centuries, Congress by Congress, the story of the medical profession's contribution to the development of the American Legislature. Here are some statistics on the doctors' participation:

Total representation

Six physicians now are Members of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress. Counting them, a total of 361 physicians have served in American Congresses since 1775, including 35 Senators. Of the 361, 11 practiced another profession—generally law—as well as medicine, 33 were not active in practice when elected, and 18 had graduated in medicine but never practiced.

By parties

A total of 165 physicians were Democrats. Other party representation: Republicans 68, Whigs 30, Federalists 17, Jacksonian Democrats 6, American Party 5, National Republicans 2, Independents 2, and 1 each from 6 other minor parties. There is no record of party affiliation for 32 doctors in Congress, and party labels were not attached to the 27 who sat in the Continental Congress between 1775 and 1788.

By States

The large States that were members of the Original Thirteen Colonies naturally have supplied the most doctors to Congress. Leading the list is Pennsylvania with 52. Next are New York with 48 and New Jersey, 30. Ohio, although coming into the Union later, has sent 26 doctors to Congress. Other totals: Georgia 17, Kentucky 12, Maryland 16, Massachusetts 13, Missouri 10, New Hampshire 14, Virginia 18, North Carolina 11, Connecticut has elected 6 to Congress, Delaware 7, Illinois 5, Indiana 7, Louisiana 5, Michigan 5, South Carolina 5, Tennessee 8. The following have elected from one to four physicians as Representatives or Senators: Alabama, Arkansas, California, North Dakota, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Puerto Rico's present Resident Commissioner also is a physician, Dr. A. Fernós-Isern. He is a nonvoting Member of the House.

SKETCHES OF A FEW FAMOUS AMERICAN PHYSICIAN-LEGISLATORS

During the troubled years from 1810 to 1849—the War of 1812, the struggle for expansion, the Mexican War, the early political skirmishes over slavery—there were at least eight and usually 12 to 18 doctors in Congress. In the following few sessions of Congress, the years leading up to the Civil War, the profession also was well represented, having from 7 to 15 of its Members in the House or Senate. During the Civil War, although a high percentage of the doctors were with the armies, between five and seven usually were seated in Washington.

These statistics may be important, but they show nothing at all about what these men were like as men, or what impelled them into the turmoil of national politics. In subsequent paragraphs some of them will be described in other connections—as State governors, as military line officers, as physician-legislators who also made unusual contribu-

tions. Below are brief sketches of a few not otherwise described in this report who are outstanding.

Matthew Thornton, a contemporary of Dr. Bartlett and the third signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a colonel in the New Hampshire troops almost 30 years before the Revolutionary War. Massive physically as well as mentally, he is said to have had black and penetrating eyes and an invincibly grave expression. After one session of the Continental Congress, he was appointed to his State's supreme court and thereafter did not practice medicine. One example of his mental capacity: when past 80 years of age he wrote a metaphysical treatise.

Lyman Hall, another signer of the Declaration, was born in Connecticut, graduated from Yale, then migrated to St. John's Parish on the Georgia coast, where he gathered around him a colony of intellectuals and independents. When he arrived at the Continental Congress in 1775, John Adams described him as "intelligent and spirited . . . made a powerful addition to our phalanx." Like Dr. Bartlett and most of the others, he suffered for his views. His home was burned by the British in 1778. Later, as Governor of Georgia, he helped to found the University of Georgia. Throughout his career he practiced medicine while also prospering as a rice planter.

Benjamin Rush of Pennsylvania, another practicing physician who signed the Declaration, was easily the most famous American physician and medical teacher of his generation. Dr. Rush was a rugged character, brash and bold in debate and in conduct. His correspondence was so indiscreet—he feuded violently with Washington, among others—that his family kept his private papers secret until recent years. He was a confidant of all the important men of his age in political life. It was to him that Jefferson wrote the famous line: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

William Shippen of Pennsylvania was a member of the Continental Congress and a dedicated physician all his life, one of the founders of the College of Philadelphia (later University of Pennsylvania) and of the College of New Jersey (later Princeton).

Samuel Holten of Massachusetts, a friend of the Revolution from the beginning, held many State posts, and was a member of Provincial Congress, of the Committee of Safety and at one time president pro tempore of Continental Congress; later a judge.

David Ramsey of South Carolina, where he moved from Philadelphia, was an Army surgeon during the Revolution. Captured at the fall of Charleston, he was imprisoned by British for 11 months. Later, a member of Continental Congress and at one time its president pro tempore, he instituted the first election contest ever filed before Congress.

John Condit of New Jersey was twice appointed and twice elected to the U.S. Senate and several times elected to House. A founder and trustee of Orange Academy, he was an Army surgeon during the Revolution.

Samuel L. Mitchell of New York served as Representative or Senator from 1800 to 1813. He was medical editor and professor of natural history and botany and materia medica in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Westel Willoughby, Jr., of New York, was State judge, member of State assembly and president of Western New York College of Physicians and Surgeons. He was an Army surgeon (1812) before election to U.S. House. He founded the town of Willoughby, Ohio, and Willoughby College (now part of Syracuse University).

Royal S. Copeland of New York, perhaps best known of the modern physician-Sena-

tors, entered political life as mayor of Ann Arbor, Mich. (1901-03), and on moving to New York City, served as public health commissioner for 5 years. He was elected to the Senate in 1922 and served until his death in 1938.

FOURTEEN PHYSICIAN-CONGRESSMEN ALSO WERE GOVERNORS

Among the 359 doctors who have reached Congress, there are scores who, the records show, thrived on political combat. All their lives they were active in State and local politics and government, as well as national. They were sheriffs, judges, State legislators, State and national committeemen. Records we have studied are evidence that at least 14 of these men—doctors elected to Washington—also became State or Territorial Governors at one time or another.

One of the most colorful must have been Dr. James W. Throckmorton, of Texas, who served in the House of Representatives after the Civil War. He was elected Governor of Texas without much trouble, but was thrown out of office on orders of General Sheridan.

Three States, Alabama, Delaware, and Ohio, had doctors as their first Governors. William W. Bidd was Alabama's first Governor, before coming to Congress, where he served both in Senate and House. Likewise, Edward Tiffin was elected first Governor of Ohio in 1803, following which he came to Washington as a U.S. Senator. Joshua Clayton, who had one term in the U.S. Senate at the end of the 18th century, was Delaware's first Governor.

At least two physicians who served in Congress also have been Territorial Governors. Late in his career, William A. Newell was Territorial Governor of Washington, a job that could not have been a novelty to him as he had served as New Jersey's chief executive between 2 terms in the U.S. Senate in the mid-nineteenth century. Dr. Newell rounded off his career with an appointment as U.S. Indian Inspector, starting in 1884. During the Civil War, William Jayne was Dakota Territory Governor after sitting 2 years in the U.S. House as a nonvoting delegate. Other physician-Governors who spent some time in the U.S. House or Senate: John Osborne, Wyoming Governor 1893-95; William Harrison Bissel, Illinois, mid-nineteenth century; Alexander M. Dockery, Missouri's Governor at end of 19th century; William Eustis, who served as U.S. Minister to the Netherlands and Governor of Massachusetts after two terms in the House of Representatives; Joseph Kent, Maryland's Governor between terms in U.S. House and Senate; Henry Drury Hatfield, spectacular West Virginian, Governor 1913-17, U.S. Senator 1929-35; and Drs. Hall, of Georgia and Wolcott, of Connecticut, mentioned earlier as signers of the Declaration.

SCORES OF PHYSICIAN-CONGRESSMEN ALSO LED TROOPS IN BATTLE

When the country was young and bursting at its seams, doctors like others moved from one profession or business to another rather freely—medicine to law to agriculture then

perhaps back to medicine. But among doctors in national politics, the most popular transition was from medicine to military duty as line officers, then back again to medicine. This tendency was pronounced during the Revolutionary War, continued through the War of 1812, and was not unusual in the Civil War, even though by that time there was a national awareness of the great value of military surgeons.

Henry M. Shaw, of North Carolina, served two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives before the Civil War. But when the fighting started he showed up as a line colonel in the Confederate Army and was killed in action near New Bern, N.C.

Similar to his career was that of a contemporary, Graham Fitch, of Indiana, who raised a regiment of volunteers for the North and led the men as colonel until wounds forced his retirement. A younger doctor in Virginia, Robert E. Withers, followed the same course; a major of infantry, then colonel, finally discharged in consequence of numerous disabling wounds. After the war he served in the Senate, founded the Lynchburg (Va.) News, was named consul at Hong Kong.

A generation earlier, Solon Borland, of Arkansas, had done the same thing—practiced medicine until the fighting started in Mexican and Civil Wars, then led troops in battle. His Senate service came between the wars. Similarly, John Bratton, of South Carolina, preferred fighting to doctoring; like Dr. Borland he had the rank of line brigadier general in the Confederate Army. He was a U.S. Senator after the reconstruction period.

In view of these cases, it is not unusual that two physicians who served in Congress also were selected as Secretary of War. One was Henry Dearborn, of Massachusetts, line officer in the Revolutionary War, Secretary of War for 8 years under Washington, Member of Congress, then senior major general in command of troops in the War of 1812. An earlier Secretary of War for Washington was James McHenry, of Maryland, whose Revolutionary War record shows him as surgeon, secretary to Washington, member of Lafayette's staff. He had sat in the Continental Congress.

THEY WERE LAWYERS, BOTANISTS, ASTRONOMERS, DIPLOMATS, PREACHERS

In addition to sitting in the U.S. Congress, doctors had the enthusiasm and capacity for many other activities, some unusual. They are not easy to catalog. Following are a few words about more of them. Unless otherwise indicated, their Congressional service was in the House of Representatives and during the years shown in parentheses:

John Archer of Maryland (1801-09) received the first medical degree issued on the American continent. Several combined preaching or theology with medicine; John Bull of Missouri (1833-35), Oliver Cromwell Comstock of New York (1813-19), Luther Jewett of Vermont (1815-17), Hugh Williamson of North Carolina (1789-93), and Manasseh Cutler of Massachusetts (1801-05). Dr.

Cutler also had the time to be a lawyer, botanist, and astronomer; John S. Harrison of Ohio (1853-59), had as good a claim on the White House as a man could get without being elected to it; he was the son of one President and the father of another. The first President Harrison, incidentally, studied medicine but did not practice. * * * Two doctors who served in the Congress were later directors of the U.S. mint, Samuel Moore of Pennsylvania (1817-23) and Daniel Sturgeon of Pennsylvania (Senate 1840-51), and one was U.S. Treasurer, Thomas T. Tucker of South Carolina (1787-88). * * * Alexander Campbell (Senate 1809-13) was vice president of the first Ohio anti-slavery society. * * * Thomas Dunn English of New Jersey (1891-95), trained as physician and lawyer, neglected both for writing. . . Samuel Fowler of New Jersey (1833-37) is recognized as the discoverer of two minerals, fowlerite and franklinite. * * * John E. Hutton of Missouri (1885-89) practiced law and medicine at the same time. * * * After serving in the House, George B. Loring of Massachusetts (1877-81) was made U.S. Commissioner of Agriculture, then minister to Portugal. * * * William S. Haymond (1875-77) organized the Central Medical College of Indianapolis, after Civil War service. * * * Norton S. Townsend of Ohio (1851-53) became prominent in scientific agriculture. * * * William Darlington of Pennsylvania (1815-23) was internationally recognized as a botanist. * * * Robert B. Vance of North Carolina served one term (1823-25), was defeated three consecutive times when he tried again, the last time with a degree of finality: his successful opponent killed him in a duel.

PHYSICIAN MEMBERS OF 86TH CONGRESS

IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, Member of the House since 1939, is the dean of five physicians in the 86th Congress in point of service. He is known in the House as the hard coal doctor because of his persistent battles in behalf of the Pennsylvania anthracite region, some of which have attracted national attention. As an Army medical officer FENTON was awarded the Silver Star and World War I Victory Medal with two Bronze Battle Clasps for "gallantry in action and meritorious services." WALTER H. Judd, of Minnesota, Member of House since 1943. Served in field artillery in World War I, medical missionary in China 1925-31 and 1934-38; just prior to World War II staged virtually one-man campaign to arouse people of the United States against Japanese military expansion. THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, Member of House since 1945. Maintains practice at Fredericktown, Pa. Chairman of House Foreign Affairs Committee. DALE ALFORD, of Little Rock, Ark., who ran for public office for first time last fall; he is a board ophthalmologist. ANTONIO FERNOS-ISERN, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington since 1946. Cardiologist, professor of public health in School of Tropical Medicine of Puerto Rico, commissioner of health and Acting Governor of the island several times prior to election to House.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1959

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
1. Abbot, Joel (1776-1826). Prepared the first National Pharmacopoeia.	Georgia	Democrat	15-18	House.
2. Acker, Ephraim Lester (1827-1903). Graduated in medicine, editor and publisher.	Pennsylvania	do.	42	Do.
3. Ahl, John Alexander (1813-82)	do.	do.	35	Do.
4. Alexander, Nathaniel (1756-1808). Served in the Revolutionary War as a surgeon 1778-82. Governor of North Carolina.	North Carolina	do.	8-9	Do.
5. Alford, Thomas Dale	Arkansas	Democrat	86	Do.
6. Allen, Henry Dixon (1854-1924). Later practiced law.	Kentucky	do.	56-57	Do.
7. Anderson, Samuel (1773-1850)	Pennsylvania	do.	20	Do.
8. Archer, John (1741-1810). In 1767 received the 1st medical diploma issued on the American Continent.	Maryland	Democrat	7-9	Do.
9. Armstrong, James (1748-1828)	Pennsylvania	Federalist	3	Do.
10. Arnold, Jonathan (1741-93). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon.	Rhode Island		Member of the Continental Congress, 1782-84	

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
11. Atkinson, Louis Ewans (1841-1910). Later practiced law.	Pennsylvania	Republican	48-52	House.
12. Austin, Albert Elmer (1877-1942)	Connecticut	do.	76	Do.
13. Averett, Thomas Hamlet (1800-1855)	Virginia	Democrat	31-32	Do.
14. Avery, John (1824-1914)	Michigan	Republican	53-54	Do.
15. Ayerigg, John Bancker (1798-1856)	New Jersey	Whig	25, 27	Do.
16. Babcock, Alfred (1805-71)	New York	do.	27	Do.
17. Baker, Ezra (before 1765, died after 1818). Practiced medicine for a short time.	New Jersey	do.	14	Do.
18. Ball, Lewis Heisler (1861-1932)	Delaware	Republican	57	Do.
19. Barber, Isaac Ambrose (1852-1909). Practiced medicine for 15 years, then engaged in the milling business.	Maryland	do.	1903-5	Senate.
20. Brachfeld, Andrew Jackson (1863-1922). Delegate to the peace congress at Brussels in 1905.	Pennsylvania	do.	55	House.
21. Barnett, William (1761-1834)	Georgia	Democrat	59-64	Do.
22. Barstow, Gamaliel Henry (1784-1865)	New York	National Republican	12-13	Do.
23. Barstow, Gideon (1783-1852)	Massachusetts	Democrat	22	Do.
24. Bartlett, Josiah (1729-95). Signer of the Articles of Confederation and of the Declaration of Independence. Governor of New Hampshire.	New Hampshire	do.	17	Do.
25. Bartlett, Josiah, Jr. (1768-1838)	do.	do.	Member of the Continental Congress, 1775-76.	House.
26. Bateman, Ephraim (1780-1829)	New Jersey	Democrat	12	Do.
27. Bates, James (1780-1882). Served as a surgeon during the War of 1812.	Maine	do.	14-17	Do.
28. Beatty, John (1749-1826). Colonel of the Revolutionary Army.	New Jersey	do.	1826-29	Senate.
29. Bernhisel, John Milton (1799-1881)	Territory of Utah	Whig	22	House.
30. Bibb, William Wyatt (1780-1820). The 1st Governor of Alabama.	Georgia	Democrat	3	Do.
31. Bissel, William Harrison (1811-60). Later practiced law. Governor of Illinois 1857-60.	Illinois	do.	32-35, 37	Delegate.
32. Bland, Theodorick (1742-90)	Virginia	do.	9-13	House.
33. Bohn, Frank Probasco (1866-1944)	Michigan	Republican	1813-16	Senate.
34. Booze, William Samuel (1862-1933)	Maryland	do.	31-33	House.
35. Borland, Solon (1808-64). Served throughout the Mexican War as major. Appointed a brigadier general in the Confederate Army.	Arkansas	Democrat	Member of the Continental Congress, 1780-83.	House.
36. Bower, Gustavus Miller (1790-1864)	Missouri	do.	70-72	Do.
37. Bradford, William (1729-1808). Abandoned the profession, studied and practiced law.	Rhode Island	do.	54	Do.
38. Bradshaw, Samuel Carey (1809-72)	Pennsylvania	Whig	1848-53	Senate.
39. Bratton, John (1831-98). Brigadier general of the Confederate Army.	South Carolina	Democrat	28	House.
40. Brewer, Francis Beattie (1820-92)	New York	Republican	1793-96	Senate.
41. Brown, Benjamin (1750-1831)	Massachusetts	do.	34	House.
42. Browne, Charles (1875-1947)	New Jersey	Democrat	48	Do.
43. Brownson, Nathan (1742-96). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army.	Georgia	do.	48	Do.
44. Buffington, James (1817-75). Studied medicine but never practiced.	Massachusetts	Republican	14	Do.
45. Bull, John (1803-63). Later also a Methodist minister.	Missouri	Whig	68	Do.
46. Burke, Thomas (about 1747-83). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	North Carolina	Whig	Member of the Continental Congress, 1776-81.	House.
47. Burleigh, Walter Atwood (1820-90). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	Territory of Dakota	Republican	23	Do.
48. Burnet, William (1730-91). In 1787 president of the State medical society.	New Jersey	do.	39-40	Delegate.
49. Burns, Robert (1792-1866)	New Hampshire	Democrat	Member of the Continental Congress, 1780-81.	House.
50. Burton, Hiram Rodney (1841-1927)	Delaware	Republican	23-24	Do.
51. Butler, Thomas Belden (1806-73). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	Connecticut	Whig	59-60	Do.
52. Butler, William (1790-1850)	South Carolina	do.	31	Do.
53. Caldwell, Greene Washington (1806-64). Abandoned the profession and practiced law.	North Carolina	Democrat	27	Do.
54. Campbell, Alexander (1779-1857). Vice president of the first general antislavery society of Ohio in 1835.	Ohio	Democrat (?)	27	Do.
55. Carlton, Henry Hull (1835-1905)	Georgia	Democrat	1800-13	Senate.
56. Carpenter, Davis (1799-1878)	New York	Whig	50-51	House.
57. Castle, Curtis Harvey (1848-1928)	California	Populist and Democrat	33	Do.
58. Chaffee, Calvin Clifford (1811-96)	Massachusetts	American Party	55	Do.
59. Chambers, Henry (1790-1826). Served in the Indian wars as a surgeon.	Alabama	Democrat	24-35	Do.
60. Chaves, Jose Francisco (1833-1904). Graduated in medicine but never practiced.	Territory of New Mexico	Republican	1825-26	Senate.
61. Chinn, Thomas Withers (1791-1852). Practiced medicine 1817-25.	Louisiana	Whig	39-41	Delegata.
62. Chisholme, John (1777-1808)	Virginia	do.	26	House.
63. Chardy, John Daniel (1828-1918). Abandoned the profession.	Kentucky	Democrat	9-10	Do.
64. Clark, Robert (1777-1837)	New York	do.	54-55	Do.
65. Clawson, Isaiah Dunn (1822-79)	New Jersey	Whig	16	Do.
66. Clayton, Joshua (1774-98). President and then the 1st Governor of Delaware.	Delaware	do.	34-35	Do.
67. Clements, Andrew Jackson (1832-1913)	Tennessee	Unionist	1798	Senate.
68. Clift, Joseph Wales (1837-1908)	Georgia	Republican	37	House.
69. Cobb, David (1748-1830). Aide-de-camp on the staff of General Washington.	Massachusetts	Federalist	40	Do.
70. Cole, William Hinson (1837-86). Practiced medicine and law.	Maryland	Democrat	3	Do.
71. Comstock, Oliver Cromwell (1780-1860). Abandoned the profession (Baptist minister).	New York	do.	49	Do.
72. Condit, Lewis (1772-1862). President of the State medical society, 1816-19.	New Jersey	Anti-Federalist	13-15	Do.
73. Condit, John (1755-1834). Served as surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	do.	Democrat	12-14, 17-22	Do.
74. Conover, Simon Barclay (1840-1908)	Florida	Republican	6-7, 16	Do.
75. Cooper, Thomas Buchecker (1823-62)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	1803-17	Senate.
76. Copeland, Royal Samuel (1808-1938)	New York	do.	1873-79	Do.
77. Cowan, Jacob Pitzer (1823-95)	Ohio	do.	37	House.
78. Cowen, Benjamin Sprague (1793-1860). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	do.	Whig	1923-38	Senate.
79. Crawford, William (1760-1823)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	44	House.
80. Crump, George William (1786-1848)	Virginia	Jackson Democrat	27	Do.
81. Cunningham, Francis Alanson (1804-64). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Ohio	Democrat	11-14	Do.
82. Cutler, Manasseh (1742-1823). Lawyer, theologian, physician, botanist, astronomer.	Massachusetts	Federalist	19	Do.
83. Darling, Mason Cook (1801-66)	Wisconsin	Democrat	29	Do.
84. Darlington, William (1782-1863). Noted as a botanist.	Pennsylvania	do.	7-8	Do.
85. Darrall, Chester Bidwell (1842-1908)	Louisiana	Republican	30	Do.
86. Davis, John Wesley (1799-1859). Governor of Oregon Territory, 1853-54.	Indiana	Democrat	14, 16-17	Do.
87. Davis, Reuben (1813-90). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Mississippi	do.	41-44, 45	Do.
88. Davis, Robert Thompson (1823-1906)	Massachusetts	Republican	21, 26, 28-29	Do.
89. Davis, Roger (1762-1815)	Pennsylvania	Democrat	35, 36	Do.
90. Dearborn, Henry (1751-1829). Secretary of War, 1801-09; Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal, 1822-24.	Massachusetts (Maine district)	do.	48-50	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1950—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
91. Deboe, William Joseph (1849-1927). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Kentucky	Republican	1897-1903	Senate.
92. Dennis, George Robertson (1822-82).	Maryland	Democrat	1873-79	Do.
93. Dick, Samuel (1740-1812). Colonel during the Revolutionary War.	New Jersey		Member of the Continental Congress, 1783-84	Do.
94. Dickson, David (?-1830). Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi in 1821.	Mississippi	Democrat	21	House.
95. Dickson, Samuel (1807-58).	New York	Whig	34	Do.
96. Dickson, William (1770-1816).	Tennessee		7-9	Do.
97. Doan, William (1792-1847).	Ohio	Democrat	26-27	Do.
98. Dockery, Alexander Monroe (1845-1926). Abandoned medicine (business). Governor of Missouri 1901-5.	Missouri	do.	48-55	Do.
99. Douglas, Fred James (1869-1949).	New York	Republican	75-78	Do.
100. Duncan, Alexander (1788-1853).	Ohio	Whig	25-26, 28	Do.
101. Eckert, George Nicholas (1802-65). One of the organizers of Berks County Medical Society in 1824.	Pennsylvania	do.	30	Do.
102. Eddy, Norman (1810-72). Practiced medicine until 1847.	Indiana	Democrat	33	Do.
103. Edwards, Thomas Owen (1810-70).	Ohio	Whig	30	Do.
104. Egbert, Albert Gallatin (1828-96). Practiced medicine until 1861.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	44	Do.
105. Eldredge, Nathaniel Buel (1813-93). Engaged in the practice of medicine for a short time (lawyer).	Michigan	do.	48-49	Do.
106. Ellsberry, William Wallace (1833-94).	Ohio	do.	49	Do.
107. Elmer, Ebenezer (1752-1843). Served in the Revolutionary Army.	New Jersey	do.	7-9	Do.
108. Elmer, Jonathan (1745-1817). President of the State medical society in 1787.	do.	Federalist	1789-91	Senate.
109. Ely, John (1774-1849). One of the organizers of the New York State and Greene County Medical Societies in 1807.	New York	Democrat	26	House.
110. English, Thomas Dunn (1819-1902). Graduated in medicine and law but mainly pursued journalism.	New Jersey	do.	52-53	Do.
111. Eustis, William (1753-1825). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon. Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands 1814-18. Governor of Massachusetts, 1823-25.	Massachusetts		16-17	Do.
112. Evans, Isaac Newton (1827-1901).	Pennsylvania	Republican	45, 48-49	Do.
113. Faison, John Miller (1802-1915).	North Carolina	Democrat	62-63	Do.
114. Farrington, James (1791-1859).	New Hampshire	do.	25	Do.
115. Felton, William Harrell (1823-1909). Physician, later also Methodist minister.	Georgia	do.	44-46	Do.
116. Fenton, Ivor David (1889-7).	Pennsylvania	Republican	76-86	Do.
117. Fernós-Isern, Antonio (1895-7).	Puerto Rico		1946-50	Resident Commissioner.
118. Fitch, Asa (1765-1843). President of the Washington County Medical Society, 1806-20.	New York	Federalist	12	House.
119. Fitch, Graham Newel (1809-92). Colonel of the 46th Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry during the Civil War.	Indiana	Democrat	31-32	Do.
120. Fitzgerald, William Thomas (1858-1939).	Ohio	Republican	1857-61	Senate.
121. Flood, Thomas Schmeck (1844-1908). Studied medicine but did not practice (drug business).	New York	do.	69-70	House.
122. Floyd, John (1783-1837). Surgeon in the War of 1812.	Virginia	Democrat	50-51	Do.
123. Fort, Tomlinson (1787-1859).	Georgia	do.	15-20	Do.
124. Foster, Martin David (1861-1919).	Illinois	do.	20	Do.
125. Fowler, Samuel (1779-1844). Discoverer of minerals: Fowlerite and franklinite.	New Jersey	Jackson Democrat	60-65	Do.
126. France, Joseph Irvin (1873-1939).	Maryland	Republican	23-24	Do.
127. Fries, George (1799-1886).	Ohio	Democrat	1917-23	Senate.
128. Furlong, Robert Grant (1886).	Pennsylvania	do.	29-30	House.
129. Gaines, John Wesley (1860-1920). Graduated in medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	Tennessee	do.	1943-45, 1949-53	Senate.
130. Gaither, Nathan (1788-1862).	Kentucky	do.	55-60	House.
131. Gallinger, Jacob Harold (1837-1918).	New Hampshire	Republican	21-22	Do.
132. Gerry, James (1796-1873).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	59-60	Do.
133. Griffith, John Keller (1882-1942).	Louisiana	do.	1891-1918	Senate.
134. Gwin, William McKendree (1805-85).	Mississippi	do.	26-27	House.
135. Hahn, John (1776-1823).	Pennsylvania	do.	75-76	Do.
136. Hall, Lyman (1724-90). Signed the Declaration of Independence. Governor of Georgia in 1783.	Georgia	do.	27	Senate.
137. Hall, Thomas H. (1773-1833).	do.	do.	1850-55, 1857-61	House.
138. Halsey, Silas (1743-1832).	North Carolina	do.	14	Do.
139. Hammond, Jabez Delno (1778-1856). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	New York	do.	15-18, 20-23	House.
140. Hammons, Joseph (1787-1836). Member of the New Hampshire Medical Society.	New Hampshire	Jackson Democrat	9	Do.
141. Band, Edward (1744-1892). Started as lieutenant colonel in the Revolutionary War; honorably discharged as major general of the U.S. Army in 1860.	Pennsylvania		21-22	Do.
142. Harper, Joseph Morrill (1787-1865).	New York	Democrat	Member of the Continental Congress 1784-85	Do.
143. Harrison, John Scott (1804-78). Son of President William Henry Harrison and father of President Benjamin Harrison. Studied medicine but abandoned the profession (engaged in agricultural pursuits).	Ohio	Whig	22-23	House.
144. Hatch, Jetro Ayers (1837-1912).	Indiana	Republican	33-34	Do.
145. Hatfield, Henry Drury (1875-), of West Virginia, 1914-17.	Governor, West Virginia	do.	54	Do.
146. Haughey, Thomas (1829-69).	Alabama	do.	29-35	Senate.
147. Haven, Nathaniel Appleton (1762-1831). Ship's surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	New Hampshire	Federalist	40	House.
148. Hawes, Aylett (1768-1833).	Virginia	Democrat	11	Do.
149. Haymond, William Summerville (1823-85). Organized the Central Medical College in Indianapolis in 1877. Published history of Indiana in 1879.	Indiana	Candidate of Democrats and Liberals.	12-14	Do.
150. Haynes, Charles Eaton (1784-1841).	Georgia	Democrat	44	Do.
151. Hedrick, Erland Harold (1894-7).	West Virginia	Unionist	19-21	Do.
152. Henderson, Joseph (1791-1863).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	24-25	Do.
153. Henderson, Thomas (1743-1824).	New Jersey	do.	79-82	Do.
154. Henkle, Eli Jones (1828-93).	Maryland	Democrat	23-24	Do.
155. Henney, Charles William Francis (1854-7). President of the Columbia County Medical Society, 1928-30.	Wisconsin	do.	Elected as Delegate to the Continental Congress in 1779 but declined to serve.	4
156. Henry, John Flournoy (1769-1873).	Kentucky		44-46	House.
157. Higgins, Wm. Lincoln (1867-1931).	Connecticut	Republican	73	Do.
158. Hoffman, Michael (1787-1848). Graduated in medicine and law but never practiced medicine.	New York	Democrat	19	Do.
159. Hogg, Samuel (1783-1842). President of the State Medical Society of Tennessee in 1840.	Tennessee	do.	73-74	Do.
160. Holcombe, George (1786-1828).	New Jersey	do.	19-23	Do.
161. Holland, Cornelius (1783-1870).	Maine	do.	15	Do.
			17-20	Do.
			21-22	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
162. Holten, Samuel (1738-1816). Signed the Articles of Confederation in 1783.	Massachusetts		Member of the Continental Congress, 1778-80, 1782-87	House.
163. Hubbard, Joel Douglas (1860-1919). Practiced medicine and law.	Missouri	Republican	3	Do.
164. Hunter, Whiteside Godfrey, (1841-1917). U.S. Minister to Guatemala and Honduras, 1897-1902.	Kentucky	do.	54	Do.
165. Huntington, Abel (1777-1858).	New York	Democrat	50, 54, 58	Do.
166. Hutton, John Edward (1828-93). Practiced medicine, later law, and finally medicine and law.	Missouri	do.	23-24	Do.
167. Ikert, George Pierce (1852-1927).	Ohio	do.	49-50	Do.
168. Irvine, William (1741-1804). Colonel and general of the Revolutionary Army.	Pennsylvania		53	Do.
169. Irwin, Edward Michael (1869-1933).	Illinois	Republican	Member of the Continental Congress, 1786-88.	House.
170. Jackson, David (about 1730-1801). Physician and apothecary.	Pennsylvania		3	Do.
171. Jackson, Edward Brake (1793-1826).	Virginia	Democrat	69-71	Do.
172. James, Addison Davis (1850-1947).	Kentucky	Republican	Member of the Continental Congress, 1785-86.	House.
173. Jayne, William (1829-1916). Governor of Dakota 1861-63.	Territory of Dakota	do.	16-17	Do.
174. Jewett, Luther (1772-1860). Practiced medicine. Ordained as a minister.	Vermont	Federalist	60	Do.
175. Johnson, James Augustus (1829-96). Graduated in medicine, but never practiced (lawyer). Lieutenant Governor of California, 1875-80.	California	Democrat	38	Delegate.
176. Johnson, Perley Brown (1798-1870).	Ohio	Whig	14	House.
177. Jones, Daniel Terryll (1800-1861).	New York	Democrat	40-41	Do.
178. Jones, George (1766-1838). Served in the Revolutionary War and in the War of 1812.	Georgia	Federalist	28	Do.
179. Jones, James (1772-1848). Served in the War of 1812.	Virginia	Democrat	32-33	Do.
180. Jones, John William (1806-71). Professor in the Atlanta Medical College 1856-62, 1865-70.	Georgia	Whig	1807	Senate.
181. Jones, Noble Wymberley, (1723-1805).	do.		10-17	House.
182. Jones, Walter (1745-1815).	Virginia	Democrat	30	Do.
183. Jorgensen, Joseph (1844-88).	do.	Republican	Member of the Continental Congress 1775-76, 1781-83.	House.
184. Judd, Walter Henry (1898-).	Minnesota	do.	5, 8-11	House.
185. Kent, Joseph (1779-1837). Governor of Maryland, 1826-29.	Maryland	Federalist	45-47	Do.
186. Kidwell, Zedekiah (1814-72).	Virginia	Democrat	78-84-86	Do.
187. Kindred, John Joseph (1864-1937).	New York	do.	12-13	Do.
188. King, Adam (1790-1835). Editor of the York Gazette, 1818-35.	Pennsylvania	do.	16-19	Do.
189. Kinsley, Martin (1754-1835). Served in the Revolutionary Army.	Massachusetts	National Republican	1833-37	Senate.
190. Kirkpatrick, William (1769-1832).	New York	Democrat	33-34	House.
191. Kittredge, George Washington (1805-81).	New Hampshire	do.	62, 67-70	Do.
192. Lane, Harry (1855-1917).	Oregon	Anti-Nebraska Democrat	20-22	Do.
193. Larrabee, Henry William (1870-).	Indiana	Democrat	16	Do.
194. Latimer, Henry (1752-1819). Served as a surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	Delaware	do.	10	Do.
195. Lattimore, William (1774-1843).	Mississippi Territory	do.	33	Do.
196. Lawson, John William (1837-1905).	Virginia	Democrat	1913-17	Senate.
197. Layton, Caleb Rodney (1851-1930).	Delaware	Republican	72-77	House.
198. Lazaro, Ladislav (1872-1927).	Louisiana	Democrat	3	Do.
199. Lee, Arthur (1740-92). Graduated in medicine and law; practiced law only.	Virginia	Democrat	1795-1801	Senate.
200. Lee, Joshua (1783-1842). Served as a surgeon in the War of 1812.	New York	Democrat	8-9, 13-14	Delegate.
201. Lee, Moses Lindley (1805-76).	do.	Republican	52	House.
202. Leftwich, John William (1826-70). Graduated in medicine but never practiced. Mayor of Memphis 1869-70.	Tennessee	Democrat	65-67	Do.
203. Leib, Michael (1760-1822). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army.	Pennsylvania	do.	63-70	Do.
204. Leib, Owen D. (?-1848).	do.	do.	Member of the Continental Congress, 1781-84.	House.
205. Lilly, Samuel (1815-1880). Consul general of the United States to British India in 1861-62.	New Jersey	do.	24	Do.
206. Linn, Lewis Fields (1796-1843). Surgeon in the War of 1812.	Missouri	do.	36	Do.
207. Logan, George (1753-1821). Graduated in medicine but devoted himself to scientific farming.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	39	Do.
208. Lord, Frederick William (1800-1800).	New York	Whig	6-9	Do.
209. Loring, George Bailey (1817-90). U.S. Commissioner of Agriculture 1881-85. U.S. Minister to Portugal 1889-90.	Massachusetts	Republican	1809-14	Senate.
210. Love, Peter Early (1818-66). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Georgia	Democrat	29	House.
211. Mallory, Francis (1807-60). Practiced medicine for a short time.	Virginia	Whig	33	Do.
212. Marable, John Hertwell (1786-1844).	Tennessee	National Republican	1801-07	House.
213. Marchand, David (1776-1832).	Pennsylvania	American Party	36	Do.
214. Marshall, Alexander Kloth (1808-84).	Kentucky	Federalist	25, 26-27	Do.
215. Mason, James Brown (1775-1819).	Rhode Island	do.	19-20	Do.
216. Mason, Moses, Jr. (1789-1866).	Maine	Democrat	15-16	Do.
217. Mason, William (1786-1800).	New York	do.	34	Do.
218. Massey, Zachary David (1864-1923).	Tennessee	Republican	14-15	Do.
219. McCormick, James Robinson (1824-97).	Missouri	Democrat	23-24	Do.
220. McCulloch, John (1806-79).	Pennsylvania	Whig	24	Do.
221. McDill, Alexander Stuart (1822-75).	Wisconsin	Republican	61	Do.
222. McHenry, James (1753-1816). Secretary to General Washington, 1778-80. Secretary of War, 1796-1800.	Maryland	Republican	40-42	Do.
223. McLean, James Henry (1829-86).	Missouri	Republican	33	Do.
224. Miller, Arthur Lewis (1892-).	Nebraska	do.	43	Do.
225. Miller, Homer Virgil Milton (1814-96).	Georgia	Democrat	Member of the Continental Congress, 1783-86.	House.
226. Miller, John (1774-1862). Organized and in 1808 was the first vice president of the Cortland County Medical Society.	New York	do.	78-84-85	Do.
227. Mitchell, Charles Burton (1815-64).	Arkansas	Democrat	1808 (7)-71	Do.
228. Mitchell, George Edward (1781-1832). In 1814 brevetted colonel for gallant conduct in repelling attack of British forces.	Maryland	do.	19	Do.
229. Mitchell, Henry (1784-1856).	New York	Jackson Democrat	1861	Senate.
230. Mitchell, Robert (1778-1848).	Ohio	Democrat	18-19, 21-22	Do.
231. Mitchell, Samuel Latham (1764-1831). Editor of the New York Medical Repository (1797-1813). Founder and the president of the Lyceum of Natural History of New York City 1817-23. Professor in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons 1808-26 (natural history, botany, materia medica).	New York	do.	23	Do.
232. Moffet, John (1831-84). Practiced pharmacy and medicine.	Pennsylvania	do.	23	Do.
233. Molony, Richard Sheppard (1811-91).	Illinois	do.	7-9, 11-12	Senate.
234. Montgomery, William (1789-1844).	North Carolina	do.	1804-09	Do.
235. Moore, Ely (1798-1861). Studied medicine but did not engage in extensive practice (editor).	New York	do.	41	House.
236. Moore, Samuel (1774-1861). Practiced medicine for a short time. Director of the U.S. Mint, 1821-35.	Pennsylvania	do.	32	Do.
237. Morgan, Thomas Ellsworth (1906-).	do.	do.	24-26	Do.

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1950—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
238. Morrill, David Lawrence (1772-1840). Practiced medicine 1793-1800, 1807-30. Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in 1802-11.	New Hampshire	Adams Democrat	1817-23	Senate
239. Morris, John Alexander (1814-1904).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	32	House
240. Moseley, William Abbott (1798-1873). Abandoned profession.	New York	Whig	28-29	Do.
241. Naudain, Arnold (1790-1872).	Delaware		1830-36	Senate
242. Neal, Will E. (1875-)	West Virginia	Republican	83-85	House
243. Nes, Henry (1799-1850).	Pennsylvania	Independent	28	Do.
244. Newell, William Augustus (1817-1901). Governor of New Jersey 1857-60. Territorial Governor of Washington 1880-84.	New Jersey	Whig	30-31	Do.
245. Norton, James Albert (1843-1912). Practiced medicine 1867-70.	Ohio	Republican	39	Do.
246. Nourse, Amos (1794-1877). Professor of obstetrics at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine 1846-54.	Maine	Democrat	55-57	Do.
247. Olds, Edson Baldwin (1802-69).	Ohio	Democrat	1857	Senate
248. Olpp, Archibald Ernest (1882).	New Jersey	Democrat	31-33	House
249. Osborne, John Eugene (1838-1943). Governor of Wyoming 1893-95. First Assistant Secretary of State 1913-17.	Wyoming	Republican	67	Do.
250. Paine, Ephraim (1730-85).	New York	Democrat	55	Do.
251. Palmer, John William (1866-). Practiced medicine 1895-1908.	New York		Member of the Continental Congress 1784-85.	
252. Parker, James (1768-1837).	Missouri	Republican	71	House
253. Patton, David Henry (1837-1914).	Massachusetts	Democrat	13, 16	Do.
254. Patton, John Mercer (1797-1858). Graduated in medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	Indiana	do.	52	Do.
255. Peabody, Nathaniel (1741-1823). Served in the Revolutionary Army. Commanded a brigade in Rhode Island in 1779.	Virginia	do.	21-25	Do.
256. Peck, Erasmus Darwin (1808-76).	New Hampshire		Member of the Continental Congress in 1779-80.	
257. Petrkin, David (1788-1847). Surgeon in the War of 1812.	Ohio	Republican	41-42	House
258. Peyton, Joseph Hopkins (1808-45).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	25-26	Do.
259. Peyton, Samuel Oldham (1804-70).	Tennessee	Whig	28-29	Do.
260. Pfeiffer, Joseph Lawrence (1892-).	Kentucky	Democrat	30, 35-36	Do.
261. Phelps, Lancelot (1784-1860).	New York	do.	74-81	Do.
262. Pierce, Ray Vaughn (1840-1914). Publisher of the Medical Adviser.	Connecticut	do.	24-25	Do.
263. Pierson, Isaac (1770-1833). President of the Medical Society of New Jersey in 1827.	New Jersey	Republican	46	Do.
264. Pinkney, William (1764-1822). Joint Minister to Great Britain 1806-7. Minister Plenipotentiary 1807-11. U.S. Attorney General 1811-14. Minister Plenipotentiary to Russia 1816-18. Studied medicine but never practiced (lawyer).	New Jersey	Whig	20-21	Do.
265. Platt, James Henry, Jr. (1837-94).	Maryland		2, 14	Do.
266. Post, Jotham, Jr., 1771-1817. Graduated in medicine but did not practice (engaged in the drug import).	Virginia	Republican	1819-22	Senate
267. Preston, Jacob Alexander (1796-1868).	New York	Federalist	41-43	House
268. Pugh, John Howard (1827-1905).	New York		13	Do.
269. Ramsay, David (1749-1815). Served in the Revolutionary Army as surgeon. State historian and author of several historical works.	Maryland	Whig	28	Do.
270. Reading, John Roberts (1826-86).	New Jersey	Republican	45	Do.
271. Reed, Robert Rentoul (1807-64).	South Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1782-86.	
272. Reese, David Addison (1794-1871).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	41	House
273. Rely, Luther (1794-1854). Served in the War of 1812.	do.	Whig	31	Do.
274. Relie, James Hugh (1791-1863).	Georgia	do.	33	Do.
275. Rice, John Birchard (1832-93).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	25	Do.
276. Riggs, Jettur Rose (1809-69). One of the founders of the District Medical Society of Passaic County, N.J., in 1844.	Missouri	do.	28-29	Do.
277. Riggs, Lewis (1789-1870). President of the Cortland County Medical Society in 1825-26.	Ohio	Republican	47	Do.
278. Robbins, George Robbins (1808-75).	New Jersey	Democrat	36	Do.
279. Rosh, Benjamin (1745-1813). Professor at the Philadelphia Medical College. Surgeon general in the Revolutionary Army. Signer of the Declaration of Independence. Treasurer of the U.S. Mint from 1797.	New York	do.	27	Do.
280. Russell, John (1772-1842). Practiced medicine for a short time.	New Jersey	Whig	34-35	Do.
281. Sage, Ebenezer (1755-1834).	Pennsylvania		Member of the Continental Congress, 1770-77.	
282. Sage, Edmund William (1837-1930).	New York		0-10	House
283. Say, Benjamin (1759-1813). Physician and apothecary. 1 of the founders of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia in 1787. President of the Pennsylvania Humane Society.	do.	Democrat	11-13	Do.
284. Schenck, Ferdinand Schureman (1790-1800).	Pennsylvania	Republican	59	Do.
285. Scudder, John Anderson (1759-1830). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army. Secretary of the New Jersey Medical Society in 1788-89.	do.		10-11	Do.
286. Scudder, Nathaniel (1733-81). Killed while resisting the invasion of the British Army.	New Jersey	Jackson Democrat	23-24	Do.
287. Semmes, Benedict Joseph (1789-1863).	do.	Democrat	11	Do.
288. Seybert, Adam (1773-1825). Graduated in medicine but did not practice (chemist).	Maryland		Member of the Continental Congress, 1777-79.	
289. Shaw, Frank Thomas (1841-1923).	Pennsylvania	Democrat	21-22	House
290. Shaw, Henry Marchmont (1819-64). Killed as a colonel of the Confederate Army.	do.	do.	11-13, 15	Do.
291. Shaw, Samuel (1768-1827).	Maryland	do.	49-50	Do.
292. Sheffer, Daniel (1783-1880).	North Carolina	do.	33, 35	Do.
293. Sherman, Socrates Norton (1801-73).	Vermont	do.	10-12	Do.
294. Shippen, William (1712-1801). 1 of founders of the College of Philadelphia and of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University).	Pennsylvania	do.	25	Do.
295. Showalter, Joseph Baltzell (1851-1932).	New York	Republican	37	Do.
296. Showers, Jacob (1803-79).	Pennsylvania		Member of the Continental Congress, 1778-80.	
297. Shull, Joseph Horace (1848-1944). Practiced law and medicine.	do.	do.	53-57	House
298. Simmons, Samuel (1792-1847).	Maryland	Independent	33	Do.
299. Simonton, William (1788-1846). One of the original supporters of the free-school system, established in 1834.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	58	Do.
300. Singleton, James Washington (1811-1892). Practiced medicine for a short time (lawyer).	Connecticut	do.	28	Do.
301. Sivovich, William Irving (1882-1930).	Pennsylvania	Whig	26-27	Do.
302. Skelton, Charles (1806-79).	Illinois	Democrat	46-47	Do.
303. Smith, Frederick Cleveland (1884-7).	New York	do.	70-76	Do.
304. Smith, Isaac (1740-1807).	New Jersey	do.	32-33	Do.
305. Smith, James Strudwick (1790-1839).	Ohio	Republican	70-81	Do.
306. Spence, John Selby (1788-1840).	New Jersey	Federalist	4	Do.
307. Standford, Eliza David (1831-87). Abandoned the practice of medicine.	North Carolina	Democrat	15-16	Do.
308. Stewart Jacob Henry (1829-84). Mayor of St. Paul in 1864, 1868, 1872-74.	Maryland	do.	18, 22	Do.
309. Stone, Joseph Champin (1829-1902).	Kentucky	do.	1830-40	Senate
310. Storer, Clement (1760-1830).	Minnesota	Republican	43	House
311. Stratt, Thomas Jefferson (1846-1924).	Iowa	do.	45	Do.
312. Strawbridge, James Dale (1824-90).	New Hampshire	do.	10	Do.
313. Sturgeon, Daniel (1789-1878). Treasurer of the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia 1853-58.	South Carolina	Alliance Democrat	1817-19	Senate
	Pennsylvania	Republican	53-55	House
	do.	Democrat	43	Do.
			1840-51	Senate

Physicians who have service in the American Congress, 1774-1959—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
314. Summers, John William (1870-1937)	Washington	Republican	66, 72	House.
315. Sutherland, Joel Barlow (1792-1861). Physician to Lafayette. Founder of Jefferson Medical College at Philadelphia. Abandoned the profession.	Pennsylvania	Jackson Democrat	20, 24	Do.
316. Swan, Samuel (1771-1844)	New Jersey		17, 21	Do.
317. Swick, Jesse Howard (1879-7)	Pennsylvania	Republican	70-73	Do.
318. Swinburne, John (1820-89). Mayor of Albany in 1882	New York	do.	49	Do.
319. Swope, John Augustus (1827-1910). Discontinued the practice of medicine after a few years.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	48-49	Do.
320. Taylor, Miles (1805-73). Studied medicine, but never practiced. Lawyer.	Louisiana	do.	34-36	Do.
321. Taylor, William (1791-1865)	New York	do.	23-25	Do.
322. Tenerowicz, Rudolph Gabriel (1890-7)	Michigan	do.	76-77	Do.
323. Tenney, Samuel (1748-1816). Surgeon in the Revolutionary War.	New Hampshire		6-9	Do.
324. Terrell, William (1778-1855)	Georgia	Democrat	15-16	Do.
325. Thomas, Henry Franklin (1843-1912)	Michigan	Republican	53-54	Do.
326. Thompson, Hedge (1780-1828)	New Jersey		20	Do.
327. Thompson, John (1780-1852)	Ohio	Democrat	19, 21-24	Do.
328. Thorckelson, Jacob (1876-1945)	Montana	Republican	76	Do.
329. Thornton, Mathew (1714-1803). Signed the Declaration of Independence.	New Hampshire		Member of the Continental Congress, 1776-78	
330. Throckmorton, James Welb (1825-94). Surgeon in the Mexican War. Abandoned the profession. Elected Governor of Texas but removed by order of General Sheridan.	Texas	Democrat	44-45, 48-49	House.
331. Tiffin, Edward (1766-1829). Physician and Methodist minister. Elected as the 1st Governor of Ohio in 1803.	Ohio	do.	1807-09	Senate.
332. Tillotson, Thomas (1750-1832). Served in the Revolutionary Army.	New York		Elected to the 7th Congress, but did not take his seat and resigned in 1801.	
333. Tilton, James (1745-1822). Surgeon in the Revolutionary Army.	Delaware		Member of the Continental Congress, 1783-85	
334. Townshend, Norton Strange (1815-95). Delegate to the World's Anti-slavery Convention in London, England, in 1840.	Ohio	Democrat	32	House.
335. Trimble, Carey Allen (1813-87)	do.	Republican	36-37	Do.
336. Tucker, Thomas Tudor (1745-1828). Surgeon in the Revolutionary War. U.S. Treasurer, 1801-28.	South Carolina		Member of the Continental Congress, 1787-88	
337. Updegraff, Jonathan Taylor (1822-82)	Ohio	Federalist	1-2	House.
338. Valk, William Weightman (1806-79)	New York	Republican	46-47	Do.
339. Van Aernam, Henry (1819-94). Commissioner of Pensions, 1869-71.	do.	American Party	34	Do.
340. Vance, Robert Brank (1793-1827). Mortally wounded in a duel.	do.	Republican	39-40, 46-47	Do.
341. Volk, Lester David (1884-7). Editor of the Medical Economist. Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	North Carolina	Democrat	18	Do.
342. Walker, Percy (1812-80)	New York	Republican	66-67	Do.
343. Wallace, John Winfield (1818-89)	Alabama	American Party	34	Do.
344. Walling, Ansel Tracy (1824-96). Practiced medicine a short time (lawyer).	Pennsylvania	Republican	37, 44	Do.
345. Weatherford, Zadoe Lorenzo (1888-)	Ohio	Democrat	44	Do.
346. Welch, William Wickham (1818-92)	do.		76	Do.
347. Whipple, Thomas, Jr. (1787-1835)	Connecticut	American Party	34	Do.
348. White, Bartow (1776-1862)	New Hampshire		17-20	Do.
349. Williams, John (1752-1806). Colonel of the Revolutionary Army.	New York		19	Do.
350. Williamson, Hugh (1735-1819). Theologian, mathematician, physician. Surgeon general of the North Carolina troops, 1779-82.	do.		4-5	Do.
351. Willoughby, Westel, Jr. (1769-1844). President of the Herkimer County Medical Society, 1806-16 and 1818-36. President of the College of Physicians and Surgeons for the Western District of New York, 1812-44. Founded the town of Willoughby, Ohio, and also Willoughby College.	North Carolina	Member of the Continental Congress, 1782-85, 1787-88	1-2	House.
352. Wilson, Frank Eugene (1857-1935)	New York	Federalist	14	Do.
353. Wise, Richard Alsop (1843-1900)	do.	Democrat		
354. Witherell, James (1759-1838). Served in the Revolutionary Army.	do.		56-58, 62-63	Do.
355. Withers, Robert Enoch (1821-1907). Lieutenant Governor in 1873. U.S. counsel at Hong Kong, China, 1885-89.	Virginia	Republican	55-56	Do.
356. Wolcott, Oliver (1726-97). Studied medicine but did not practice. Signed the Declaration of Independence. Governor of Connecticut 1796-97.	Vermont	Democrat	10	Do.
357. Wood, John Travers (1878-). President of Kootenai County Medical Society for many years.	Virginia	Conservative	1875-81	Senate.
358. Yoder, Samuel S. (1841-1921). Abandoned the profession (lawyer).	Connecticut		Member of the Continental Congress, 1775-78 and 1780-84.	
359. York, Tyre (1836-1916)	Idaho	Republican	82	House.
360. Young, Bryant Rust (1800-1882)	Ohio	Democrat	50-51	Do.
361. Young, William Singleton (1790-1827)	North Carolina	Liberal Democrat	48	Do.
	Kentucky	Democrat	29	Do.
	do.	do.	19-20	Do.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

As the sources do not contain a complete biography of each Member of the Congress (this is especially true for the Members of early Congresses), we are not able to get an exact total of persons who have completed their medical education.

Keeping this in mind, we can derive from the list of physician Members of the Congress statistical data as follows:

Practicing physicians	299
Physicians practicing medicine and also another profession	11
Physicians who abandoned their profession	33
Graduates in medicine who did not practice	18

Total

Political affiliation	361
Democrats	166
Republicans	69
Whigs	30
Federalists	15
Jackson Democrats	6

Political affiliation—Continued

American Party	5
National Republicans	2
Independents	2
Liberal Democrats	1
Adams Democrats	1
Conservatives	1
Unionists	1
Anti-Federalists	1
Alliance Democrats	1
Anti-Nebraska Democrats	1
Total	302
Political affiliation not known	32
Members of the Continental Congress	27
Total	361

Physician Members of Congress by State

State:	Number of physicians
Alabama	4
Arkansas	3
California	2
Connecticut	7
Dakota	2

Physician Members of Congress by State—Continued

State:	Number of physicians
Delaware	7
Florida	1
Georgia	17
Idaho	1
Illinois	5
Indiana	7
Iowa	1
Kentucky	12
Louisiana	5
Maine	4
Maryland	16
Massachusetts	13
Michigan	5
Minnesota	2
Mississippi	4
Missouri	10
Montana	1
Nebraska	1
New Hampshire	14
New Jersey	30
New Mexico	1

Physician Members of Congress by States—
Continued

State:	Number of physicians
New York	48
North Carolina	11
Ohio	26
Oregon	1
Pennsylvania	52
Puerto Rico	1
Rhode Island	3
South Carolina	5
Tennessee	8
Texas	1
Utah	1
Vermont	3
Virginia	18
Washington	1
West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	3
Wyoming	1
Total	361

Physician Members of the Continental
Congress

1774	—
1775	4
1776	8
1777	7
1778	8
1779	6
1780	6
1781	6
1782	8
1783	11
1784	11
1785	8
1786	5
1787	4
1788	3

Representatives (and Delegates) in the
Congress

CONGRESS AND NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS	
1st (1789-91)	3
2d (1791-93)	3
3d (1793-95)	7
4th (1795-97)	4
5th (1797-99)	2
6th (1799-1801)	3
7th (1801-3)	8
8th (1803-5)	10
9th (1805-7)	13
10th (1807-9)	9
11th (1809-11)	10
12th (1811-13)	13
13th (1813-15)	13
14th (1815-17)	15
15th (1817-19)	12
16th (1819-21)	17
17th (1821-23)	15
18th (1823-25)	11
19th (1825-27)	16
20th (1827-29)	16
21st (1829-31)	15
22d (1831-33)	16
23d (1833-35)	16
24th (1835-37)	18
25th (1837-39)	13

Representatives (and Delegates) in the
Congress—Continued

26th (1839-41)	10
27th (1841-43)	11
28th (1843-45)	10
29th (1845-47)	8
30th (1847-49)	8
31st (1849-51)	7
32d (1851-53)	10
33d (1853-55)	15
34th (1855-57)	14
35th (1857-59)	10
36th (1859-61)	8
37th (1861-63)	7
38th (1863-65)	1
39th (1865-67)	5
40th (1867-69)	7
41st (1869-71)	9
42d (1871-73)	6
43d (1873-75)	6
44th (1875-77)	10
45th (1877-79)	10
46th (1879-81)	8
47th (1881-83)	6
48th (1883-85)	10
49th (1885-87)	13
50th (1887-89)	10
51st (1889-91)	5
52d (1891-93)	5
53d (1893-95)	6
54th (1895-97)	9
55th (1897-99)	10
56th (1899-1901)	6
57th (1901-3)	6
58th (1903-5)	4
59th (1905-7)	4
60th (1907-9)	5
61st (1909-11)	3
62d (1911-13)	5
63d (1913-15)	5
64th (1915-17)	2
65th (1917-19)	4
66th (1919-21)	4
67th (1921-23)	6
68th (1923-25)	4
69th (1925-27)	8
70th (1927-29)	5
71st (1929-31)	5
72d (1931-33)	5
73d (1933-35)	5
74th (1935-37)	5
75th (1937-39)	5
76th (1939-41)	10
77th (1941-43)	6
78th (1943-45)	7
79th (1945-47)	7
80th (1947-49)	7
81st (1949-51)	7
82d (1951-53)	6
83d (1953-55)	5
84th (1955-57)	5
85th (1957-59)	6
86th (1959-)	5

Senators

NAME AND SERVICE IN THE SENATE

1. Ball, Lewis Helsler	1903-05
2. Bateman, Ephraim	1826-29
3. Bibb, William Wyatt	1813-16
4. Borland, Solon	1848-53

Senators—Continued

5. Bradford, William	1793-96
6. Campbell, Alexander	1809-13
7. Chambers, Henry H.	1825-26
8. Condit, John	1803-17
9. Conover, Simon Barclay	1873-79
10. Copeland, Royal Samuel	1923-38
11. Deboe, William Joseph	1897-1903
12. Dennis, George Robertson	1873-79
13. Elmer, Jonathan	1789-91
14. Fitch, Graham Newel	1857-61
15. France, Joseph Irvin	1917-23
16. Gallinger, Jacob Harold	1891-1918
17. Gwin, William McKendree	1850-55, 1857-61
18. Hatfield, Henry Drury	1914-17
19. Jones, George	1807
20. Lane, Harry	1913-17
21. Latimer, Henry	1795-1801
22. Leib, Michael	1808-09
23. Linn, Lewis Fields	1833-43
24. Logan, George	1801-07
25. Miller, Homer Virgil Milton	1868-71
26. Mitchel, Charles Burton	1861
27. Mitchell, Samuel Latham	1804-09
28. Morrill, David Lawrence	1817-23
29. Naudain, Arnold	1830-36
30. Nourse, Amos	1857
31. Pinkney, William	1819-22
32. Spence, John Selby	1836-40
33. Storer, Clement	1817-19
34. Sturgeon, Daniel	1840-51
35. Tiffin, Edward	1807-09
36. Withers, Robert Enoch	1875-81

Bibliography

- Browning, William, "Men of Medical Training in Congress (1789-1910)," *Western Medical Times* (Denver, Colo.), XXXIX (1919), 2.
- Congressional Quarterly Almanac, Washington, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1945-1958.
- Haggard, H. W., "The Doctor in History," New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934.
- Letters of Benjamin Rush. Edited by L. H. Butterfield. Philadelphia, The Philosophical Society, 1951.
- Major, Ralph H., "A History of Medicine," Springfield, Ill., Ch. C. Thomas, (1954).
- Ripley, Jacob James, "The Beginning of the U.S. Army, 1783-1812," Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1947.
- Scheier, George Albert, "Chronological Table Showing Some Outstanding Events and Achievements of the Medical Department of the U.S. Army, 1755-1947." (Manuscript, Library of Congress).
- Thoms, Herbert, "Lyman Hall, Physician, Patriot, Signer," *Medical Journal and Record* (New Haven, Conn.) June 15, 1927.
- U.S. Congress, "Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950.
- U.S. Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1873-1958.
- U.S. Congress, "Official Congressional Directory for the Use of the U.S. Congress," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1944-1958.

Members of Congress who have attended medical school¹

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
1. Angel, William G. (1790-1858). Began the study of medicine in 1807. Lawyer.	New York	Adams, Democrat	19	House.
2. Bates, Martin Waltham (1787-1869). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Delaware	Jackson, Democrat	21-22	Do.
3. Chapman, John (1740-1840). Studied probably medicine as he called himself "practitioner of physics".	Pennsylvania	Democrat	1857-59	Senate.
4. Chilcott, Charles Miles (1828-91). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Territory of Colorado	Federalist	5	House.
5. Conger, James Lockwood (1805-76). Studied medicine. No trace of practicing. Lawyer.	Colorado	Republican	40	Delegate.
6. Cowan, Edgar (1815-85). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Michigan	Whig	1882-83	Senate.
7. Goodenow, Robert (1800-74). Studied medicine. Lawyer.	Pennsylvania	Whig	32	House.
8. Harrison, William Henry (1773-1841). President of the United States. Studied medicine.	Maline	Whig	1801-07	Senate.
	Territory Northwest of the River Ohio.		32	House.
	Ohio	Whig	6	Delegate.
9. Hickman, John (1810-75). Began the study of medicine but abandoned it for the study of law.	Pennsylvania	Whig	14-15	House.
10. Lawrence, William (1819-90). Studied medicine, 1841-43.	Pennsylvania	Democrat	1825-28	Senate.
	Ohio	Douglas Democrat	34-35	House.
		Republican	36	Do.
		Republican	37	Do.
		Republican	39-41, 43-44	Do.

Footnote at end of table.

Members of Congress who have attended medical school¹—Continued

Name	State	Political party	Congress	House or Senate
11. Manson, Mahlon Dickerson (1820-95). Studied medicine.	Indiana	Democrat	42	House
12. McKissock, Thomas (1790-1866). Studied medicine and law. Practiced law.	New York	Whig	31	Do.
13. Niles, Nathaniel (1741-1828). Studied law, medicine, and theology.	Vermont		2-3	Do.
14. Polinsett, Joel Robert (1779-1851). Studied medicine, attended the military school, and studied law.	South Carolina	Democrat	17-19	Do.
15. Read, Nathan (1759-1849). Studied medicine (?). Apothecary.	Massachusetts	Federalist	6-7	Do.
16. Ritchie, John (1831-87). Commenced the study of medicine but abandoned it for law.	Maryland	Democrat	42	Do.
17. Sharpe, Peter (data unknown). Nothing is known about his studies and practice of medicine. In 1807 he was a member of Columbia County Medical Society.	New York		18	Do.
18. Sibley, Joseph (1850-1927). Taught school and studied medicine.	Pennsylvania	Democrats and People's Party and Prohibitionists.	53	Do.
		Democrat	56	Do.
		Republican	57-59	Do.
		do.	45-46	Do.
		do.	52	Do.
		Democrat	15-18	Do.
		do.	30-32	Do.
19. Starin, John Henry (1825-1909). Began the study of medicine in 1842.	New York			
20. Stewart, Andrew (1836-1933). Studied medicine.	Pennsylvania			
21. Tracy, Albert Haller (1793-1839). Studied medicine but abandoned it.	New York	Democrat	15-18	Do.
22. Venable, Abraham Watkins (1799-1876). Studied medicine 2 years. Lawyer.	North Carolina	do.	30-32	Do.
23. Wade, Benjamin Franklin (1800-1878). Studied medicine, 1823-25. Lawyer.	Ohio	Whig Republican	1851-69	Senate.
24. Ware, Nicholas (1769-1824). Studied medicine for a time. Lawyer.	Georgia		1821-24	Do.
25. Wick, William Watson (1796-1858). Moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1816; taught school; studied medicine until 1818 and then law. Lawyer.	Indiana	Democrat	26, 29-30	House.

¹ Available information is not sufficient to indicate if those listed here completed their medical education and/or if they entered active practice.

Hallelujah! The Small Tobacco Farmer Has Been Saved for One More Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report the arrival of good news which will hearten everyone who is interested in seeing that people get a fair break in their efforts to make a living.

I was informed yesterday that the Department of Agriculture had abandoned a previous plan to cut burley tobacco quotas by 16 percent, and will keep the 1959 quotas at the present level for another year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great break for the small tobacco farmers in West Virginia, and throughout the burley belt. In fact, it will mean the difference between their survival and the danger of bankruptcy and possible starvation.

A few days ago I made a strong appeal for the small tobacco farmer in testimony before the Tobacco Division of the Department of Agriculture. I pointed out that the small tobacco farmer could scarcely be held responsible for creating any surplus—if indeed there were a surplus. Had this punitive measure been put into effect, it would have been roughly comparable to court-martialing a lowly private for the war crimes of his general.

Most recent policies of the Agriculture Department have tended to favor the big farmer, and conversely, to hamper the small farmer. Millions of small farmers have been driven off their farms. A cut in tobacco quotas not only would have hampered our small tobacco farmers—in some cases it would have driven him out of business altogether.

When I appeared before the tobacco hearing, I paraphrased a famous old tobacco advertising slogan, saying I did not want "L.S./M.F.T." to come to mean

"Let's starve mountaineer farmers of tobacco."

If I may paraphrase another tobacco slogan of more recent vintage, may I say that "They said it couldn't be done." But somehow, the Department of Agriculture was persuaded to change its mind and rescind this punitive decrease in allotments.

All of us interested in fairness and justice applaud the action taken, and we are truly thankful.

A Whole \$1,027 Per Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Roscoe Fleming in the Denver Post very graphically points out the misconceptions which are fostered by the present administration in regard to per capita farm income in our Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article, titled "A Whole \$1,027 Per Year," from the Denver Post of January 23, 1959:

THE GREEDY FARMER AGAIN—A WHOLE \$1,027 PER YEAR

(By Roscoe Fleming)

It is said that figures do not lie. However, statisticians do obfuscate, as aided by publicity men.

One of the finest alltime jobs of this kind is done by the staff of Mr. Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture.

For example, the Department of Agriculture recently got out a release implying that the farmers "never had it so good" as under Mr. Benson; and all at the expense of us city folk.

They reported that the average U.S. farmer is now enjoying a per capita yearly income of \$1,027, or the "highest in history."

And they added that net income per farm

operation is \$2,735 yearly, characterized as the second-highest of all time.

The serious flaw in Mr. Benson's happy statistics is that they make no comparison whatever with the status of other Americans.

To take one example, the farmer's "highest in history" per capita income of \$1,027 yearly is just about half of the 1957 national average income per person which was \$2,027.

In other words, the farmer as a group got paid for his work and investment at hardly more than half the average return of all Americans.

Second, the \$2,735 yearly net income per farm operation means that this was what the average farmer had left yearly to support his family on, buy shoes, schooling, and Cadillacs, after paying his business expenses.

How many city families get along on \$2,735 a year? Too many, perhaps. But the average city wage earner, salaried man, or businessman would regard \$52 a week as a starvation return, and that's what the farmer's net return averages.

Don't know about you, but I'm getting a little tired of having \$5,000 to \$50,000 city people encouraged to scold the \$2,735-a-year farmer for allegedly charging them too much for food.

Finally, the makeup of the farmer's net: As reported by Mr. Benson's statisticians, it is made up, one-third from jobs off the farm; one-third from Government payments; and only one-third from actual market returns for the food and the fiber which he provides to keep the Nation going.

I do not know any other group of Americans whose net income is figured on the basis of what they must do outside their regular vocation to make a living.

By the lowest estimate a million farm families, or more, keep going only because either husband or wife has a full-time extra job of some sort, maybe driving 20 miles each way daily to and from it.

Of course, lots of city families are two-job families too; but they do end up with somewhat more than \$2,735 yearly to show for it.

Second, that one-third of the farmer's net income from Government payments. Mostly these are designed to hold up prices at the farm and in the marketplace, which is exactly the wrong way to go about it.

But this statistic, more than any other, shows the grave illness of American agriculture. Yet, we are being continuously importuned to take away those supports, on the ground that the farmer is nothing more than a greedy oaf who is victimizing all the rest of us.

Specifically, that would reduce net income from farming to not more than \$1,000 per farm, and net income per farm person from farming to not more than \$400 a year.

A dandier way to promote poverty and to bring on depression, insecurity, and another 1929 can scarcely be imagined.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, for January 19, 1959, relating to the subject of a judge's earnest efforts to find some way to stem the rising tide of juvenile delinquency.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that for some years I have known Common Pleas Judge Jay S. McDevitt, whose new plan for helping to assuage the problem of juvenile delinquency is discussed in this thoughtful editorial. As an attorney, I have argued cases in his court and I know him to be a prudent, kind, and extremely intelligent jurist. I know that he, like many another conscientious judge, has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the problem of juvenile delinquency.

We all understand that there is no one answer to the growing problem of crime with which our Nation is plagued, whether the crime be committed by young people or by old, hardened criminals. There is much to be learned about the subject, and how society will deal with this increasing problem. And there is much being left undone that could be done, under the laws now in existence, to stem the crime wave. I am happy and proud that Judge McDevitt is striving to find some answers, and I am just as happy to know that there are alert editors who will pay him the tribute he deserves, as this fine editorial does.

The editorial follows:

HOLDS PROMISE

Numerous attempts to solve the problem of teenage delinquency have been made. Few have been successful judging by reports on crime.

Some have failed because they were too drastic and some because they were too lenient.

A program, designed to deter young people from committing the numerous crimes that have been committed in the community recently was announced from the bench the other day by Common Pleas Judge Jay S. McDevitt when he was called upon to pass sentence on four young men, all under 20 years of age.

They had been indicted by the grand jury, 3 on 11 counts of breaking and entering, and 1 on a count of grand larceny. All had pleaded guilty.

Judge McDevitt announced that he had discarded the "plain probationary" method of handling such cases and had devised one of his own.

The four were placed on probation for 6 months under unusual conditions.

They were ordered to answer, without help, five questions which he submitted:

Did you know you were doing wrong when you committed this crime?

Why did you commit this crime?

Are you sorry you committed this crime or just sorry you got caught?

Will you obey the laws from now on and why?

What would you think of a person who would steal from you under like or similar circumstances wherein you were apprehended?

The questions must be answered and submitted to the court in writing within 30 days, must be accompanied by a statement, sworn to before a notary public, that they are their own.

Further provisions of the probation, include:

They must be at home by 9 p.m. every night of the six-month period.

They must not drink intoxicating liquor. They must file monthly reports with Probation Officer Arthur L. Warman.

They must learn the ten commandments and recite them to the court within 30 days.

They must accompany the sheriff or his deputies to the Mansfield Reformatory or the Ohio Penitentiary to see what they still might face.

And the judge sternly warned them that the slightest violation of the provisions of their parole will mean sentences to the reformatory.

Judge McDevitt's program is neither too drastic nor too lenient.

He has imposed terms which are entirely reasonable, but which, at the same time, enable officials to keep tab on their habits, which should make them consider their illegal conduct and make them reflect on what is in store for them should they disobey the court's orders.

The four are at an age when they should be starting their careers and preparing to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

They have been given the opportunity to make a start in that direction. It is not too late.

Judge McDevitt's program holds promise.

In Memoriam: October 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following text of a statement which appeared in the Michigan Daily, the official student newspaper of the University of Michigan, a few months ago. This statement, written by the Hungarian students at that university, appeals again to the American people not to forget the treachery of the Soviet Communists and the millions of enslaved peoples still living behind the Iron Curtain:

HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION—IN MEMORIAM: OCTOBER 23, 1956

Two years ago today the people of Hungary rose against their Communist rulers who had reduced the country to a mere colony of Soviet imperialism in servile obedience to their Kremlin masters.

With one blow the meticulously constructed legend of "people's democracies"

Marching toward the blissful goal of communism was shattered. Never will we forget that magnificent display of national unity, of millions of Hungarians fighting with one will for freedom, for independence.

From the old, retired lady teacher who overnight became an expert in fixing Molotov cocktails to the 14-year-old schoolboy who left a football game to play cowboys and Indians with Soviet tanks, from the docile elderly professor of philosophy who went sharpshooting on AVH henchmen and their Soviet pals to the frail, dark-haired girl confronting an armored car column with a single weapon, the Hungarian flag in her hand, holding it high until crushed to death; every one of us has contributed his or her modest share.

Incredible as it seems for our sophisticated century, the romantic pages of oldtime history books came alive. With banners and barricades, songs and pamphlets, rifles and machineguns, students and workers, peasants and poets challenged the massed military might of the Red Army—and a miracle took place, the people gained six unforgettable days of freedom. Apparently, these 6 days proved too short a time for the United Nations, to officially acknowledge the country's regained independence and the declared neutrality of the revolutionary Hungarian Government (recognized, incidentally, as the legal government of the country by the Russians during the short period of armistice talks between the two countries). Left to themselves in a world preoccupied with the Suez crisis, and their supreme commander lured to a trap, under the pretense of negotiating the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian soil, the revolutionaries fought to the last bullet against the overwhelming strength of 25 Soviet armored divisions.

When the last hope of UN action faded, fearful of Communist revenge, unable to face their final loss of freedom, tens of thousands fled to the West leaving everything behind.

Those of us who were fortunate enough to be accepted by this country have experienced genuine good will, utmost willingness to help, and opportunity for all to found a new existence in the free world. For this, on this occasion, we would like to extend our gratitude.

As residents of the most powerful democracy, and as ambassadors by fate of our fellow Hungarians whose voice is so effectively silenced by the cruelest tyranny in the history of mankind, we feel obliged to draw the attention of our fellow students to some facts of major importance.

1. We wish to refute certain cleverly disguised, insinuations, manifestations of clandestine Communist propaganda, according to which the October 1956 revolution had been a merely nationalistic uprising against foreign oppression. Our revolt was primarily aimed against the Hungarian Communist regime with the aim of securing the basic human rights of the individual citizen.

2. Millions are living today behind the Iron Curtain under a dictatorship whose callous brutality is unimaginable to those of you enjoying a democratic way of life. These millions have all but lost their faith in the Western democracies as well as in the United Nations because of their failure to come in any form to the aid of Hungary after her victory over the Soviet oppressors.

3. Anybody having to deal with Communist governments must realize that their word, like that of Hitler, is not worth the paper it is written on, and that in no way and under no circumstances can they be trusted to carry out their obligations if and when they find it more advantageous to do contrarywise.

4. While the West is painfully trying to maintain peaceful coexistence with com-

munism alias Soviet imperialism, for hundreds of millions this peaceful coexistence is tantamount to total economic, political, social and moral imprisonment with torture chambers and execution squads extinguishing human lives day by day. Who dares to assert that all this is not permitted to continue with the tacit acceptance of the free world?

HUNGARIAN STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Israel Metes Justice in Kafr Kasim Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the young State of Israel has set an example in meting out punishment to its citizens who were responsible for the Kafr Kasim incident of 1956. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the October 27, 1958, issue of Congress Weekly:

JUSTICE IS DONE

The specter of Kafr Kasim, the scene of the shocking murder of 43 Israeli Arabs on October 29, 1956, the day the Sinai campaign was launched, has for the past 2 years haunted the national conscience of Israel and has occasioned widespread uneasiness among Jews everywhere. The atrocity was an inexcusable accompaniment to a military action ultimately recognized by the world as both moral and justified. If left unpunished, it could only expose the callousness of a people whose heritage and traditions enjoin against insensibility to wrongs.

An attitude of moral paralysis, however, has not prevailed nor was it ever countenanced. The outraged community of Israel, from the Prime Minister down, voiced its horror upon disclosure of the brutal facts and demanded that those responsible be brought to justice. Now, after months of testimony in a trial that lasted almost a year, a special military court sitting in Jerusalem has found eight border policemen guilty of murder for their part in the Kafr Kasim killings and sentenced them to long prison terms. Thus, in a dramatic application of the ancient Biblical injunction to "put away the evil from the midst of thee," Israel has again given evidence of her decision to abide by principles of law and honor.

The court's verdict cannot, of course, erase the memory of an act whose wantonness runs counter to every genuine Jewish instinct; the innocent blood of the murdered villagers will always be a stain on the nation's honor. Nevertheless, by the court's courageous action in assigning guilt, in addition to the generous compensation previously paid to the families of the victims, such amends as are possible have been made. Moreover, a nation's shame and horror have been publicly admitted, and this in itself is something remarkable.

Incidents such as the one at Kafr Kasim are not unknown throughout our troubled world, but rarely do they arouse the same degree of impassioned outrage as that vented by the Israeli public. Though officially regrettable, localized atrocities, minor massacres and the like have come to be regarded as inevitable consequences of the tensions of our time. That the innocent, caught helplessly in the path of the crossfire, must

suffer an occasional, incidental injustice is accepted as a cruel but unavoidable fact. Governments rarely take the trouble to make full investigations, nor do they seek to punish the guilty. A justification—or at least a rationalization—is handily supplied and that is where the matter usually ends.

Israel, too, could have explained away the Kafr Kasim massacre in routine fashion. It had occurred at a time of national tension when a certain number of trigger-happy fingers could be expected, to be subsequently forgiven. Arab border villages had been placed under curfew and the villagers returning from the fields, though unaware of the curfew, were in technical violation of the law and the orders were to shoot anyone caught breaking curfew.

Nevertheless, despite these opportunities to be lenient in judgment and notwithstanding the excellent service records of the defendants, the court held fast and found the policemen guilty of having killed the 43 men, women and children deliberately and without any justification. As the presiding judge reminded the court, officers in other Arab villages had received the same orders as those given to the patrol at Kafr Kasim, but had interpreted them differently. What happened at Kafr Kasim must therefore be regarded as murder in cold blood.

In her insistence that justice be done, in avoiding an easy way out of a moral dilemma, Israel has set an example that other nations might well emulate.

A Salute to the 4-H Clubs and Their Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the Kentucky 4-H champions were named and it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned that Joseph Wesley Sprague, 18, of Sturgis, Union County, Ky., had been selected as the champion in agriculture in the 1958 4-H Club achievement contest, while a young lady from another section of Kentucky took honors in home economics.

Joe W. Sprague is typical of the young men in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, who have consistently taken prize after prize in agricultural contests throughout the State. During the 9 years Joe has been a member of the 4-H Club he has undertaken projects in the following categories: Baby beef, labor service, electric, tractor, leadership, appearance and grooming. His baby-beef project has won him numerous blue ribbons and cash awards; and a profit of \$3,175 earned from this project has been set aside for his college education. In addition to his 4-H Club work, Joe, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Sprague, takes a keen interest and an active part in various school and church affairs. He has a 12-year perfect attendance record at Sunday school.

While Joe Sprague is certainly to be commended for his outstanding achievements in agriculture, we must not forget

or neglect the many dedicated people concerned with the development of our youth who make such achievements possible. We are indeed fortunate in having in the Second Congressional District a great many intelligent and energetic men and women who as 4-H Club leaders, agricultural teachers, county and home demonstration agents, and advisers to the Future Farmers of America and the Future Homemakers of America play such a vital part in inspiring, guiding, and instructing our youth in agricultural pursuits. When so many of our young people are leaving the land for the so-called glamour of the city, the selfless and untiring efforts of these persons in demonstrating the benefits to be gained from farming cannot be overestimated. It is to these leaders that we owe a deep sense of gratitude for having instilled in our young men and women an appreciation of the rewards and satisfaction to be achieved from a life devoted to farming, for as Thomas Jefferson said, "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God."

Fame of Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a well deserved tribute to Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick, Middlesex County, Mass., which appeared in the Lynn, Mass., Telegram-News on January 22, 1959:

FAME OF FITZPATRICK

The appointment of Middlesex County Sheriff Howard Fitzpatrick as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson committee by Democratic Party leaders serves notice that the party is not pausing in its forward march to hold, in 1960, the elective offices they won in the last election.

A close associate of the late former Gov. Paul A. Dever, Fitzpatrick succeeds Governor Dever as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson fund-raising committee.

His unanimous choice by party leaders to succeed Governor Dever, virtually places him in the commanding post of director of important party functions on both the State and national level.

The fame of Fitzpatrick, energetic, hard working and brilliant battler for the Democratic cause that he is, extends beyond the political boundaries of the Bay State.

National Democratic policy-makers credit him for being responsible for the changing over of Middlesex County, which was once considered the greatest Republican stronghold in the State, to a solid Democratic section.

Governor Dever first brought Sheriff Fitzpatrick into public service by appointing him Middlesex County sheriff to fill a vacancy. He was elected sheriff in 1950, being the first Democratic sheriff ever elected in the county. In 1956 he was reelected with the largest vote ever given to a candidate in the county.

Through Fitzpatrick's political endeavors, every major elective office in the county is now held by a Democrat.

Noted as an outstanding benefactor to humanity, a business man of extraordinary talents and an astute politician, Fitzpatrick's appointment as chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson committee will redound to the great benefit of the Democratic Party as a whole, both State and nationwide.

He will bring to the party new faces, new ideas, and dynamic initiative. He exemplifies the qualities of leadership that are so much a part of the modern Democratic Party.

Blast at Arizona Meant for Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. RHODES or Arizona. Mr. Speaker, since Arizona became a State in 1912, it has always voted for the winning candidate for President of the United States. In fact, Arizona has been a more dependable political bellwether than has the great State of Maine, about which it has been said, "As Maine goes, so goes the Nation."

I represent one county in Arizona. This county has a population of over 550,000. In it is located the city of Phoenix, which has a population in excess of 350,000. It would hardly qualify then as a sparsely settled area of the country.

Therefore, when I heard a well-known commentator on television say that Arizona is sparsely populated, is an undeveloped State, and cast doubts upon Arizona's political erudition, I was somewhat taken aback. Apparently so was my friend Bert Fireman, whose column "Under the Sun" has appeared in the Phoenix Gazette for many years. I include herewith Mr. Fireman's column of Wednesday, January 21, 1959:

BLAST AT ARIZONA MEANT FOR SENATOR
(By Bert Fireman)

There probably are as many ways of falling in love with Arizona as there are persons possessed of the bright spark of individualism. Ordinarily affection for our sunshine and beauties comes through association. After a person has been here a while—whether he or she came for a vacation, as a health seeker, on business, or was sent here by Uncle Sam for training—he finds the joy of living here leads to the desire to remain. Those who go away soon want to return.

But there are also individuals who can so project their emotions that they can fall in love with a star in the sky, with a princess in a fairy tale, or with glamorous accounts of a sunny land as reported in the public prints. A lady, who lives in the East, has fallen in love with Arizona through reading the Phoenix Gazette. She hasn't explained how she happened to subscribe, and I would not look a gift horse in the mouth by asking. It is almost enough that she has adopted Arizona although she has never been here and has no immediate plans to immigrate. Like the bullfight aficionado who lives in Brooklyn, or the resident of Montpelier, Vt., who knows the addresses of the Hollywood stars, she enjoys this escape from the realities of her own life.

Well, she doesn't always enjoy it. Some time ago she had her television set turned

on. It being the Sunday after the general election, she heard and saw a program called "The Great Game of Politics." She sat there with great interest as Eric Sevareid and a panel of newspaper columnists reviewed the big upsets of the week.

She listened to their erudite comments without unusual response until one of the panelists started discussing Arizona. Say, said our fair listener to herself, that's my State. What she heard turned to gall. She just couldn't believe it. Lest she had misunderstood, she got in touch with the TV station and some time later was sent a copy of what had been said. She had heard correctly.

Miss Doris Fleeson, one of the best-known political columnists in the country, had made three statements (in commenting on the election) that my friend insists were unfair.

Miss Fleeson's first damaging statement was this: "Arizona is virtually meaningless in this land." One of the other panelists disagreed, saying Arizona residents wouldn't agree with that.

Undismayed, Miss Fleeson continued: "Arizona is sparsely populated, an undeveloped State relative to the trend that appeared . . . It seems to me that it's idle to say that Arizona represents anything significant . . ."

The lady who loves Arizona began to dislike Miss Fleeson. She wrote to me: "Can't you get the chamber of commerce to protest to Miss Fleeson and her syndicate? Why should she be allowed to slander Arizona? Who does she think she is, anyhow? I'd like to punch her."

Newspaper people are supposed to defend their colleagues. It just happens that I am acquainted with Miss Fleeson, but I don't know, in justice to either of us, that we are like peas in a pod. She can defend herself.

Doris is probably the most articulate and partisan defender of the Truman administration who still has an audience. She is married to Adm. Dan Kimball, former Secretary of Navy under Truman, now head of Aerojet, a California subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber Co., which produces rockets.

Miss Fleeson has visited Arizona at least twice that I know about in recent months. Both times she seemed to like our sunshine and warmth. But she is rabid, as Truman Fair Dealers can be, in her political opinions, and particularly zeroes-in on Senator BARRY GOLDWATER whenever she has the chance. Being an adept political columnist, she makes opportunities when none are readily available. He is one of her favorite whipping boys.

Actually, her comments about Arizona were not directed against Arizona, but was her way of venting displeasure over our State's choice of Senator GOLDWATER in the election. She meant that Arizona's decision to reelect BARRY was virtually meaningless against the national trend and jettisoned other Republicans. She doesn't like the way Arizona voted, so churlishly calls the results here "insignificant".

She is entitled to that opinion, of course, no matter how wrong it may be.

A Poem by Fred W. Cole of Upland, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I insert in the Appendix

of the Record, by request of Mr. Paul L. Hillsamer, of Marion, Ind., a poem written in 1938 by a young man 18 years of age, Fred W. Cole, of Upland, Ind., which is as follows:

Land of the dreamers where dreams come true.

These are my dreams and hopes for you;
Always thy government's form to be
An ever evolving democracy,
With thy people empowered to safeguard all
With initiative, referendum and recall.
May the spirit that prompts all law agree
With the Golden Rule and equality.
In the love of peace may our spirits pause
And weigh the merits of every cause.

And for sake of harmony let us seek
To avert strife, turning the cheek;
But never being too proud to fight;
If the need arise, in the cause of right:
For only through courage is progress made,
So, be ye peaceful but unafraid.
May thy economic creed aspire
To a living standard ever higher,
To the end that abundance be shared by all
Be the citizen rich, poor, great, or small.

May your modes of travel be good and cheap
That the lowliest citizen may keep
In touch with Nature's scenic thrills,
Waterfalls, geysers, springs and hills,
Oceans, mountains, and giant trees,
Canyons, glaciers, and sights like these,
That lift men's spirits and make them grow
Tuned with creation's wondrous show.
May the cities be free from ugly scars
Of crime and poverty, all that mars
The civic beauty, and destroys wealth,
Lowers manhood and injures health,
Like crowded tenements, filth, disease,
Graft, corruption, and things like these
That serve no purpose of worthy need
Racial hatred and narrow creed,
Of religious bigot whose dark-age rot
Blights and embitters, we need them not.
May men have courage to put in place
Facts of science and deeds of grace,
That America may ever stand
In peace and plenty—the promised land.

The Responsibility of Maintaining Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, early last September I had the privilege to attend the seventh conference of the World Parliamentarians Association in France. There were parliamentarians from 28 countries in attendance. The aims of our meeting were expressed through a charter which we adopted at Versailles on September 8. My remarks moving the adoption of the Charter of Versailles are, under a previous consent, included below along with the text of the charter:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, THE PALACE OF VERSAILLES, SEPTEMBER 8, 1958

Mr. President, distinguished Lord Attlee, and distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be permitted to move adoption of the Charter of Versailles.

Although I am the only Member of the United States Congress present here today,

you may be sure that there are many other Members who agree with our aims and who will help attain them.

My 460,000 constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon on the westernmost side of the United States join with the peoples of the world in demanding that the rule of law replaces the rule of force before it is too late.

While we must dream, must look ahead beyond seemingly impassable difficulties of history, languages, and culture, we must also be skeptics. Here we are in a beautiful historic palace, the scene of many crucial decisions in the fate of great nations. Is our Charter of Versailles a scrap of paper which will rate not even the sneer of a latter-day Caesar?

Paper and ink alone will not overcome greed and fear. The hour is too late for mere gestures, however pretty. This charter is a call to action, particular action, or it is worse than nothing.

In the 85th U.S. Congress, recently adjourned, I joined with my colleagues in voting to appropriate some \$40 billion to keep my country strong. I am proud to be an officer in the Air Force Reserve. But, along with you I yearn for an end to the waste, the futility, the catastrophe of war.

What do we do to make our solemn act today meaningful?

Here are my recommendations, humbly presented for your consideration both as dreamers and as skeptics.

First, the call of this charter should be presented immediately to the chief executive and the legislative body of every nation. They must decide. The people of the world want their affirmation without delay. Specifically it is my hope that the decision will be to consider these vital matters at a United Nations Charter Revision Conference in 1959.

In my country we have a special problem. The Secretary of State holds that such matters are not within "the proper scope of the review conference." This means that the President or the Congress must overrule Mr. Dulles or Mr. Dulles has to change his mind or, regrettably in my opinion, the conference must be held outside the United Nations.

My intention is to present a copy of this charter to President Eisenhower directly upon my return home and to ask that he give his opinion about it and that he consider changing the policy laid down by his Secretary of State.

Both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are clearly on record endorsing world law as the only road to world peace. Less than 2 months ago in Washington the President declared that the attainment of peace required that nations make mutual concessions of sovereignty so that law could become the basis for settling their disputes.

To gain universal and enthusiastic acceptance of the aims set forth in the charter will require strong delegations of this association in every country. In the face of ignorance and prejudice this will not be easy. It may be that the first conference, because of the reluctance of some or even all of the big powers, will be a foothills conference of the other nations, a step which I believe would lead the peoples in the nonparticipating nations to demand favorable policies from their governments.

The second line of action has to do with devising and agreeing on safeguards so as to prevent one nation from getting the advantage over another or of interfering in the internal affairs of any nation in matters unrelated to world peace.

Of course the superb book by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn immediately comes to mind. They have intelligently proposed the necessary amendments for strengthening the United Nations Charter and in a form most convenient for profitable discus-

sions. The name of the book is "World Peace Through World Law."

Our lawyers and parliamentarians are up to this task. Already the American Bar Association and the International Bar Association have made great contributions and are determined to advance steadily.

The third and last line of action I suggest relates to what is known as public relations. The aims of this charter must be sold to people who thirst for peace but are themselves properly skeptical and somewhat disillusioned. The Clark-Sohn recommendations should be discussed widely, especially by women's organizations like the League of Women Voters in my country, by youth groups and by religious bodies everywhere.

Your signature on this charter, fellow parliamentarians, means that you will use your best efforts along these interrelated lines of action, political, legal and public relations. The winds that blow radioactive debris over all the earth will whisk away mere scraps of paper.

Finally, a word about the urgency of action. The massive force of the new weapons is a banal subject. The possibility of the total extinction of the human race bores many people. The human mind rebels at concentrating very long upon the prospect of collective death. Many are comforted by the so-called balance of terror and I, myself, believe that the instinct of self-preservation greatly diminishes the likelihood of intentional atomic war.

The danger, as I see it, is that given our present policies we will certainly stumble into the all-out atomic war. Three nations today have, each of them, enough nuclear power to end human life or at least human civilization. Almost all of these weapons are ready for instant dispatch and detonation. And who controls these myriad delivery systems and detonations? Who but error-prone human beings like you and me, imperfect entities who often make mistakes no matter what precautions are taken. We panic, we get drunk, our minds snap, we miscalculate, we misunderstand, we are misguidedly idealistic.

The real danger for mankind is that an accidental or unauthorized explosion will, perhaps later today even, trigger the all-out war. It not today, in my opinion, sometime soon. Errare est humanum now just as in the days of Rome. The difference is that they didn't have these awesome weapons.

Such an explosion will lend itself to misinterpretation as being the precursor of an attack. There will be no witnesses to interrogate, no twisted wreckage to examine. There will be many pictures on TV and in the papers, stories in the papers and on the radio, driving home the horror and, you may be sure, repeatedly and fearfully raising the question "Is this terrible explosion the first of many?"

An explosion of this sort means instant full alert for our Strategic Air Command and for our other Armed Forces. Our intelligence agencies would report to the President forthwith that there was no evidence of it being part of an attack by the Soviet Union. But 20 minutes later or less the Soviet Union will go on maximum alert, just as would the United States were the circumstances reversed and the tensions as critical as they are today. Decision times grow shorter daily. Ballistic missiles, unlike manned bombers, cannot be recalled. There is no way to determine with reasonable certainty the difference between a military alert which is entirely defensive and one which precedes an offensive.

In these times of dread a small match in the form of an accidental or unauthorized nuclear explosion can light the short fuse of disastrous war. The question is this: Are we smart enough to survive? There is much reason for doubt but none for despair.

What parent would not readily give up his place in the lifeboat of a sinking ship to save his child? The stakes are no less, but the choice is not yet clear to many parents.

The alternative to one world or peace through law is no world at all for anybody.

Mr. President, as dreamer, skeptic, and parent, I move the adoption of the Charter of Versailles.

CHARTER OF VERSAILLES

The point has been reached in human history when the peoples, parliaments, and governments of the world, must abolish the evil of war, fraught as that evil is with the possibility of the total extinction of the human race.

The peoples, parliaments, and governments of the world must decide to set up a world authority charged with the responsibility of maintaining permanent peace.

The world authority must be endowed with the necessary powers and means to carry out this task.

We, parliamentarians of many nations, met in the Galerie des Batailles in the Palace of Versailles, on this 8th day of September, 1958, dedicate ourselves to this end.

We solemnly promise that, through our parliaments and our governments, we shall seek urgently to realize our aim in order that the men, women, and children of the world may be saved from the destruction which threatens them.

We call upon the prime ministers, foreign secretaries, and governments who accept the principles underlying this policy, to convene a world conference of peoples, parliamentarians, and governments, to consider how there should be established: A world assembly to enact world law in order to secure and maintain permanent peace; an executive to administer these world laws; international courts of justice with compulsory jurisdiction in all matters of dispute concerning these world laws; a world police force to enforce world laws against all those who commit, or threaten to commit, a breach of these world laws, and thus make possible universal, simultaneous, and complete disarmament of all nations.

Demise of Government Contractors by Bureaucratic Fiat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Commercial Law Journal of September 1958.

The article was written by my longtime friend, Solomon Dimond, a member of the District of Columbia and New York bars:

DEMISE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS BY BUREAUCRATIC FIAT

Government contractors, financially sound in every respect, have been indirectly forced out of business without any legal basis by the actions taken by Government officials. The subsequent liquidations are the byproduct of these arbitrary and ill-advised actions. As soon as the contracting officer concludes that there is a sum of money due the Government, he is required by internal regulations to follow prescribed procedures. These

procedures are designed to withhold sufficient moneys due the contractor to protect the Government.

If a contractor has one or more Government contracts and, in the opinion of the contracting officer, it has defaulted on one of its contracts, the contracting officer is obligated to protect the Government for its possible damage claims. This is done by withholding funds due for materials delivered to and accepted by the Government, either on the defaulted contract or on any other Government contract. These alleged damage claims can be very substantial since in the event of default the Government reserves the right to reprocure by negotiation. It can claim that time is of the essence and instead of going into the open market, agree to pay any sum that it considers necessary to get the materials which it needs within the delivery requirements of the original contract. In one case, the original contract unit price was \$6.75, after a default termination, the Government negotiated a replacement at a unit price of \$16.11 and claimed damages of about \$160,000. Apart from the fact that the contractor does not get paid for its work in process on the defaulted contract, any other moneys owed it by the Government, regardless of the source, are subject to withholding. Government contractors who allegedly owe money to the Government are placed on a consolidated hold up list which requires all other Government agencies and instrumentalities to withhold funds due the contractor to the extent of its indebtedness to the Government.

Government contracts have certain standard clauses which make them unique. The standard defaults clause gives the contracting officer the authority to make findings of fact that the contractor is in default and the standard disputes contract states that any findings of fact made by the contracting officer shall be final unless an appeal is taken within 30 days after the making of the findings. Despite the fact that an appeal is taken and the findings are not final, the Government nevertheless proceeds to collect the moneys allegedly due it.

Thus, as a practical matter, the Government pre-judges the issue and withholds the moneys due the contractor without regard to the consequences of the withholdings. It is quite obvious that if the sums withheld by the Government are relatively substantial, companies could be forced out of business and into insolvency and liquidation. While the contractor has some remedies, it has no remedy as of right by which it can obtain the release of its funds before it is finally determined whether the decision of the contracting officer was fraudulent or capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

The time factors in the remedies available to the contractor are not within its control. Firstly, the contractor has 30 days' time in which to file its notice of appeal. The contractor can either file its complaint with its notice of appeal or within 30 days thereafter. After the appeal is filed with the contracting officer, there is no mandatory time requirement by which he must forward the appeal to the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals. In one situation, the contracting officer held the notice of appeal for 72 days, and this period was not considered unreasonable by the U.S. Court of Claims. If after the appeal is taken, the contracting officer feels that he wants to make revised findings, he merely does so, and again the contractor has the privilege of filing an appeal. Thereafter, the Government has 30 days time in which to file its answer, or, if that time is not sufficient, then, as a practical matter, it may obtain on a unilateral basis as much additional time as it may re-

quire from the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.

Depending upon the complexities of the case, the appeal procedures can easily take from 1 year to 3 years.¹ If the decision of the Board is adverse, the contractor may institute suit in the U.S. district courts or the U.S. Court of Claims if the amount involved is less than \$10,000, and if more than \$10,000 is involved, suit must be brought in the U.S. Court of Claims.² While either the Board or a court might determine that the contracting officer was wrong, years can go by during which period the contractor's funds can be withheld.³ If it is finally determined that the contracting officer was wrong, the contractor can obtain neither interest on the moneys withheld nor damages for the losses sustained by the contractor as a result of the withholding of its funds. There is little solace for a contractor who has been put out of business to be advised that the contracting officer's actions were wrong and that he has the privilege of proving his claim for damages as of the date the contract was improperly terminated.

While the heads of the Departments involved can grant relief, as a practical matter such relief is rarely given without the intervention of Members of Congress, particularly those Members who can act through one of the cognizant congressional committees. There are instances in which funds have been released under congressional pressure when a showing could be made that a contractor would be forced into bankruptcy.

It is unfortunate that Government officials are not more concerned with the irreparable harm caused by precipitate and ill-advised decisions. Unless Government procurement authorities are willing to write appropriate regulations protecting contractors from the arbitrary withholding of their funds, it is up to the Congress to enact suitable legislation to prohibit the withholding of a contractor's funds until it is finally determined that the Government is entitled to withhold.

¹ There are a few cases which have taken less than a year.

² It generally takes a minimum of 18 months in the U.S. Court of Claims to get a final decision.

³ In one instance, the contract was defaulted on Feb. 24, 1951, and the contractor forced into bankruptcy. The issues have been in litigation since that time.

Unjustified Oil Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. No problem has been brought more forcefully or more repeatedly to the Members of the 86th Congress than has the problem of inflation and the need for holding the line in our price structure. The President of the United States has made this the major theme in two of the messages which he has submitted to this body, the state of the Union message and the economic report of the President.

In his state of the Union message Mr. Eisenhower said:

We must avoid any contribution to inflationary processes, which could disrupt sound growth in our economy. Prices have dis-

played a welcome stability in recent months and, if we are wise and resolute, we will not tolerate inflation in the years to come. * * * Inflation can be prevented. But this demands statesmanship on the part of business and labor leaders and of Government at all levels.

In his economic report the President touched on the same line:

Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices in the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically. * * * Self-discipline and restraint are essential if reasonable stability of prices is to be reached within the framework of the free competitive institutions on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare.

Among the commodities which are essential to our modern civilization, in the rural areas no less than in the urban and industrial areas, is oil, especially oil for heating purposes. I have been deeply disturbed, Mr. Speaker, to learn that in sections of the 32d Congressional District of New York a wholesale oil price increase has gone into effect within recent days. In the village of Cooperstown, N.Y., the famous home of baseball, the major oil companies have just instituted an increase of one-half a cent per gallon in No. 2 oil, boosting the total price on this commodity to 16.4 cents a gallon, the highest in history. A similar increase of one-half a cent per gallon has gone into effect in Gloversville, and a similar increase has been authorized for Schenectady and Oneonta.

In Cooperstown alone it has been estimated that this increase will cost consumers about \$7,000 during the next 2 winter months, when the necessity for oil is at its height.

I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time this price increase has gone into effect for individual home consumers, that the oil companies have negotiated an arrangement with the Otsego County Courthouse to deliver oil at a price which is a cent a gallon less than Cooperstown dealers are themselves required to pay for the same product.

Let me make clear, Mr. Speaker, that this increase has not resulted from action by the local dealers, but has been dictated by the oil companies themselves, and without any justification. As a result the dealers are as hard pressed as the consumers, because their margin of profit has been forced down.

Irresponsible action of this kind is contrary to the call made by the President, and is the type of thing that could most directly contribute to the kind of runaway inflation we all abhor.

Because inflation, Mr. Speaker, is something that can come upon us gradually step by step, without our fully realizing it, I believe that this unjustified price increase ought to be fully explored immediately, and I have therefore referred the facts concerning it both to the congressional committee which is investigating all aspects of so-called administered prices and to the Justice Department for possible anti-trust action on their part.

We in the Congress and in the Nation must act promptly and together to pre-

vent such unjustified increases and to hold the line against inflation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial from the Freeman's Journal, of Cooperstown, one of the oldest regular weekly newspapers in our Nation. The editorial appeared on January 21, 1959:

UNJUSTIFIED OIL PRICE INCREASE

Last week, the major companies which supply Cooperstown dealers with fuel oil announced a half-cent-a-gallon price increase, which local dealers of necessity have had to pass on to their customers because of the small margin of profit per gallon on which they operate. The dealers did not—and rarely do—add on anything extra for themselves. In fact their profit per gallon is just about the same now as it was 10 years ago. They've been able to maintain this per gallon profit, despite increasing costs, because of a higher business volume over the past 10 years.

Last week's price rise, initiated by the oil companies, ran the price of No. 2 oil to 16.4 cents a gallon, the highest in history here. There was no justification for this increase—it simply is a matter of price gouging on the part of the major producers who seem to operate on the theory that if you can come up with some excuse—no matter how flimsy—you've got a moral right to charge whatever the traffic will bear under a given set of conditions.

This time the oil companies have the flimsiest of excuses. They plead that this winter has been colder than usual so far, and that demand for oil has outstripped their refinery capacity. They've had to go into the open market, they say, and pay independent producers a premium for their product in order to get enough oil to meet this demand. That's a lot of bunk. They may have to do that to cover a small percentage of their requirements, but this percentage would be so small that a major producer would have to search and search for a legitimate excuse to boost the price by even a tenth of a cent a gallon, much less five times this amount.

Another thing that sticks in our craw about this oil company piracy, is this—how come a major producer can deliver oil to the Otsego County courthouse at a price which is about a cent a gallon under the price Cooperstown dealers have to pay for the same basic product? This means that the county pays about \$60 a tank truck load less for its oil than local dealers pay for the same amount.

Why should it cost \$60 more to deliver a truckload of oil from a terminal (Albany or Utica or Binghamton) to the storage plants of two local dealers only a few hundred feet from the courthouse, and to the third dealer who is less than a mile from the courthouse? The consumer could use this penny-a-gallon saving, and we're sure the local dealers would pass it on to him.

This latest half-cent increase by the oil companies is going to cost Cooperstown consumers about \$7,000 during the next 2 winter months.

We would like to emphasize that this oil price increase has been none of the doing of your local dealers. They aren't going to make any more money out of it. In fact, their percentage of profit has dropped.

Don't get mad at him. But if this latest price increase makes you want to sound off, well, go ahead and sound off—but to the oil companies, who are the culprits. Your local dealer will forward your letter to the company if you can't find the latter's address.

Pioneering a New School Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Star on January 25, 1959. It deals with that all-important subject of education and how the city of San Angelo, Tex., is attempting to improve its system. The article is as follows:

PIONEERING A NEW SCHOOL PLAN

(By G. K. Hodenfield)

SAN ANGELO, TEX.—This city of 60,000 on the west Texas plains thinks it has the best public school system in the United States.

That's a strong statement, even for Texas, and it begs for proof. San Angelo thinks it has proof aplenty.

For more than a year critics of education in the country have been demanding more academic achievement and less life adjustment. They want more of the solid and traditional subjects and fewer frills and vocational "escape courses," more challenges for the gifted student, more attention to the slow learner, better discipline, and more and better counseling.

In San Angelo they practice what the critics preach.

The philosophy here is to challenge each student to do his very best work in every subject, and then to provide the facilities and courses to meet and extend that challenge.

The payoff is in the curriculum—a three-rail program tailored to meet the needs and capabilities of all students, from the brightest to the dullest.

The San Angelo story is more than just the curriculum, however.

It's the story of a young, eager and informed schoolboard more concerned with learning than penny pinching, a citizenry willing to pay the taxes that built one of the outstanding high school plants in the country, a group of teachers and administrators willing to work 12 to 14 hours a day.

TOO PROGRESSIVE

It's the story, too, of Supt. Gerald S. Wadzeck, a man who cherished a dream for years and now has the tools and backing to make it a reality. When Mr. Wadzeck came to San Angelo 7 years ago the city had had an overdose of progressive, permissive, do-as-you-please education. It was ready for a change.

It took 2 years—until 1954—for Mr. Wadzeck to lay the groundwork and get his plans into action. And he's the first to admit there is still much to be done.

The San Angelo curriculum is based on the 3-rail plan. Rail I is for superior students, able to move much faster than their schoolmates. Rail II is for average students, eligible for college after high school graduation. Rail III is for the poor student, the slow learner for whom high school is the terminal point of education.

The rail plan isn't new. Versions of it can be found across the country. In San Angelo, however, it starts in the first grade.

During a pupil's first year in school he is constantly tested and evaluated to see

whether he is really ready for school, really ready for the learning process.

"About 90 percent of a kid's trouble in grade school," says Mr. Wadzeck, "is that he is biologically immature when he starts. Some kids walk earlier than others, some talk earlier. It's the same with learning, some are ready before the others."

If a child isn't up to doing first grade work, he is held in that grade for another year.

FIRST MAJOR CHECK POINT

"We retain about 25 percent of our first graders," Mr. Wadzeck says, "probably the highest proportion in the country. We don't call it flunking or failing. We just hold them back till they're ready to learn, then we throw the book at 'em."

"After the first grade, there are very few we have to hold back through the next 5 grades."

At the end of the third grade there is a major check point.

"In the first 3 grades these children have been introduced to the tools of learning—numbers, the alphabet, reading, etc.," Mr. Wadzeck says. "From the fourth grade on, they will be using these tools more extensively. It's time to find out just where they stand."

Based on grades, intelligence tests, aptitude tests and teachers' reports, the pupils are assigned to rails I, II, or III during the first grade. Depending on their aptitudes, some students might be in rail I English and social studies, and rail II or III arithmetic. Depending on their achievement, they can climb to a higher rail, or drop to a lower one. All three rails are taught by the same teacher in the same classroom.

Some pupils spend 4 years getting past the third grade, some do it in two. There is no grade skipping, although Mr. Wadzeck says it may be necessary in the near future. Brighter pupils stay in their own age groups, but do more advanced work.

One major departure from normal grade school practice, even where the program is railled, is that only the student in rail I can get an A. If he is in rail II, the best he can get is a B, in rail III a C.

Some educators will tell you this might frustrate the children, that they should be graded on the basis of whether they are doing the best work of which they are capable.

Mr. Wadzeck disagrees: "Life is competitive, and if the children don't learn it in the classroom, they'll certainly find it out for themselves on the playground."

At the end of the sixth year there is another major check point. For many students, this may be a last chance to get on the academic rail.

From all of San Angelo's 17 elementary schools the pupils are brought to Washington School for the seventh grade. No other grades are taught in the building.

SIX SUBJECTS TAUGHT

Each student in rails I and II takes six academic subjects—English, reading, math, social science, natural science and foreign language—plus one fine arts elective and physical education.

Rail III students do no seventh grade work. They spend the year catching up on work in which they have fallen behind. In math, for instance, they would review fourth, fifth and sixth grade arithmetic.

And here is an exclusive San Angelo twist: If the rail III students get an A or B in his makeup work, he isn't promoted. He is held back so that the following year he can take rail II or college preparatory courses. If, however, he gets a C or less, he is promoted into the eighth grade in rail III.

"When a rail III student comes up with excellent grades in his remedial work," says Mr. Wadzeck, "we figure he deserves another chance. He may have had emotional problems stemming from troubles at home. Maybe he has been ill and out of school for long periods. Maybe he's just a 'late bloomer'."

LOOK TO HONOR COURSES

"But if he comes up with poor grades in his remedial or makeup work, we just have to figure he isn't college material. So we push him ahead on a rail III program that will give him the best education he can absorb. If he spurts ahead later, of course, our testing and evaluating will catch him and there may still be time for him to advance to a higher rail."

Rail I students in the seventh grade take 2 years of a subject in 1 year and clear the way for honor courses and college-level work during the 11th and 12th grades. Rail II students take the "national curriculum" or normal college preparatory courses. Rail III students take modified work adapted to their capabilities, but including arithmetic every year through the 11th grade and English every year through the 12th.

"It may take a slower learner 10 to 12 years to master ninth-grade math," Mr. Wadzeck says, "but he'll know it by the time he graduates. And our kids with 4 years of rail III English are going to know more about the subject than the average student who takes 3 years of English in a traditional high school program."

In this, the fifth year of the program, San Angelo's only high school, Central High, has railled courses in math, foreign languages, science, and English.

Mr. Wadzeck figures only about 1 percent of the students are able to handle the top rail in all four subjects. About 10 percent take two courses in rail I and two in rail II and about 5 percent take only one rail I course.

The bulk of the students—about two-thirds—can handle all rail II courses. Even those who carry two rail II courses can be college material, Mr. Wadzeck says, if they have two rail II courses and keep their grades up.

CHECKING UP ON WORK

In high school the students are graded according to the work they do in the rail to which they have been assigned. The transcripts, however, identify the course by the rail number. Thus colleges and universities, as well as prospective employers, will know just what sort of work the student has done.

San Angelo's students are given every opportunity to enrich and broaden their education—and to pull themselves up to a higher rail while doing it.

For instance, the 710 seventh graders at Washington School have a 75-minute extra learning period at the end of the school day. If enough students ask for a particular course, Principal Dave Sands will try to find them a teacher.

Thus, 20 students who take Spanish during regular school hours are studying Latin in the extra-learning period—for no academic credit. Similar no-credit courses are also offered in math, science, orchestra, drama, rapid reading, poetry, speech, journalism—even football.

"Some of our students stay in the science labs until 5 or 5:30, when we have to chase them home," Mr. Sands says. "It proves our point that if you give the students an opportunity, they'll jump at it."

PAY TUITION IN SUMMER

Almost half the 1,400 students at Central High paid tuition to take summer courses last summer. Most of them wanted only to brush up in their weak subjects or qualify for a higher rail.

Mr. Wadzeck hopes that eventually all summer courses will be free and that the

summer program can take over most or all of the nonacademic subjects.

"Typing is an excellent course for students who are going on to college," he says, "but why waste time on it during the regular school year? It would be a fine summer session course. The same goes for driver training—I'd like to see that as a strictly summer course, although it will take time to make the shift."

"We encourage the students to go to summer school and pull themselves up."

"That's the whole idea here—we want to challenge every student to extend himself to his limits, his full capacity. And when you get right down to it, that's all any school system can do."

Why Did O'Henry Become O'Henry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed before that great legal minds frequently take up hobbies of literary detective work, and the result is usually entertaining as well as instructive. I suppose this is because lawyers in general, and particularly those who have risen to the top of their profession, have cultivated a talent for observing significant details and solving the riddles of human motivation, all from the written word.

I believe the Members may be interested and amused by a highly original conclusion that Mr. Joseph Borkin has reached as a result of his literary detective work on the question why William Sidney Porter chose the pen name O'Henry. Accordingly, I am inserting a clipping from the Boston Daily Globe of January 1, 1959, which sets out Mr. Borkin's analysis.

Perhaps I should add that Mr. Borkin has engaged in literary detective work of a much more serious nature. In the early years of World War II Mr. Borkin was Chief of the Patent and Cartel Section of the Department of Justice, an experience which led to one of his more famous writings, "Germany's Master Plan," which he coauthored with Charles A. Welsh in 1943.

My own interest in Mr. Borkin was first aroused on reading his article on "Impeachment" in the Encyclopedia Britannica and on learning that he had, as a hobby, become the top authority on this subject.

The clipping from the Boston Daily Globe is as follows:

WHY DID PORTER CHOOSE O. HENRY?

(By Joseph Borkin)

WASHINGTON.—The origin of the pseudonym O. Henry and the motive for its choice have baffled students of literature for over half a century. Why did William Sidney Porter employ the alias? Was it more than a random choice? The solution presented here has the quality that follows the traditional formula for an O. Henry story.

To take his readers by surprise in constructing plausibility out of absurdity and contradiction was in the essence of his liter-

ary character. We should not be astonished, therefore, if the alias O. Henry betrays what it was designed to hide.

The explanation by Porter that the surname Henry was chosen at random, plucked from the society columns of a New Orleans newspaper, while the "O." was added as the easiest letter to write, has a tongue-in-cheek quality.

A theory accepted by many critics and biographers is that the name was that of a guard, Orrin Henry, who was employed years earlier at the Ohio Penitentiary. It is surmised that Porter, while a convict, saw the name on some prison records and adopted it.

In another version, Henry was the name of a bartender in a tavern frequented by Porter, who would indicate his thirst by calling, "Oh, Henry!"

Less plausible is the version that O. Henry was derived from an old ballad of the Kentucky hills and may have been a favorite song of Porter's.

These accounts are two-dimensional, and none is in the tradition or character of O. Henry. This is apparently what led Stephen Leacock to remark that the choice of pseudonym lacked aptness and must have been picked in a moment of whimsy.

Examine the portrait of William Sidney Porter.

He had the soul of a poet, the weaknesses of an alcoholic, and the job of a bank clerk. He was indicted in Austin, Tex., under the Federal Banking Act for embezzling funds from the bank in which he worked.

He stood mute at his trial, unwilling to help his attorneys or himself.

His bored and disinterested manner at the trial helped assure the verdict of guilty by the jury. An eyewitness who saw him off to prison recalled that he appeared to have welcomed his conviction. Many experts today are convinced of Porter's innocence, however.

Sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment in the Ohio penitentiary, which at that time had a subleasing arrangement with the Federal Government, he actually served 3 years, from 1896 to 1899.

In prison he utilized his talent as a writer and storyteller, sending his literary products to publishers via an intermediary, the relative of a fellow prisoner. It is to these stories, written in prison, that Porter first attached the pseudonym O. Henry, indicating no first name. With these devices, he was able to disguise his place of residence as well as his identity as the convicted embezzler William Sidney Porter.

Writers use pseudonyms to mask authorship while criminals use them to conceal their past records. Although O. Henry fits both categories, his pseudonym does not appear to have been designed to conceal the writer but rather to hide the identity of the convict. This distinction, I believe, is the answer to the riddle of O. Henry.

A police department could not function properly without an alias or monicker file. Although an alias is consciously designed to hide criminal identity, it so often is revealing that it has become standard operating procedure to examine it for clues. An alias lends distinction to the individual.

Sometimes the name will be taken from what the police call the "M.O." or modus operandi, of the crime.

Among criminologists and psychologists, there is a growing awareness that many criminals may engage in a life of crime in order to be punished due to an irrational and overwhelming sense of guilt. They are constantly seeking punishment and perform in a manner designed to insure capture. It explains the masochistic components of most persons who find themselves incarcerated in prison.

Alcoholics seem to be subject to the same mechanism. It is possible that the compulsive drinker does so in order to be punished

by the inevitable hangover. O. Henry gave evidence of fitting both masochistic molds. He was not only a convicted embezzler but also an alcoholic, teetering on the border of skid row, and ultimately dying of cirrhosis of the liver at the age of 48 with his entire fortune of 23 cents in his pocket and nine empty whisky bottles under the bed.

Whether guilty or innocent, O. Henry's criminal record haunted him like a ghost, and its concealment was apparently one of his overwhelming needs. He covered up the time served in prison by falsifying his age to account for the missing years. In interviews he omitted any mention of his residence in Austin. He made his close friends feel that there were areas in which they were not permitted to pry.

Even after they all knew his secret, he acted as though it was still hidden from them. Will Irwin, the writer and friend of O. Henry, exclaimed, "Why didn't one of us go to him and say, 'Stop trying to hide yourself from strangers for fear of running across someone with knowledge of a secret that is no secret at all.'"

There is evidence that O. Henry himself was responsible for arranging the conditions whereby his secret was no secret at all, that in his methods of concealment he was preparing his self-betrayal.

To Al Jennings, a bank robber and close prison-mate, O. Henry resolved, "I will bury the name of Bill Porter in the depths of oblivion. No one shall know that the Ohio Penitentiary ever furnished me with board and bread."

Could it be that with the reverse irony that was O. Henry's trademark, he took an alias that was in truth a "pen" name?

Sheriff Howard W. Fitzpatrick To Be Chairman of Democratic Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the Boston Herald and which was authored by my very good friend, Edward Devin, of that newspaper. It refers to our beloved Sheriff Fitzpatrick, who has accepted the post of chairman of the \$100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner coming up in February. The Honorable Howard W. Fitzpatrick is the sheriff of Middlesex County in Massachusetts, the largest county in the United States.

I commend the article to my colleagues in the House, for it is a perfect illustration of how a successful and prominent businessman may also be successful in the political field; but let the following speak for itself:

FITZPATRICK, CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC
DINNER

(By Edward Devin)

Leaders of the Democratic Party have chosen Sheriff Howard W. Fitzpatrick of Middlesex County as chairman of the \$100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, which will be held at the Statler Hilton in mid-February—the date hasn't been set officially yet.

It is fitting that the popular sheriff has been selected as chairman. The chairman of this year's dinner was the late Gov. Paul A. Dever. Fitzpatrick was one of the late governor's closest friends and supporters. He was also Dever's protegee in politics, for it was Dever who appointed him sheriff of Middlesex to fill a vacancy.

Fitzpatrick is already making plans to make next February's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner the most successful in history. And he's just the man who can do it, too.

The most cash the Democrats ever raised from this dinner was \$119,000. Fitzpatrick is shooting for \$175,000 and without pressuring anyone into buying tickets, either. He has more than a dozen close personal friends working with him on the arrangements.

LOYAL PARTY WORKERS

The Statler Hilton will be bulging with Democrats the night of the dinner. Of course, Republicans are invited, too, at \$100 a head.

There is one thing anyone who knows him will tell you about Fitzpatrick. He is a loyal party worker. He works for the party at large and helps everyone in political contests. That's his favorite pastime, incidentally, helping people, even in his job as sheriff, or perhaps most of all as sheriff.

Fitzpatrick was the first Democrat to be elected to office in Middlesex County, formerly a Republican stronghold.

After his appointment by Governor Dever, he ran for election and swamped Dr. A. Warren Stearns, the noted penologist. It was the first time a Democrat had cracked Middlesex County. In 1956, Fitzpatrick was re-elected sheriff by 70,000.

WORKERS CALMED

Now the Democrats hold all the offices in Middlesex County. The district attorney's office is held by James L. O'Dea, Jr. All the county court jobs went to Democrats and the three county commissioners are of the same political allegiance.

Wren Fitzpatrick first took office as sheriff of the State's largest county there was some trepidation among the employees, 99 percent of whom were Republicans.

"I never let anyone go because of his party affiliation," Fitzpatrick said. "They are all family men who have to earn a living. Besides I owe my success in politics to Democrats and Republicans alike."

He supported a bill passed by the legislature this year making deputy sheriffs court officers, thus protecting their jobs by giving them tenure. He also has a bill in now to make the guards permanent and to take the jails out of politics and run them as efficiently as a business.

Incidentally, Fitzpatrick doesn't take any salary. He accepts the \$10,000, of course, but turns it over to a charity fund set up. Friends wanted to throw him a party but he declined. So they held a charity fund dinner in Lowell last year and raised \$45,000.

LIKES TO HELP THE PUBLIC

In a year the fund spent \$73,000 on good works. Howard and his brother, Robert, with whom he operates a big catering business, made up the difference.

"It makes you feel good to help people," the sheriff said. He must feel very good for he has found jobs for many of his former prisoners, many of them in his own plant. He has "straightened out" many prisoners and helped them and their families with money, clothes and good advice.

There is hardly ever any trouble with the prisoners at the Cambridge Jail or the house of correction at Billerica. The sheriff treats the prisoners right and they have the greatest respect for him. He has charge of 320 prisoners at Billerica and 150 at Cambridge and both institutions have been given triple A ratings by the Federal government for

their cleanliness and the way they are operated.

Fitzpatrick uses civilian chefs, bakers, butchers and mechanics instead of prisoners. In that way he gets trained help and there is not the turnover there would be if prisoners were used on those jobs.

He said that when he took over, he found the meals served the prisoners were "inadequate," that many men were losing weight and in some cases their health. As an experienced caterer he was able to remedy the food situation in short order, and not short order cooks either.

BLOOD DONATED

Now the men at Billerica donate 70 pints of blood every 2 months to the Red Cross and 40 pints at the East Cambridge Jail.

Fitzpatrick has been in politics all his life but he admits he never had the desire to run for sheriff. He accepted the appointment from Dever after talking things over with another former close friend, the late Chief Justice John P. Higgins of Superior Court.

Sheriff Fitzpatrick has operated his jails so efficiently that if he doesn't watch out the State is going to be making a profit. The institutions have 200 acres of cultivated land, a canning factory, a piggery, slaughterhouse, smokehouse and deep freeze facilities. The herd at Billerica produces 250,000 quarts of milk a year. The dairy, piggery and canning factory provide half the costs of feeding the prisoners.

The prison brush and mat shops supply all of Middlesex County and had a \$50,000 surplus in their account. They are going to turn back \$25,000 to the State.

The late Judge Higgins advised Fitzpatrick to take the job of sheriff. He said he "could do a lot of good." He certainly has.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Milton F. Brown, of Dallas, Tex., Outstanding American Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my State of Texas offers many living proofs of the durability of the principles that form the foundation of our free-enterprise system.

The Horatio Alger legend is not dead. A man can still get ahead in Texas—in America—by hard work and thrift and honesty in his dealings with his fellow men.

A recent issue of Texas Parade magazine, published in Austin, tells the story of such a man—Milton F. Brown, one-time "butcher boy" on a train through Texas, who today is president of the Mercantile National Bank of Dallas, one of the Nation's hundred largest banks.

Milton Brown's story is truly inspiring. I ask unanimous consent that the article from Texas Parade be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN OF THE MERCANTILE NATIONAL—THE MAN WHO MAKES DOLLARS MAKES SENSE

(By Joe Cunningham)

In the year 1892, 400 years had come and gone since Columbus discovered America, but Texas had been a State of the Union for less than 50 years, and Dallas, as an incorporated city, had just turned 21.

The Civil War had been over for nearly three decades. There would be another decade before the Spanish-American War was to break in upon the country's complacency. It is true that, down in Texas, Jim Hogg and George Clark were getting warmed up for a no-holds-barred gubernatorial campaign. But, other than that, all was quiet on the southwestern front.

A placid conservatism was permitting the country to simmer down to a steady, plodding development—a sort of burrowing-in process that was to act, at least, as a partially effective shock absorber against whatever economic upheavals lay ahead.

In the atmosphere of this undramatic interlude the vital statistics were only mildly disturbed when, on July 16, 1892, Milton F. Brown was born. The event occurred at Ennis, in Ellis County, where his father was practicing law.

The county seat was at Waxahachie, some 15 miles away. This, in those days, with roads and means of transportation such as they were, was not an inconsiderable distance. Thus, even the mild milling of gathering citizenry on "court days" and the occasional forensics of the more impressive trials were in a world apart from the little fellow growing up at Ennis.

The most engaging activity of Milton Brown's hometown was the coming and go-

ing of the trains, Ennis was an important station on the Houston & Texas Central Railroad. This was the second rail line that had ever been built in Texas. It began in 1853 as the Galveston & Red River, but after 3 years the name had been changed with a change of ownership.

A high percentage of the rail payroll in those days was people. The chugging, smoke-snorting engines with their train of plush coaches was the era's most luxurious form of travel. It was thrilling simply to board the cars, and then, in rolling along over the clicking rails, one soon settled down to a sense of satisfaction with the world.

The conductor was a romantic figure. A badge of officialdom adorned his cap, while an enormous, gold-plated chain festooned his midriff and led to a ponderous, snap-lid watch in the pocket of his blue serge suit. Withal, he was a towering functionary who occupied an enviable but, to a very young lad, a wholly unattainable status.

The butcher boy's job seemed more nearly within the range of youthful ambitions.

Milton Brown decided that he was going to be a butcher boy on the H. & T.C. The product of an unpretentious era and developing his personality and character in a quiet, orderly and unspectacular community, it seems that, already, what Milton Brown wanted he set about to accomplish with a sure and steady precision. He not only became the purveyor of fruit pies and other delicacies to the passengers, but was an exceptionally good one. He developed a merchandising technique that was not only pleasing to the customers but profitable to himself. On the special trains to Galveston he often netted as much as \$20 a trip. Twenty dollars in those days was important money.

Some indication of Milton Brown's future as a vital factor in the upbuilding of business and community life manifested itself in the desire of the young railroading Merchant of Ennis to become a construction engineer and to have a part in building the roads. No sooner decided upon than done. He switched over to work—hard work—with the right-of-way crews.

His progress was next highlighted when he earned a diploma from Columbia Military Academy. That was in 1909. Then he was shaken out of the dream of an engineering career by learning the fact that college graduates with engineering degrees were paid less than \$100 a month, with limited future prospects.

His thoughts turned back to business. Through a series of part-time jobs he got through a business college.

One day in 1911, he encountered a long-time friend who confided to him that he was going to quit his job as a messenger boy, or runner, for a Dallas bank. Young Brown decided that was for him.

Together the two youths went to Dallas, and, as the friend resigned the job, Milton Brown offered himself as a replacement. The beginning salary—\$30 a month—was not the deciding factor. Intuitively, he glimpsed the opportunities that were ahead. He was more eager to learn than to earn when he became an employee of the important American Exchange National Bank. It then occupied quarters at Main and Poydras in Dallas. Since that day, more than 47 years ago, Milton F. Brown has been identified with the banking in this important financial center.

One just does not think of Dallas banks and bankers without obeisance to the colorful and dynamic E. L. "Bob" Thornton, chairman of the board of the Mercantile National Bank and longtime mayor of Dallas. Thornton is frequently quoted as having referred to his colleagues in the progressive development of Dallas and the Southwest, as "Dallas' dynamic men." Whether the quotation is accurate or not, invariably a lot of admiration goes along with it.

Ever the discerning man, Thornton had his eye on the young fellow who had not only gotten on the payroll of the American Exchange but had gone to work. An active, aggressive man himself, Thornton was attracted to this individual—a pleasant, determined and personable young man who took to banking "like a duck to water"—and enjoyed it.

In 1917 Brown had a call from Bob Thornton who, with two partners, had, only the year before, established a private banking concern in Dallas. Milton F. Brown was offered the job of assistant cashier in this little bank of modest beginnings. He accepted. The three partners, the new assistant cashier, and one other employee constituted the entire personnel.

The development of the original banking firm of Stiles, Thornton, and Lund, then the Dallas County State Bank, later the Mercantile Bank & Trust Co., and now the giant Mercantile National Bank is one of the epochal accomplishments of the Southwest's most epochal half century.

Today the Mercantile National, of which Milton F. Brown is president, is one of the Nation's 100 largest banks and is third in Dallas in deposits. A recent \$5 million increase in its capital and surplus brings that figure to \$30 million, with over \$6½ million in undivided profits and reserves for contingencies.

The increase, as Brown has pointed out "is another step in keeping pace with the continuing growth of Dallas and the Southwest."

This country could not have built up, says Brown, "without its banks. You tell me what kind of banks and bankers are in any community and I would venture an opinion as to prosperity and progress of that community or the lack of it."

Milton F. Brown was in the banking business when automobiles were a rarity. It was then freely predicted that these contraptions would never replace the horse. He is the first Dallas banker, however, who ever made a loan on an automobile and is probably the first to have accepted an airplane as collateral. The Mercantile was the first bank in Dallas to have drive-in facilities. The imposing institution which Brown quite accurately calls "a financial department store" does not yet have a "Space Ship Loan Department," but one should not rule out the long-range possibility.

An interviewer can jump from automobile loans to the international situation without banker Brown showing the slightest evidence that, to him, the subject has been changed at all. This, of course, is of the greatest significance: we have a world growing smaller, there is no longer such a thing as isolation from any part of any people of this globe, and, perhaps, there may eventually be none from those of other planets. It is obvious that the thinking of the Mercantile is attuned to the most minute banking needs of the individual, yet related at all times to the overall, worldwide picture.

The so-called capitalistic economy of this country, so paradoxically supported, as it is, by the continued communistic threat of war, does not, in Brown's opinion, place continued growth and prosperity in the position of a disturbed situation for its support. "Why," he says, "if we did not have a money circulation occasioned by these defense efforts, America would be spending just as much money, or more, on entirely peacetime pursuits. For one thing, our highway programs would take a big jump ahead. We are a growing country, it is our nature, and this country will continue to grow. It is the responsibility of the banks to be soundly qualified at all times to finance progressive undertakings, large or small, as they develop."

"What is the relation of size to a bank's effectiveness in a community?" he was asked.

"Size is important, of course," he replied, "but every big business used to be a little business, and the all-important thing is to maintain, at all times and at all levels, the human relationship, the friendly attitude."

Milton F. Brown became a vice president of the Mercantile National in 1928, executive vice president in 1943, and president in 1947. He is also chairman of the board of First Federal Savings & Loan Association, a director of Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Southwestern Public Service Co., Mercantile Securities Insurance Co., Cabell's, Inc., Burrus Mills, Inc., and of the important agricultural research facility, the Texas Research Foundation at Renner, Tex. He is a director and past president of Circle 10, Council of Boy Scouts of America, and has been active in Scout work for more than a decade. He is past president of the Dallas Community Chest, vice president of Dallas Clearing House Association for 1958, as well as being a past president of that association, a 33° Mason, and 1956 general chairman of the Methodist Hospital building-fund campaign. He is a member of the Highland Park Methodist Church, Trinity Valley Lodge, Hella Temple, and Dallas Petroleum Club, the Dallas Country Club, the Dallas Athletic Club, Brook Hollow Country Club, the City Club, the Downtown Club, and the Reserve City Bankers' Association.

Asked if he has any hobbies, the busy man looked up in some surprise. "Why, sir," he said, "everything I do is a hobby. I like my work—and then I do a little gardening."

One would guess him to be a gardener when the day's work is through. Milton Brown likes to make things grow.

Soviet Challenge and Western Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of today entitled "Soviet Challenge and Western Response." I urge that my colleagues read the editorial for these reasons: First, they will see the stakes which are involved, and the position which is being taken by the United States in respect to Berlin and the reunification of Germany. They will recognize, as the New York Times editorial has recognized, that this is the point of decision, and that if we retire from Berlin on Soviet terms, we shall probably be yield-

ing not only Europe but the "cold war"—the cause of freedom, itself.

The editorial analyzes that subject in the greatest detail. It is very important that Members of Congress, in all of their speeches, and in all of their answers to questions should not be confounded in their ability to answer on the facts. The fact is that the western position is thoroughly sound in terms of law, in terms of statutes, in terms of policy, in terms of the failure of the Soviet Union to keep its commitments, and in terms of our fidelity to our commitment the fact that we have kept them not only in letter, but in spirit.

We may be able to give ground in many ways—and the New York Times editorial suggests fundamental proposals we can make for security, for disengagement, for guarantees against any future German oppression and for nuclear arms limitation—but we cannot give way on the ground that the Soviet Union is attempting to foist on the world in the guise of peace—that we should quit Berlin and leave it as an isolated, sterile, neutralized area. If we yield on the Soviet terms, we shall not encourage peace; we shall have a prelude to war, just as yielding at Munich was a prelude to war. I assure Senators that the parallel is very apposite.

The editorial gives the background of the subject, legally and logically. By reading it every Member of the Congress of the United States will have the capability of answering any questions of any of his constituents as to whether the policy of the U.S. Government is reasonable or unreasonable. I believe the editorial demonstrates the U.S. policy on Germany is eminently reasonable, and I think it is must reading for every Member of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET CHALLENGE AND WESTERN RESPONSE

I

Ever since, and even during, the catastrophe of the Second World War, the Western powers have sought to restore to the world a just and lasting peace. To that end they have made innumerable proposals, beginning with the Atlantic Charter, continuing through the war and postwar conferences of Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Moscow, London, Paris, New York, Geneva and elsewhere and culminating in the Charter of the United Nations.

These efforts have been frustrated by Soviet Russia, which broke up the wartime alliance, violated its war and postwar agreements, spurned all attempts to control the atomic bomb, and paralyzed the United Nations with its abuse of the veto. Even the peace treaties signed by the Soviets with East European countries were used by them merely to fasten their yoke on these areas.

Now Soviet Russia has offered a new challenge to the West. In what remains, in essence, an ultimatum with a time limit, it has in effect ordered the Western powers to get out of Berlin or risk an atomic war.

II

There should be no mistake about the seriousness of this challenge, whether Khrushchev blows hot or whether he blows cold. What is at stake here is not only the

fate of free Berlin and its 2,200,000 free people, or even the fate of Germany, important as both are. What is at stake is the fate of Europe, of our own first line of defense, of peace.

The abandonment of Berlin would force Germany to seek a deal with the Soviets at the price of isolation and neutralization that would make that country a marshalling ground for further Soviet advances. It would undermine the North Atlantic alliance and in the end force a premature American withdrawal from Europe. It would torpedo the whole European unification movement and split the Continent again into isolated and indefensible individual states.

The consequences of such a development for the United States are self-evident.

III

Under the Potsdam agreement and related compacts both East and West agreed that Germany, "within her frontiers as they were on 31st December, 1937," and under the supreme and joint authority of the occupying powers, should be administered as a "single unit," except for territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, put under Polish and Soviet administration pending a peace pact. It was further agreed that the Big Four should prepare Germany for reconstruction of its political life on a democratic basis, with freedom for all democratic political parties, and that the Allied Council of Ministers should prepare a German peace settlement to be accepted by an all-German Government that was to be established as soon as conditions would permit.

The manner in which Soviet Russia destroyed this agreement is history. Unable to impose its will on all Germany under joint control, it detached its zone from the rest of the country and put East Germany under Communist control, suppressed the promised freedoms, sovietized its economy and rearm it, annexing the eastern territories outright.

In consequence, the Western powers were compelled to organize a new regime for West Germany. And after the Soviet coup in Czechoslovakia they were forced to look to their own defenses. The Western European Union and the North Atlantic alliance were the result. These organizations include West Germany in their common defense and rearm it for that purpose, but also keep it under control. But as they also check further Soviet expansion they are denounced by Moscow as aggressive military groupings and Berlin is to be the apparent instrument of their destruction.

IV

It is against this background that Soviet purposes in the Berlin challenge must be viewed. In the existing situation the Western powers cannot and should not stand merely on their defensive strength. It is important for them to mobilize the moral forces of the world in support of a real peace. It is in this area that the West has failed thus far to take full advantage of its opportunities to state its case effectively.

One principal reason is that, in contrast to the deluge of elaborate and detailed Soviet proposals, the Western powers have produced nothing equally concrete and detailed. It would seem, therefore, to be the first duty of Western statesmanship to work out a comprehensive peace plan so fair, so practical and reassuring to all, that it would appeal to the decent opinion of mankind.

With the force of world opinion behind it, such a plan might persuade the Soviets that they have more to gain than to lose by accepting it.

V

It is beyond the scope of any newspaper editorial to define the terms of such a plan, which in any case cannot be presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis and must first be negotiated with our allies and then with

Soviet Russia. But certain essential elements of such a plan have frequently been advanced by Western statesmen. Unfortunately, these Western proposals have too often seemed to be put forward in such a tentative, cursory, and piecemeal manner as to fall short of the impact they should have. It is therefore pertinent to attempt to summarize them, to tie loose ends together, and to look at the broad outlines that emerge.

Three of the essential elements of such a plan emerge at once. The first is that any move toward real peace cannot start with negotiations over Berlin alone, as the Soviets propose. The Berlin problem is merely part of the German problem, and the German problem is part of the problem of Europe. Any separate negotiations over Berlin would be really negotiations over the Western right to stay in the city. If that right is admitted by the West to be negotiable, it is immediately undermined, and once that is done a Western withdrawal from the city is in sight.

The second essential element is that Europe cannot afford a repetition of the folly of Versailles. As both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have said, any new attempt to isolate, segregate, neutralize, and demilitarize a people as numerous, vital, and vigorous as the Germans could only turn them again into a restless and dangerous force that could breed another Hitler. This is equally true of any attempt to partition Germany and divide its people by force.

The third element, deriving from the first two, is that a European peace settlement depends on a German peace settlement, and that a German peace settlement cannot be concluded in a vacuum. Militarily, politically, and economically, Germany is too large a factor in the European balance of power for such a solution. Any German settlement must therefore tie Germany into a European security system as West Germany is already tied into the Western security system.

VI

Such a system should first of all provide security for Germany's neighbors—and especially Russia—against a resurgence of German militarism and aggression and provide the basis for the kind of rapprochement that now unites Germany and France. Russia is entitled to have firm assurance in this matter.

The plan must also provide security for Germany itself, in order to prevent a recurrence of the nightmare of isolation that dominated the Germans in the past, prompted them to try to play off East against West and in the end produced the paranoia that led to disaster.

The logic of these considerations argues, therefore, that a European peace settlement should begin with the reunification of Germany and the creation of an all-German Government capable of accepting for all the German people the obligations of such a settlement. Such reunification, which would also automatically solve the Berlin problem, should rest on the will of the whole German people, and that will can be ascertained only by a free expression of opinion.

This means free elections, for which no one has found an acceptable substitute. Free elections may not necessarily be the first step toward reunification, but they should certainly be the last step. If the Communists are as certain of popular support as they claim, they should be willing to take their chances in such a test of popular opinion, together with all other parties.

The Soviets themselves agreed to such elections at Geneva, and they make a poor case when they propose that reunification be left to the German people but prevent these people from acting on that demand.

VII

A Germany reunited in freedom should be free to organize its own international relations and choose its own associations and alliances. The West makes no secret of its hopes that a reunited Germany would stay within the North Atlantic alliance. But the mutual security of both East and West also demands that the military balance of power should not be changed thereby to the detriment of either side. For that reason the Western Powers, including West Germany, have already offered various proposals which should be further explored, clarified and formalized.

These proposals include:

1. An undertaking by the North Atlantic alliance not to move its defenses eastward beyond their present positions. If a reunited Germany should choose to remain in the alliance, and to treat East Germany as a demilitarized buffer zone containing only ordinary police forces to maintain internal order.
2. No missile bases to be built on German soil, East or West. This is again an assurance to which Russia is entitled.
3. A thinning out of foreign forces in West Germany in return for a thinning out of Soviet forces in East Germany—a process which lessened tensions after the achievement of German reunification would make increasingly possible.

Over and above these measures in Germany itself, the Western Powers have suggested broader security measures. These include: (1) an overriding European security pact superimposed on both the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact powers, which meets the Soviet proposal for an East-West nonaggression pact, and (2) a worldwide system to prevent surprise attack. Such pacts must be self-enforcing through an effective inspection and control system. But once such a system was put into operation, the way would be open to further measures of control that would lift from all nations the burden of present-day armaments and the dread of an atomic holocaust.

VIII

We believe that a comprehensive plan presented to the world, not in bits and pieces, but as a consistent and self-contained whole, would win the support of all men of goodwill, as Wilson's Fourteen Points once did. It would demonstrate the peaceful purposes of the Western Powers and should be allowed to penetrate the Iron Curtain to appeal to the Soviet masses, which also dread war.

It must be hoped that the discussions which are now beginning between the Western Allies will give consideration to such points as these and that from these discussions there will emerge a positive program to meet the crisis now threatened for the end of May.

Oilmen as Creators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Oklahoma honored a group of its citizens by selecting them for the State's hall of fame. The three college presidents, two oilmen, and two distinguished women singled out in 1958 were Dr. John W. Raley, president of Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee;

Dr. Oliver S. Willham, president of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater; Dr. W. Max Chambers, president of Central State College, Edmond; Mrs. Charles Page, Sand Springs, philanthropist; Miss Alice Marriott, Oklahoma City, author; Dean A. McGee, president Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Oklahoma City; and K. S. (Boots) Adams, chairman of the board of Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville. Each of these individuals has made a very real contribution to Oklahoma, and we are proud of them. In paying tribute to these individuals for their accomplishments, Frank Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute, made a speech in which he wove the history of our State into a dramatic story of pioneers and the creative force they provided. I share his conviction that "the force of creation is stronger than the force of destruction," and applaud his statement that "wisely led, soundly educated Americans can both gain and guard the good life that is due them."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech entitled, "Oil Men as Creators," delivered at Oklahoma City, Okla., on November 17, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. I make this request notwithstanding the fact that I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the address in the Record will require 2¼ pages at a cost of \$182.25.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OIL MEN AS CREATORS

(Address of Frank M. Porter, president, American Petroleum Institute, before Oklahoma annual hall of fame banquet, Biltmore Hotel, Oklahoma City, Okla., November 17, 1958)

The idea of this annual hall of fame banquet has always appealed strongly to me. I believe a State that takes this means of paying tribute to its distinguished citizens testifies to its own merit as well as to theirs. By the very act of acknowledging the contributions of its outstanding people, Oklahoma proves it deserves their contributions.

Certainly in this age, when there is a marked tendency to submerge the man in the mass, it is heartening to participate in a ceremony that singles out individual achievement.

The occasion reminds us of a sometimes forgotten fact: No matter how favorably situated a State may be, no matter how abundantly supplied with natural resources, that State cannot hope to rise above the performance and capabilities of its individual citizens. Far more than any natural advantage of geography, the character of the people determines the character of the State, and decides to what extent it will be successful, prosperous and productive.

Oklahoma has been doubly blessed. It has been blessed with a lavish supply of natural resources, particularly oil and natural gas; it has been blessed again with the kind of citizens who have the intelligence, energy and initiative to make the most of nature's bounty. Without the right people, the richest resources would be but idle monuments to incompetence.

This, to my mind, is the theme of our gathering tonight: The theme of human achievement.

It seems particularly fitting that the men and women chosen for this year's tribute should include educators and oil men. Both occupations have done much for Oklahoma, both have an enormous potential for future service, and both are being drawn closer and closer together by the circumstances of their respective professions.

When I entered the oil business, 42 years ago, many an experienced wildcatter would have scoffed at the suggestion that there was any mutuality of interest between oil and education.

Yet, events have shown that even then the petroleum industry was in a transition stage, though few of us noticed the change. Science was replacing hunches in the search for and production of oil, the businessman was supplanting the speculator, and the industry was moving toward a maturity of outlook. Not that it was getting old and hidebound. I hope it never gets that way. But in my starting days the industry was outgrowing the restless impatience of its adolescence and beginning to make practical plans for a long future, as only adults do.

I had the advantage of taking part in some of the oil industry's most exciting years right in this State. I had the privilege of knowing and working with men whose careers are almost legends in the industry today. I had the thrill of being in many of the historic boom towns at the height of their booms. And I shall never forget the sights and the sounds of those towns that sprang up almost magically at the first show of oil. They were noisier than bedlam and as crowded as a New York subway at rush hour.

Not for anything in the world would I have missed the experience of those boom days. And yet, as I look toward the future of this State and of the oil business, I must confess a feeling of envy for the coming generation of oil men, too. Their experiences will be altogether different from mine. Their environment will be totally changed from the one I lived in during my early years in the business. They will never know the thrills I had, or the discomforts either, but they will encounter many thrills of their own, of a different kind, but equally exciting.

The first pioneers pushed back the wilderness and opened nature's storehouse. Their successors—a new kind of pioneer—will push back the wilderness of ignorance and pry from nature its most carefully hoarded and deeply hidden secrets.

And that's where education and educators come in.

The oil pioneers got their advanced training in the toughest and most expensive school of all—the school of experience. The qualities they needed to pass their examinations are not the kind you usually expect to acquire in classrooms—qualities like physical endurance, the ability to stand up under the hardest blows of fate, courage to the point of folly, daring to the limit of recklessness, and total inability to calculate the odds against any venture.

Sometimes these qualities were carried to extremes by the tough, hard-bitten pioneers; the early oil boom towns were hardly ideal communities by any standard of civic pride. But still courage, fortitude, stamina, and determination are not to be despised. They are virtues rated high in the American heritage. I hope that parents and educators will continue to instill respect for these qualities in the next generation of Americans, and especially in those young men and women who choose to make their careers in the oil business.

But from educators much more will be needed to prepare future oil men and women—all the learning they can get in school, plus the enthusiasm to continue their education throughout their lives; and, beyond that, an unswerving desire to create, to bring forth something new in the world.

For whatever else may be said of the oilmen of the past—the pioneers—they were first, and above all, creators. Oklahoma stands today as living proof of their creative force.

Repeated over and over again in human history is the tragic record of energy, intelligence, and talent misspent on unworthy and destructive endeavors. It is our sorrow and our loss that sheer destruction has so often proved the motive for vast undertakings, and that opportunities for discovery and creation have been neglected for the hot pursuit of predatory aims.

That is why I'm proud of my association with the oil industry; it is an intensely creative enterprise, wholly dedicated to bringing something more to people, instead of taking away from someone's stock of things that already exist on the earth's surface.

I think the contrast is well made by episodes from the history of this very State.

Just a bit more than four centuries ago Francisco Coronado wandered through a vast territory of the Southwest, including Oklahoma, in pursuit of a phantom. His quest had been inspired by reports of the Seven Cities of Cibola—seven cities reputed to be so rich that they glittered with gold and the buildings were ornamented with precious stones.

And so Coronado ventured forth with a large expedition—and larger hopes for gold and glory. Even after the Seven Cities proved to be a fraud, he plodded on, goaded by fresh rumors of another great metropolis laden with treasure for the taking.

It is ironic that in the course of his expedition he traversed some of the richest land in the whole world. He passed through areas where gold and silver abounded, where there were huge stocks of another treasure—then unknown—oil, waiting for the man who would free it from its prison in the earth. But he found nothing. He returned to Mexico with empty hands and a broken heart.

Coronado found nothing because he looked for his treasure in cities already built, and the treasure wasn't there, it was hidden in the ground; the cities he sought had not been built, they were waiting for the builders to come.

Centuries later they were built, when the right men arrived—the creators—who were willing to dig for their treasure and bring forth something new in the world. (But because he came to loot and plunder what others had already found, and never thought to make discoveries of his own, Coronado failed.)

The Seven Cities of Cibola were a myth, as Coronado learned to his lifelong sorrow, but today real cities thrive across the land he searched because creative men came to enrich that land and nourish its prosperity. Who were the real conquistadores? The oil men—for they did not contend with other men, but with nature itself, and they did not have to loot the treasure of others; they had the vision to find treasure of their own.

I shall not attempt to recite all the advantages oil men have brought to Oklahoma. It would take too long to tell with any degree of completeness, and it would only mean repeating what all of you know and have observed with your own eyes.

However, a few figures are worth recalling just to remind us of the size of Oklahoma's economic benefits from petroleum. It is estimated, for instance, that up to the first of this year the value at the wells of the crude oil produced in this State, from the start of commercial production here, totaled close to \$13 billion. Last year alone the value at the wells of the crude oil produced in the State totaled nearly \$652 million, with natural gas liquids accounting for another \$50 million, and natural gas itself for nearly \$54 million.

Up to January 1, more than 7½ billion barrels of crude oil had been produced in

Oklahoma, and there's a lot left in the ground. Proved crude reserves run to nearly 2 billion barrels, with an additional 343 million barrels of natural gas liquids, and some 14 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Oil or gas or both are produced in all but 8 of this State's 77 counties, and at the year's beginning there were 77,887 producing wells scattered across every part of Oklahoma. Close to 68,000 Oklahomans make their living directly in some part of the oil business.

Of course, there is no need to dwell on the ways Oklahomans, who are not even remotely connected with the petroleum industry, gain from its operations—the landowners, the merchants and business people, the royalty owners, the farmers, and many others into whose pockets flow, from one direction or another, money generated by petroleum activities.

This is truly a creative force, a purely constructive force, unleashed by the pioneer oil men who brought forth a boon from the earth that would endure long after they had spudded in their last wells. And the people we honor here tonight are men and women who have carried on this tradition by giving something new to the world—whether it is the world of machinery and chemicals, in the case of oil men; or the world of thought and learning, in the case of the educators.

I want to address myself especially to the educators when I express the hope that the schools of this State and of other States will continue to supply us with oil men and women capable of carrying forward the trail blazed by the pioneers. For the industry now and in future years has great need for such people, and the American public has a constant, growing need for the benefits they can confer.

Next year the oil industry will be 100 years old. We've climbed a long way in that first century, but only to a height that gives us a clearer view of the distances expanding before us—the limitless possibilities, the boundless opportunities, the seemingly infinite capabilities of the stuff known as petroleum.

As of now, there are more than 2,300 products made by the petroleum industry, but nobody believes the limit has been reached—or anything approaching the limit. Scientists of the future will find many hundreds, more likely thousands, of new uses for petroleum, some of them unprecedented and unparalleled by anything being done today. Here is a challenge for the creative mind, the mind aroused by education to break through the barriers surrounding our present knowledge of what petroleum can do.

Can we guess the services these new products will perform? Perhaps there'll be new fabrics to make life more comfortable for those who must work in difficult climates—the tropics or the polar regions. Perhaps they'll take the form of some simple, but prized, household improvements, a new kind of plastic or paint. Perhaps we can look for some medical discovery that will tame a terrible disease, relieve pain and suffering, or significantly prolong human life.

It may even be some present student's glory to contrive a petroleum fuel powerful enough to break with ease the grip of earth's gravity and transport the first men to see the dark side of the Moon, to pierce the clouds of Venus and solve the mystery of those canal-like markings on Mars.

Anyone who thinks petroleum has become a staid and routine wrapped business, with no chance for thrills and excitement, hasn't considered the exploits and adventures still to take place in laboratories, where a new breed of pioneer—with the old breed's imagination plus a modern education—ventures into regions that no human mind has yet explored.

That's only one of the broad avenues for the creative brain, the constructive brain, in oil. Let's look at some of the others.

Those of you who lived through the oil boom days in Oklahoma have memories of the waste that resulted from weakness in technology. The great Oklahoma City oil field, in its early stages, is a case in point. We've learned plenty since those days, but we've got much more still to learn.

Though the industry has made giant strides in the prevention of waste and the conservation of oil, it is far short of its goal. In the early days, the producer could usually expect to recover only 10 to 15 percent of the oil in a pool. Today, we're doing substantially better—recovering about 35 to 40 percent as a rule, and even more in some fields where conditions are especially favorable. But even a threefold gain in the recovery of oil from a typical reservoir leaves no room for complacency. Needed are new methods that will step up our recovery rate and bring us closer and closer to the only acceptable aim—full, one hundred percent recovery of all the available oil and gas in a pool.

There's another chance for a scientist to prove himself, and, at the same time, automatically multiply the Nation's oil reserves. And there's a chance for educators to discover and encourage students who give evidence of having the kind of skill and interests that could lead to such an important development. Just consider what it would mean to the country to have its petroleum reserves virtually tripled by improved recovery methods.

Consider also what it would mean if some scientist came up with a new and better way of drilling for oil and gas, so the wells could go deeper than they are going now, without a prohibitive increase in costs, and perhaps expose huge new oil reserves presently beyond our reach.

Here's another hint as to how today's science-minded student can prepare himself for a career ripe with opportunity: Last year over 80 percent of the 747 wildcat wells drilled in Oklahoma were dry holes. For the entire oil-producing country, the dry-hole figure was nearly 86 percent. We've greatly improved our exploration techniques, but, as these figures show, we're still playing a game that bears an uncomfortable resemblance to blindman's buff. The scientist who can do anything to reduce the odds oil producers now have to buck, who can give us more reliable ways of telling where oil is—and where it isn't—will earn the gratitude of the entire industry—and every consumer of its products. We've been waiting years for this man. I hope he comes along very soon.

I've mentioned only a few suggestions for future creative accomplishments by the highly educated and thoroughly trained oil men who will carry on with the work begun by the pioneers.

And I'm not thinking only of scientists either, though we'll need all we can get in the oil industry over the years to come. We need the right people for other occupations, too—executives for the future, mentally and morally capable of managing the industry's enterprises; highly skilled marketing people to keep the flow of products moving steadily from well to consumer; and certainly there's a very pronounced need for men and women who can do a better job of interpreting the oil industry to the public, so petroleum will stop being a national scapegoat and start receiving the understanding it deserves in the nonproducing States.

This is one of the oil industry's biggest problems today—lack of public understanding and deliberately fostered misunderstanding of our business. But we're not alone in our troubles. The whole private enterprise system is taking a beating from clever propagandists who know how to use words as weapons. No matter how brilliantly private enterprise performs, it will keep on taking

punishment from these people unless it prepares itself to meet them on the battleground they have chosen, and refute their melodramatic propaganda with an equally appealing presentation of the facts. The private enterprise system is in mortal danger right now. It can't take many more propaganda blows without permanent hurt in public standing and misguided public laws. If this system is to be rescued in time, and preserved against future attacks, we must find more people with the talent and the training to wage a victorious fight for the ideas and ideals of American freedom.

You can increase the output of oilfields and the throughput of refineries to meet changing demand, but there isn't any way yet known to enlarge the supply of human talent to meet the tremendous demand now being felt in all walks of life. However, we can, and we should, look to this country's educators, and aid and support them, in developing and stimulating the best abilities in the young people given to their care. For, in large measure, what happens in our schools, our colleges and universities today will decide what happens in our country and the world tomorrow.

When we look into the future, it is with a feeling of awe at the possibilities that lie ahead. The average span of life has already been lengthened significantly and it can be lengthened more—giving people, as the saying goes, "more years in their life and more life in their years." The mobility of the present, when people think little of hopping oceans in a plane, may seem narrowly confined 10, 15, or 100 years from now. It is not at all impossible that our descendants may get away from it all by spending a vacation on the moon, as casually as one of us might take a trip to Santa Fe.

The plagues that tormented the middle ages have already been subdued in the Western World, and other diseases are yielding. Polio, once the bane of childhood, has already given way. We can hope that cancer, arthritis and the mental ills will soon be in full retreat.

Science, education, learning hold out all the prospects for a life so much better than anything we now know as to make our highest living standards seem lowly by contrast.

There is just one cloud—one threatening, ominous cloud—hanging over the future's landscape. That is the cloud of a total perversion of science in some form of destruction—either the physical destruction of war or the moral destruction of a totally regimented society. We could look happily toward the future, we could send our children and grandchildren into it cheerfully, if it were not for the specter of the kind of life described in "1984" or the end of all life in an atomic holocaust.

But I submit that the same powers of mind which are capable of inventing the advances a peaceful future can bring are equally capable of averting the catastrophes that we fear. I maintain that the force of creation is stronger than the force of destruction, and that wisely led, soundly educated Americans, can both gain and guard the good life that is due them.

We in the oil industry want them to have this good life. We have dedicated ourselves to creation—to drawing oil out of the earth and converting it into products that serve and advance human society. We want to build cities, not destroy them. We want to spread happiness and comfort, not tears and agony. These are our wishes, these are the aims we work for, these are the aspirations with which we enter the second century of our enterprise.

But we cannot realize these aims alone. We must have the help of educators, and of enlightened people everywhere, who can work with us to make this wish into a living faith, who can spread the light of learning until it overflows the boundaries of our own land

into nations now groping in the darkness of ignorance and hate.

Once the people of the world understand what creative forces can do, fear and envy will be banished from human life. For when creative energies are let loose, there is no need to think of gain in terms of taking from another what rightly belongs to him, no need to struggle to grasp a small share of a dwindling stock of goods, no cause to believe that a man can get richer only by making some other man poorer.

Creation—as oil men have practiced it here in Oklahoma—as scientists are practicing it every day and will practice it even more in the future—means tapping unlimited abundance by bringing to people something they did not have before. And as this creative force advances, the evils of poverty, disease, and despair will be forced to withdraw. There will be no room for them in the world.

Let us, therefore, shun the narrow view of poor, misguided Coronado, who thought he could only increase the wealth of his own people by diminishing the possessions of another race. Let us look at life instead with the steady vision of the oil pioneers who knew that they could not enrich themselves except by enriching others, by bringing out of the earth a treasure that was denied to all until they found it.

As we approach the end of oil's first century, and look back at the obstacles surmounted, the difficulties overcome, as we consider what oil and oil men have done in this very State, and the courage and perseverance they needed to do it, we can draw upon the past for confidence in the future.

The qualities these men possessed are still being produced on American soil. They are not common today, they never were common, but neither are they scarce. The past gave us men and women with creative vision, and the future will keep up the supply. We look to our educators, and our clergy, and the other leaders of American thought to provide the inspiration and the moral incentive for the new kind of pioneers to come, so that oil's second century will show the land with new advantages, and accelerate the progress of a State that counts its blessings and properly honors its benefactors.

The President's 1960 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Advisory Council, under date of January 21, 1959, issued a statement on the President's 1960 budget. I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues this excellent statement which reads as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S 1960 BUDGET—A STATEMENT BY THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21, 1959

The brave and new words in the President's state of the Union message have now been followed by the weak and inadequate programs contained in the President's budget message. The President says that we need to do more, but his budget proposes to do less.

The President attempts to justify this inconsistency by the claim that he is presenting a balanced budget. That claim was spurious a year ago; it is spurious today. A budget that does not meet the economic

needs of the Nation and the people cannot meet the financial needs of the Treasury.

The new Republican budget comes close to being a fraud on the American people. President Eisenhower and his advisers, if they have read the lessons of the November election, have rejected them all. They have decided that the American people want not advance but retreat, not expansion but contraction, not an imaginative step toward the future but a selfish and sullen retreat into the past. The new budget shows, above all, that in the GOP administration there are no modern Republicans and no conservative Republicans but only men who put pocketbook before people. This the people of the United States will surely remember.

What is bad for people is also bad for pocketbooks, both private and public.

The new budget talks confidently of a great expansion in income and output. This underlies the forecast of a great increase in revenue without any important increases in taxes. But at the same time national programs, far from keeping pace with the normal increase in needs and capabilities, are cut back from the levels of past years. The effect of such cutbacks is not to expand but to repress the economy. In any case, public services must keep pace with private expansion. Neither the United States nor any other country can afford to base its policy on such false reasoning and foolish inconsistencies as are manifest in this budget.

The individual budget items and the related legislative program are an intricate combination of defeat, deception, and denial. National Defense outlays are reduced, and reduced even more when proper allowance is made for price changes. This means that the administration is disarming not by negotiation, a solution that it apparently rejects, but by unilateral action. It proposes to assist our friends and meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in the uncommitted world with a big reduction in economic aid. The new Development Loan Fund and the provision for technical cooperation are to remain at low or starvation levels. Indeed, nowhere in the field of foreign affairs does the budget show the slightest imagination, or indeed, even the most elementary realization of the nature of the world in which we live.

The mistreatment of our own people is callous. The budget shows no thought of the needs of an expanding population or of an improving level of popular well-being. Nothing is deemed so important by the administration as a reduction in appropriations. As a result, there is no program for school construction, no new aid to education, nothing to show that the anxieties and concerns of the post-sputnik and space era have made the slightest impression on President Eisenhower and his Republican budget makers. Increased needs for parks, conservation, forest protection and improvement, reclamation and assistance to low-income farmers are all met with budget levels below past years.

In recent years, as the Federal Government has lagged in meeting its responsibilities, States and localities have endeavored to the best of their abilities, to fill the gap. As a result, at a time when the Federal debt has changed only slightly, State and local debt has gone up severalfold. State and local spending has increased far more rapidly than that of the Federal Government. Nevertheless this Federal budget, either in ignorance or indifference to these rising burdens, proposes to transfer numerous responsibilities of the Federal Government to States and localities. This would include some or all of the present Federal responsibility for urban renewal programs, for assistance to impacted areas, for flood control, for waste treatment and pollution control, and for feed and seed loans in areas that have suffered disaster.

In the new budget the costly and ineffective farm program is made somewhat more ineffective by a cut in support prices. Due to the ineffectiveness of the program, costs will continue to be tremendous, and as a result of the Benson mismanagement of the corn program they will probably be even higher than the present budget estimates suggest. There is an unjustifiable reduction in funds for hospital construction and for medical research programs. Veterans are to be rewarded with increased interest costs as are Rural Electrification Administration borrowers.

Nothing better symbolizes Republican attitudes than the one big increase in the budget. That is for interest charges, which rise from \$7.5 billion in the present fiscal year to \$8.1 billion in the next. This is exclusively the result of the increase in interest rates. The only people who benefit in the big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government. This shows, incidentally, that the tight money policy is to be renewed with its menace to expansion.

This is the budget of an administration which has lost respect for the American people, and which seems to have lost respect even for itself. The country is fortunate in having a Democratic Congress which is alive to our needs, both at home and abroad, and which will seek to provide for these needs in an honest and responsible way. We Democrats are not for spending for the sake of spending. But we do believe in doing what must be done for the preservation of the peace and for the protection and well-being of our people.

Is Inflation Inevitable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record excerpts from an address entitled "Is Inflation Inevitable?" delivered by Henry C. Wallich before the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IS INFLATION INEVITABLE?

(Excerpts from remarks by Henry C. Wallich, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, at the monthly meeting of the District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., Jan. 21, 1959)

President Eisenhower's balanced budget submitted to the Congress on January 19 will be a major factor in the battle against inflation. It promises to remove one of the chief sources of inflation—the Federal deficit. At a time when the Nation is moving toward new peaks of prosperity, a balanced budget is essential.

President Eisenhower's budget will have anti-inflationary effects that go beyond removal of the deficit. It is balanced at \$77 billion, well below the \$80.9 billion expenditures expected for fiscal year 1959. It thus avoids excessively high Government expenditures which can be inflationary in periods of booming business, even if fully covered by taxes.

In the Economic Report issued January 20, the President gives details concerning fur-

ther action against inflation. He proposes an amendment to the Employment Act so as to make stable prices an explicit goal of Federal economic policy. A continuing Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth is to follow Government and private activities affecting costs, prices, and economic growth. Another committee is established to follow specific Government activities that affect prices and costs, including procurement, construction, stockpiling, and commodity price support. Fuller public information on matters relating to inflation was also proposed by the President.

These governmental efforts will be important to control inflation. But inflation does not spring from one single source, nor can the Government, in a free economy, control all possible sources of inflation. The consumer contributes to inflation if he goes overboard in his expenditures, if he is not conservative in the use of credit, and if he fails to shop carefully. The businessman contributes to inflation if he engages in sudden large variations in capital spending, if he makes injudicious use of credit, and if he does not practice restraint in the pricing of what he sells. Labor contributes to inflation if wage demands are not kept in line with the growth of productivity. All these activities must be avoided if we are to fight inflation successfully.

In a free economy, the actions of consumers, businessmen, and labor cannot be controlled, they must be voluntary. The responsibility which this imposes is all the greater.

It is futile to believe that as a nation we can protect ourselves against inflation by pressing for higher wages, by buying ahead, and by seeking out inflation-proof havens for our savings. Some may succeed and a few may even gain a temporary advantage. But in the long run inflation hurts the entire economy and we are all hurt with it. Against the damage done to our productive system, there is no way of hedging.

Inflation long continued will undermine also our posture in the cold war. It threatens us with a new economic isolationism. If inflation is allowed to proceed, we may price ourselves out of our export markets and be less able to compete at home with imports from abroad. Inevitably, there will come new demands for tariff protection and the like. Inevitably, our ability to strengthen the free world economically, through private investment and Government aid, will be reduced. We must not let that happen at this critical juncture.

Inflation certainly can be controlled. We know that it poses a threat to the very essence of our free economy. A mature nation will not let that threat materialize.

Discrimination in Military Pay Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of January 25, 1959, commented editorially that it was encouraging that a large number of Senators and Representatives have sponsored proposed legislation to prevent discrimination in retired military pay and to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services.

I agree. Discrimination by statute among the combat veterans of American wars ought not to be, indeed, must not

be, tolerated. I hope legislation may be given early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the editorial comments in the Washington Star be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANK DISCRIMINATION

There are gratifying indications in Congress that a highly discriminatory provision in the 1958 military pay law will be eliminated at this session. This provision, in effect, set up an inferior and a preferred retired list for pay purposes. Relegated to the inferior list were all officers who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the day the law became effective. They were limited to a retirement pay increase of 6 percent. All officers retiring after that date are on the preferred list. They are entitled to a much larger increase, based on the traditional relationship between active duty and retired list pay scales.

Among the penalized inferior group are many of the combat leaders of two World Wars and the Korean war. They have been cut off arbitrarily from the benefits which they justifiably had expected under a century-old formula. Yet officers retired since last June 1 and those hereafter to be retired are entitled to the full benefits of this formula (50 percent of present base pay of rank for officers with 20 years' service, 75 percent for those with 30 years' service). The unfairness of this so-called economy measure may be seen by the fact that a major general or rear admiral with 30 years of service who retired the day after the law became operative receives \$1,884 more a year than an officer of like rank and service who had the misfortune to retire on the previous day.

The storm of protest which has arisen among active as well as retired officers of the three services is based not only on the inequity of the plan but on fear that departure from the established formula last year may set a precedent for future congressional economy. As the Cordier report on armed service pay persuasively pointed out, the relationship between active duty and retired pay has been a vital force in stabilizing the military career service over many years. To abandon this relationship is to impair morale by holding over the services the threat of an unstable retirement-pay structure.

Hence, it is encouraging that nearly 30 Senators and numerous Representatives have sponsored identical bills at this session to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services. This legislation, involving amendment of the 1958 pay law, merits early passage—in the interest of a more stable and stronger Military Establishment.

Indiana Dunes on the Shore of Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "Will New Congress Save the Dunes?—Vast Tract To

Be Either a Park or a Steel Plant," published in the Chicago American of January 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL NEW CONGRESS SAVE THE DUNES?—VAST TRACT TO BE EITHER A PARK OR A STEEL PLANT

(By Basil Talbott)

A strip of Indiana dunes on the Lake Michigan shore east of Gary promises to become a battlefield in the new session of Congress.

The issue is a simple one. Shall this shifting landscape, with its unusual flora and soft contours, be preserved as a natural resource or shall it be consigned to vast industrial development?

Leading the forces to keep the area as it is, is the Save the Dunes Council, of which Mrs. James Buell of Ogden Dunes, Ind., wife of an Ogden Dunes physician, is president.

Unable to find an Indiana member of Congress to carry its spear, the council appealed to Senator DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, and found him willing and eager. He introduced a bill in the 85th Congress to make the area a national park. It got nowhere, so he is to introduce it again this session.

The council is backing him up with an army of 300,000—people who have signed petitions for the preservation of the dunes.

There is a hitch. A year and a half ago, Bethlehem Steel Co. began buying up dunes. It now owns 4,000 acres—a reported investment of \$7 million—and seeks more.

ONE AND ONE-HALF MILES OF SHORELINE

The purchase takes in one and a half miles of shoreline—including the area the council wants to save for a park. At the time the steel firm began making its purchases, Eugene Grace, the board chairman, was asked what Bethlehem intended to do with the property.

His answer, rated as the quote of the year, was:

"We certainly aren't planning to put up a bird sanctuary."

Grace has subsequently retired as board chairman.

Having bought the land, Bethlehem recently evicted 58 families of dunes dwellers. These were summer residents who had rented their plots—some as long ago as 20 years—for \$125 a year and put up makeshift cabins. These structures lacked modern conveniences, such as electricity, gas and plumbing.

In effect they were told to leave and take their homes with them. The sites are inaccessible except by jeep or foot. One had to be a true dunes lover to live there. Most of these dwellers obeyed only the first part of the command, which was to leave.

WEST OF PRESENT PARK

The Bethlehem property is west of, but not adjoining, the Indiana Dunes State Park at Chesterton, which attracted more than 400,000 people last year.

Citizens who are fighting against the "dooming of the dunes" contend the building of a steel plant so near would damage if not destroy the recreational facilities of the park as well as other nearby areas.

The same group also contends that efforts to get the Federal Government to build a deep-water harbor would, if successful, be a gift to Bethlehem in the event the steel firm erected a mill.

Surveys have shown Chicago's Calumet Harbor would suffice to serve the needs of the Indiana steel industry, the group claims.

Besides the slice bought by Bethlehem, there is adjoining dunes property acquired by National Steel Co. 20 years ago. Whereas Bethlehem has indicated it wants to put up a plant there, National has disclosed no plans. The stretch of dunes owned by both firms includes 4 miles of shoreline.

TENANTS TOLD TO LEAVE

National also has dunes tenants and has ordered them to leave. This firm has its headquarters in Pittsburgh.

In a speech last year, Senator DOUGLAS said:

"The (Army) Corps of Engineers has blue-printed a harbor to slash through the middle of this park, eliminating the historic trails, uprooting the botanical and biological exhibit, closing down the way stations for migrating birds, drying out the wildlife, draining the bogs, eliminating for all time the moving, lifting, shifting landscape that has been the source of inspiration to artists, writers and just plain people for generations.

"What is worse, the construction of mills on this site will irrevocably damage the State park, polluting its waters and air, surrounding it with a symbol of industrialization, walling it up with noise, making it more like a neglected vacant lot in the city than a protected area."

ESSENTIAL TO ECONOMY

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART (Republican, Indiana), has been quoted as saying the steel mills are essential to Indiana's economy and that he had received no mail supporting the Douglas bill.

Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, reportedly remarked that Douglas should mind his own business and take care of Illinois.

DOUGLAS' ANSWER:

"Handley ought to be ashamed of himself for taking this land from the people of Indiana. The attitude of many Indiana citizens and politicians is: 'Why should we spend money to provide recreation for Illinois?'"

"This site is largely but not exclusively used by the people from Illinois and Chicago."

The dunes have attracted fishermen, campers, picnickers, bathers, photographers and other outdoors lovers since 1912 when it was brought to the public's attention by the Chicago Prairie Club, a hikers' group.

NEGOTIATE ON MERGER

A possible clue to Bethlehem's plans for use of the dunes property is supplied by the firm's recent merger negotiations with Youngtown Sheet & Tube Co., whose plant is in Indiana Harbor.

Several months ago, a New York Federal judge ruled against such a merger, saying it would tend to create a monopoly.

Bethlehem spokesmen say the decision is being studied with the possibility of initiating an appeal.

Among the groups joining the campaign of the Save the Dunes Council are the National Parks Association, Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, Garden Clubs of Indiana, Nature Conservancy, National Wildlife Federation, Wildlife Management Institute, Wilderness Society, American Nature Association, Council of Conservationists, American Planning and Civic Association, Conservation Council of Illinois, Trustees for Conservation, and the Sierra Club.

Thailand Invites Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much notice of late in the United States of the importance of ac-

celerating the rate of U.S. private investment abroad from the present net of approximately \$3¼ billion annually to a more realistic and needed \$5 billion annually. However, this is not a one-way street, for not only must the private funds be made available from this country but there must be an atmosphere conducive to the encouragement of private investment in the countries receiving the funds.

In this regard, the changes recently enacted in the foreign investment law of Thailand are worthy of interest. The United States Department of Commerce, for example, is inviting the attention of American businessmen to the new law as an incentive to investment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement by the Government of Thailand which invites private investments from the United States. Those, like myself, who are deeply interested in overseas investments have emphasized that there must be receptivity to such investments. Thailand is making an effort in that direction.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Since the provisions of the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497 are not deemed adequate and may constitute an obstacle to the establishment of industrial enterprises because of delays in completing the required formalities and, furthermore, because the facilities offered are not sufficiently attractive to induce both domestic and foreign private investment in industrial enterprises in Thailand, the revolutionary party, therefore, deems that the said act should be revised once the legislative assembly is constituted. In the meantime, and pending the constitution of that assembly, some measures must be taken with a view to promoting internal industrial development as promptly as possible, so that the country may receive benefits therefrom.

The revolutionary party, therefore, issues the following ordinance:

"ARTICLE 1. Such industrial activities which have already been the object of promotion by decree or by ordinance of the leader of the revolutionary party may be engaged in by private persons acting individually or jointly or by juristic persons, irrespective of whether they are corporations or limited companies and whether they are Thai or foreign. These physical or juristic persons enjoy similar rights and, once they receive necessary authorization from the committee empowered by the present ordinance, shall benefit from the following guarantees from the state:

"1. The state will not create new industrial establishments to compete with the authorized industries.

"2. The state will not transfer private industrial establishments to state ownership.

"ART. 2. The industries authorized by the committee in accordance with article 1 above shall enjoy the special rights as follows:

"1. Exemption from import duties on machinery, accessories, and equipments to be used by industrial establishments as they are first set up or for their major expansion. Such exemption shall not cover items which are produced or may be purchased in Thailand.

"2. In case the industrial undertakings are corporations or limited companies at the moment when they begin their industrial

activities they shall be exempted from payment of taxes or their income derived from the sales of the products of their industries, for a period of time to be determined in each case by the committee. Such period shall not be less than 2 years and not more than 5 years.

"3. Normally the export of products of the authorized industries shall be permitted. In certain cases of necessity required by national economic interest, export may be prohibited.

"4. Remittance abroad in foreign currency is permitted for capitals and for profits derived from capitals brought into the country from abroad, after payment of taxes as required by law. Authorization must be obtained through official channel and favorable consideration shall be given to any request for remittance as far as the monetary situation will permit.

"5. Skilled workers and industrial experts shall be permitted to enter the country, even in excess of immigration quotas, if the committee empowered by this ordinance deems it appropriate.

"ART. 3. The industrial undertakings authorized by the committee empowered by the present ordinance may receive the following special rights and benefits which the committee may deem appropriate taking into account the requirements of a particular industry:

"1. Exemption from or reduction of import duties, for an appropriate period of time, on materials which are required for use in an industrial establishment and which are imported from abroad. Such materials shall include those which are consumed in the manufacturing process but will not include those which can be purchased in Thailand.

"2. Exemption or reduction, for an appropriate period of time, or export duties on manufactured products to be sent abroad.

"3. Protection through import prohibition for an appropriate period of time, of manufactured goods of the same category.

"4. Protection through increase of import duties, for an appropriate period of time, on manufactured goods of the same category.

"5. Protection through prohibition, for an appropriate period of time, of new industrial enterprises for the manufacturing of products of the same category.

"ART. 4. The committee empowered by this ordinance shall be the economic advisory committee set up by the head of the revolutionary party.

"After a government has been constituted, the committee empowered to carry out the above functions shall be the committee which the government shall designate.

"ART. 5. From the date of the effective application of this ordinance, it shall be noted that:

"1. The present ordinance shall not affect the rights or benefits which have been acquired under the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497.

"2. Such provisions in this ordinance which may contravene those of the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497 shall prevail over the latter.

"3. The rights and benefits accorded by the present ordinance shall accrue to those who are engaged in industries which have already been the object of promotion by the industrial promotion act of B.E. 2497. Nevertheless, these rights and benefits may not be claimed retroactively. In particular, those specified in article 2 (2) shall accrue only to the extent as will be determined by the committee.

"ART. 6. The industries which are the object of such promotion shall be listed and published subsequently."

Issued on December 5, B.E. 2501.

Field Marshal SARISDI DHANARAJATA,
Leader of the Revolutionary Party.

An Open Letter to Governor Almond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon entitled "An Open Letter to Governor Almond," delivered by Rev. Ross Allen Weston, minister of the Unitarian Church of Arlington, Va., on Sunday, January 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO GOVERNOR ALMOND

(Sermon delivered by Rev. Ross Allen Weston, minister, Unitarian Church of Arlington, Va., Sunday, January 25, 1959)

JANUARY 25, 1959.

The Honorable J. LINDSAY ALMOND,
Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR ALMOND: My first task must necessarily be one of self-introduction, for you will want to know who it is that presumes to disturb with his tiny and insignificant voice your vast preoccupation with the complicated affairs of our Commonwealth. I am a relatively young man, the father of three children all of whom are in public schools, the minister of a Unitarian Church in Arlington, a community with which I am sure you are acquainted. I find it a fascinating and exciting place in which to live and work, and I hope that someday you will be able to spend some time here so that you can get to know us better.

I am sure that you need no introduction to Unitarianism, for being a good student of American history, you know that it was the faith of our Founding Fathers. Its history in Virginia goes right back to the days of Thomas Jefferson. The Unitarian movement is growing in Virginia. We now have churches in Arlington, Fairfax, Mount Vernon, Charlottesville, Lynchburg, Norfolk, and Richmond. We have very active fellowships in Blacksburg, Danville, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Roanoke, and Waynesboro. So it is no longer true today, as Jefferson said of his day, that, "I must be content to be a Unitarian by myself." Incidentally, our churches in Arlington, Richmond, and Norfolk are integrated congregations—a fact which I find to be of considerable significance.

The main concern of my life is with the moral and spiritual welfare of the many families that comprise my congregation, and beyond that to the millions of people who are my brothers in the great adventure of life upon this earth. Each and every one of these, whether dwelling in the Piedmont mud of Virginia, or upon the wide, windswept plains of Siberia, I believe to be the creatures of that mysterious but wondrous creative power which some men call life, others nature, and others God. As such, then, I must think of all these people as brothers of one another, immutably bound together in a common destiny. And so I write to you, Governor Almond, as a brother in spirit, and as one who longs to see brotherhood and justice reign, not only in my own community, but over all the face of the earth.

For a long time I have wanted to write to you, but, like most citizens, I just didn't take the time. Since Tuesday evening, however, when I listened to your address on the

radio, I have felt a moral compulsion to say some of the things that have been bothering me. I suppose that you will call me a "pinko" or a "Communist sympathizer hiding behind the pulpit," but that won't bother me in the least. I can understand the psychological motivation which makes a man use such a defense as that, and I can forgive him.

But I find it difficult to forgive you for the disappointment, disillusionment, and outright disgust that you have caused many thoughtful Virginians to feel as a result of your talk last Tuesday. I have always been opposed to your doctrine of massive resistance; yet, like many other Virginians, I have continued to feel an active sympathy for the difficult position in which you found yourself. It has always been my hope that your intelligence and practical approach to problems would issue in the continuance of your early ideal of moderation. It was always my hope that when Virginia's own supreme court rendered its decision on the legality of massive resistance, your qualities and leadership would blossom into greatness, that then you would cease to be the politician and become the statesman and thus take your rank among the great men in the history of this State. The present loss of faith in the qualities of your leadership is now one of the great tragedies of our current social crisis. I hope that my letter may bring to you an inkling of some of the reactions of Americans to the abuse which you saw fit to hurl at us on Tuesday night. If it can convey some of the depth of our disappointment in you, and the genuine anguish of our anger at what you have said and done, then it will not be in vain.

I realize, of course, that there is a ridiculous element in this picture of me, an utterly insignificant citizen, writing to you, one of the most powerful individuals in the State today. My letter will probably never even reach you, and if it does, it will have little influence, for I am told that you are not easily swayed. And yet I have to write. I write to you now as I write to all of the statesmen and politicians whose policies and programs immediately or ultimately affect our Nation's welfare and destiny. I write to you now because I believe that in this present situation you are the one who is most responsible for what happens to the children of Virginia and to the concept of government by law in this Nation. Not only that, but I think you are also responsible for what happens to America's position of leadership in the world today. I make no apology, therefore, in taking my pen in hand and telling you exactly how I feel.

My main purpose in writing you this letter is to urge upon you a drastic change in your policy of open defiance of State and Federal law. To do this before it is too late. To do this, not only for the sake of Virginia, but for the benefit of America. Whether we like it or not, a tremendous responsibility has developed upon this Nation—upon us. We call ourselves the leaders of the free world. We say that ours is the task of preserving democracy, and freedom, and the high spiritual heritage achieved through the years. The United States has established itself as a Nation proclaiming individual freedom, equal opportunity, human dignity, and though all other nations fail in their basic responsibilities, it is incumbent upon us to continually strive to live up to the principles we proclaim so proudly. We must endeavor to maintain our integrity as the land of the free. We must live the words we speak, or we can never expect others in this world to believe our words; to believe that our high-sounding principles can be practiced in fact; that the way of life set forth in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution is the better way of life; that is the only way mankind can truly come to the full glory of a fruitful, creative, peaceful, and just life. Our country today

can tip the scales which decide the future course of mankind. It is within the power of our Nation to enable human beings to continue the centuries-old upward climb—or to end it all. Whether we like it or not, our actions and our decisions as individuals and as a State, will decide which of those alternatives will prevail. Whether we like it or not, there is this great weight of continuing responsibility resting upon each of us and upon the groups to which we belong. We must master the problems at home before we can master the problems abroad. And home, for us, is not Chicago or Washington or Atlanta. It is Arlington, it is Richmond, it is Norfolk, and Charlottesville, and Front Royal.

Yet, in spite of the well-known horrible reality of nuclear weapons, in spite of the obvious potential war situation that exists in the world today, in spite of our announced role as leaders, in spite of widespread education concerning the basic principles of our Nation—in spite of all these, there are those in our country—and I include you among them—who are loudly pursuing a suicidal course. As world communism engulfs more and more of the globe, you sap the vitality of our strength at home, thus weakening the ability of our Nation to combat this mortal evil abroad. Do you not realize that our Nation is under moral scrutiny today? That the rest of the world is watching and wondering whether we actually live up to our high-sounding principles and pronouncements? Whether we really are a people of integrity who practice what we preach about democracy and peace and equality under law? Regardless of how anxiously you wave the State flag and brag about Virginia's superior way of life, when you defy your own Supreme Court which upholds the law of the land, you are doing a grave disservice to your State, to your country, and to the future of mankind upon this earth.

To those of us who still hope that democracy may somehow win in the desperate struggle with communism, what is happening in Virginia, under your leadership, is profoundly disturbing. The Communists want civilization to recede. They want to limit personal freedom. They want to prevent us from living the good life. That is their declared doctrine. They are book burners, polluters of the intellect, degraders of the mind, betrayers of the soul. They are tyrants, and enslavers, trampers. They proclaim the ancient tribalistic way of life. They want to take us back—back to the darkness from which we painfully emerged. They want defiance; they want disorder; they want bloodshed; they want revolution. They are in revolt against the higher levels of human life. They are in revolt against civilization. They loathe a world in which the individual can live the free life. They plan to reduce the whole world to a common level where that kind of freedom will be impossible.

They are against what all the prophets, all the moral pioneers, all the greatest of the human race have striven for. They are against the freedom that Socrates would rather drink the hemlock than lose. They are against the more abundant life that Jesus said He came to bring. They are against everything that would unburden and unfetter the human soul. Can you really be unaware, Governor Almond, of the tremendous aid you are giving to the very Communists whom you claim to be fighting? Can you really be unaware of the great harm you are doing to the people of Virginia and to the South and to the Nation you claim to be protecting?

Since your address of Tuesday night, I have received a letter which reminded me of King Darius I of ancient Persia. King Darius had feelings of dislike toward the Athenians, but apparently he did not trust the constant strength of those ill feelings, because he

ordered a slave to call out to him before every meal: "Master, remember the Athenians." The letter which I received was from a local citizen. Following the example of King Darius, there was scribbled on a piece of paper with red pencil the words: "Remember Little Rock." I wonder if it is really necessary for anyone to remind us of Little Rock? Are we ever likely to forget it? Europeans remind us of it constantly. Asians remind us of it. Africans remind us of it. The South Americans remind us of it.

Can we here in Arlington forget Little Rock? Our Stratford Junior High School is due to be desegregated within a few days, and school integration will then become a reality in our community. I am sure that the vast majority of the people of Arlington will accept this with calmness, and that we shall be proud of the democratic behavior of our schoolchildren. There will be no disorder, no violence from the thinking citizens of Arlington. Our public officials know how important we feel it is for them to take a firm stand against violence. We support wholeheartedly our public officials in carrying out their duty to support law and order.

I think it is important that you should know of this support before acts of violence occur, if they do occur, and not afterward. For if there is any act of violence it will be caused by the segregationists who have been whipped into fury by your vitriolic words of Tuesday night.

What I am saying is that the eyes of the world will be focused upon Arlington on February 2. What happens at Stratford will, in large measure, depend upon you. We can demonstrate to the world that democracy can really work, or we can prove to the world that what the Communists say about America is actually true—that we do not practice what we preach.

In a very real sense, the future of democracy will be determined by the behavior of the students and parents of Stratford. Democracy is destined to die in America unless its spirit of cooperation can join us together with all men to make a better world. The brotherhood of man must either extend or it must diminish. Selfishness will kill it everywhere, at home as well as abroad—if you and I allow it.

Do you ever wonder, Governor Almond, why it is that none of our pronouncements thus far on the purposes of the American dream have really been exciting? Why the concept of liberty somehow fails to cause enthusiasm throughout the world? Why we wage this bitter struggle with communism so grimly? The reason is not very difficult to understand. Just beneath the level of our ordinary thoughts—the thought that takes things for granted, that tries to be satisfied with what comes its way—below that level, there is a deeper level and it is very unsatisfied today. It wants more than pronouncements; it wants more than court decrees—more than any of these things. It wants a genuine, believable purpose—a sufficient purpose for life. Yes, and it wants that purpose backed up by deeds. Not just in the courtrooms, but everywhere.

Even people who do not realize it are haunted in their thought and conscience by the injustice of the world we try to live in. It depresses their nervous energies. It takes the joy out of life. It makes them uneasy and defensive. We know perfectly well that the brotherhood of man is right. We are beginning to know, too, that it is necessary. In the depths of our hearts—even when nowhere else—we realize that it is coming. In one way or another, it is sure to come. I write this without a shadow of doubt in my mind, in spite of a deepening feeling of distress about the human cost at which it may have to come.

Nothing that you do can keep brotherhood from coming. Nothing new that the general assembly enacts can keep it from coming.

Not even the complete abolishment of the public school system can keep brotherhood from coming. You are foolish indeed if you think the final issue can go your way. No one need think that prejudice can win. What we sow, we reap. Until we learn to sow the seeds of unselfishness, of brotherhood, we shall continue to reap a harvest of disaster. This was true when the prophets first declared it in pioneer loneliness—voices crying in the wilderness. It has been true throughout all history. It is true today. It is a truth which, when it can write itself in nothing else, writes itself in blood.

And of course, both sides of it are plainly written in American history. I need not remind you of that. The War Between the States was the dream of a better world battling for survival. So have been all the wars in which this Nation has fought. But some Americans still do not want to know it. For them, nothing is sacred, nothing full of promise, nothing dedicated to all mankind.

How long must it be, Governor Almond, before Virginians rediscover the meaning of America? How long before we know what that famous, founding declaration of human rights invoked? How long before we see that democracy is basically religious, spiritual, ethical, and that it must be the flaming passion for justice and freedom and brotherhood?

One who is only a Virginian is not yet an American. The Virginia creed must become the American deed. And this means brotherhood. Brotherhood in Arlington. Brotherhood in Richmond. Brotherhood in Virginia. Brotherhood in America. Brotherhood in the world. And brotherhood means religion—the religion that says "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In conclusion, I am sure that you would be first to agree that Virginia has great pride in its past. And rightly so. Here was one of the birthplaces of our democracy. Here great, democratic pioneers like Washington, Madison, Monroe, and Thomas Jefferson were at home. Virginia gave birth to ideas of freedom—freedom of thought and expression, freedom of religion—and, through Jefferson, the idea of education for all. Virginia should take pride in its past, for here in the early days of our democracy men thought and acted on the basis of reason. What has happened to that tradition today? Where are the men who can think clearly and act reasonably? You, sir, could restore that tradition with one great act of statesmanlike leadership.

The world of freemen is waiting for the restoration of human dignity and equality. If they are not revived soon, they will slip from our grasp. If they do, they may well be extinguished forever in the dark abyss of space and time.

Very sincerely yours,
ROSS ALLEN WESTON.

Oregon's Centennial Rates Three Cheers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, Oregon will be 100 years old. It is no wonder that this great event arouses ecstatic expressions from its citizens, including the poetic form. Under a previous consent, I am including a poem, written in honor of Oregon's cen-

tennial celebration, by Mrs. William McKenna, of Coos Bay, Oreg.:

OREGON

It's California for her redwood trees
And lovely girls that Hollywood sees.
And New York's fame is her gay white way,
With shows and lights on old Broadway.

Ohio and Texas have rated a rhyme,
And Rhode Island, the smallest of forty-nine.
But I've traveled afar, and none can boast
Of more wondrous sights than Oregon's coast.

Her rivers, and mountains, and cities, too,
Have more to offer than the others do.

She has myrtlewood, and Crater Lake,
And plains and forests none can fake.
They can send out posters and try real hard,
But the grass is greener in our own backyard.

Now we invite the entire Nation
To come out west for our celebration.
Oregon's centennial rates three cheers
And a wish for a happy next hundred years.

Work of the Red Cross in Pennsylvania Flood Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the American National Red Cross is doing an excellent job in Pennsylvania flood areas. The Red Cross, under the fine leadership of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, deserves the high commendation and sincere thanks from the representatives and people of the flood areas of the Nation.

The Red Cross is the quick and friendly hand that gives our people, caught in the current January 1959 flood disaster, the courage and will to rise and, through our own efforts, to clean up the damage, rebuild, and face the future with growing confidence.

WHAT THE RED CROSS DOES TO DISASTER SUFFERERS—WHAT THE RED CROSS WILL DO FOR YOU

The Red Cross is the official volunteer disaster relief agency of the Federal Government and the American people. It is the way in which people all over the country—your neighbors—are helping you to help yourselves.

Red Cross assistance is of two kinds:

First. Emergency assistance: The Red Cross will provide immediate temporary relief. If you need food, shelter, clothing, or medical attention now, report to the nearest Red Cross disaster office or emergency shelter. The Red Cross will give you a change of address order provided by the Post Office Department to speed up the delivery of your mail. On major disasters the Red Cross will provide you with safety notification cards so that you may notify your relatives and friends of your safety and whereabouts.

Second. Assistance after the emergency: The biggest job to be done is the reestablishment of homes. Those of you who

need more than temporary aid to return to normal living may apply for Red Cross help at the Red Cross disaster office.

This help is an outright gift of the American people through the Red Cross. It may include:

First. Food, clothing, and maintenance.

Second. The repair or rebuilding of owner-occupied homes.

Third. Furniture and other household necessities.

Fourth. Medical and nursing care and hospitalization.

Fifth. Occupational supplies, fixtures, inventories, and equipment.

The Red Cross does not replace losses. It is not an insurance agency. Red Cross meets those needs that you cannot meet yourself without undue hardship. Your situation will receive individual consideration by a Red Cross worker. Enough time will be taken to plan wisely with you and to verify certain information, such as home ownership, income, and liabilities. The final plan will be reviewed in confidence with an advisory committee of responsible local citizens. Each case will be handled as quickly as possible with due consideration given such things as health or age, which might create unusual conditions.

WATCH OUT FOR MISLEADING RUMORS

The Red Cross never sells food or disaster supplies—no payment is ever expected for any assistance given. Any statements to the contrary are completely false and you can help by reporting them, with the name of the person you heard tell them, to the nearest Red Cross office.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1959.
The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Knowing of your great interest in the well-being of the people in Pennsylvania, I want to give you a report of Red Cross activity in connection with the flooding that began in Pennsylvania on January 21.

Incomplete surveys from Red Cross workers indicate that nearly 22,000 families have been affected by floodwaters in 63 counties in the 5-State flood area. At the peak of the flood emergency approximately 6,000 persons were housed and fed in 82 Red Cross shelters.

Chapter volunteers and national disaster workers of the Red Cross are on the job along with Federal, State, and community agencies to bring all possible relief to flood sufferers in your State and the four others affected. The full resources of our organization have been mobilized to aid these stricken families. The Red Cross will continue its emergency and rehabilitation work until the disaster-caused needs of all these families, lacking the necessary funds, have been met.

As perhaps you know, Red Cross help is based on the principle not of replacing all losses, but of assisting disaster victims in need who lack sufficient resources of their own, including insurance, to start back on the road to recovery.

All assistance from the Red Cross is an outright gift, coming chiefly from funds contributed annually by the American people. Unfortunately, our disaster reserve has been drastically reduced because of the extraordinarily heavy disaster losses in the past 4 years. For that reason special appeals for

funds have been inaugurated by the Red Cross in the affected areas. I am confident that the American people, as always, will contribute generously.

You may be assured that the Red Cross will remain on the job until all who need our assistance have been helped.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

Jim, this has really been a rugged flood in many of your areas.

AL.

Thank you, General Gruenther, we in the flood areas do indeed appreciate your warmhearted cooperation.

Forty-first Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the day the people of America forget the sacrifices and sufferings of people throughout the world who value freedom enough to die for it—that day we shall have forfeited our birthright of liberty.

Happily, that day is not near. And fortunately, we are plentifully supplied with opportunities to remind ourselves that freedom is worth fighting for—opportunities like the 41st anniversary of Ukrainian independence which we commemorate here on January 22.

The national independence of the Ukrainian people—a goal they passionately pursued for hundreds of years—was won on January 22, 1918, with the formation of the Ukrainian National Republic.

But independence for these brave people was destined to be brief. In 1920, invading Communist armies from Russia overran the proud and fertile land and absorbed the country as a part of the new Soviet state.

Thus, the Ukrainian people became the first in a long series of victims of Communist terror, oppression, and slavery. Virtually every form of persecution has been used to kill the instincts of freedom in the breasts of Ukrainian patriots: starvation, murder, imprisonment, religious, and ethnic genocide, and slave labor.

The overwhelming force of the totalitarian state has succeeded in keeping the Ukrainian nation enslaved. But this brutality has not succeeded in killing the Ukrainian people's undying devotion to freedom. We have seen it happen so often—in Russia, Germany, Hungary—that whenever the struggle against Communist oppression breaks into the open we can be certain that Ukrainians are playing a prominent role.

This ceaseless fight for the freedom of their homeland is supported, at least in spirit, wherever Ukrainian people have settled throughout the world. To a large degree, it has been because the Ukrainian people, and others with firsthand experience, wherever they may be,

have insisted on raising their voices and telling the world of Russian brutality that the free world has remained alert to the menace of Soviet communism.

Freedom-loving Americans owe a great debt of gratitude to those of our fellow citizens who have cared so strongly.

Because Union County, N.J., has a relatively large proportion of people of Ukrainian descent among its population, I know personally of their deep feeling for freedom. It has been a major element in their success as active, public-spirited American citizens, and a contribution we must always cherish.

Let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves at this time—especially those of us who carry the responsibilities of representatives of the people in Congress—to the ancient principles of personal freedom and national independence. Let us strengthen our resolve to fight oppression, to oppose brutality, to stand steadfastly against all the relentless pressures of Communist totalitarianism.

Let us, that is, absorb the spirit and courage of those Ukrainians who have loved freedom so truly that they have died for it.

Another Honor for Budge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Twin Falls, Idaho, Times-News, paying tribute to the very able gentleman from Idaho on the occasion of his membership on the Committee on Rules. The editorial quotes another distinguished statesman from Idaho, Hon. John Sanborn, who will be remembered with affection and respect by many of us here today.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER HONOR FOR BUDGE

A few days ago, a news item from Washington told of the appointment of Idaho's Representative HAMER H. BUDGE to the powerful Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. Informative, certainly, but it didn't sound much out of the ordinary. It took a former Representative from Idaho's Second Congressional District, John Sanborn, of Hagerman, to grasp the full significance of the appointment.

"You can't appreciate this honor unless you're familiar with the workings of Congress and the House of Representatives," former Congressman Sanborn points out.

"Most people who are not familiar with the workings of Congress fail to realize the significance of this appointment. Its importance comes from the power of the Rules Committee. All important legislation is referred to the Rules Committee after other House committees have considered and approved such legislation. The Rules Committee can refuse to release any bill or legislation, thus preventing the House from acting on it.

"Or it can set the rules under which the legislation shall be considered by the House, whether the debate shall be short or long, setting specific time. It can permit or deny

the privilege of amending a bill on the floor of the House," Mr. Sanborn points out.

The fact that only 12 Members of the House are appointed to the Rules Committee from the four hundred and thirty-some Members is an honor in itself. Hence, only 12 of the 49 States can possibly be represented on the Rules Committee, the most powerful in the House. As Mr. Sanborn points out, no Idaho Representative has ever been a member of the Rules Committee before.

"The people of Idaho and especially those of the second congressional district can feel a great pride and satisfaction from the appointment," Mr. Sanborn declares.

Membership of the Rules Committee is made up of eight Democrats, who have a large majority in Congress, and four Republicans. Besides Idaho's Representative BUDGE, the other Republicans are LEO ALLEN, of Illinois; CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio; and CARROLL REECE of Tennessee.

During his tenure in the House of Representatives HAMER BUDGE has built an enviable reputation. Last November, Idaho's voters in the second congressional district recognized and approved Mr. BUDGE's record. Not only did he survive the Democratic landslide, but he was returned to office by his usual wide margin.

Now Mr. BUDGE's associates in the House of Representatives have recognized his ability and constantly growing reputation by designating him as a member of the most powerful group in the House.

The Times-News is happy to join Mr. Sanborn in congratulating Mr. BUDGE on his appointment.

Views on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a statement which I presented to the graduate club and ladies' auxiliary of the Phi Delta Epsilon medical fraternity, Washington, D.C., on January 27, 1959.

The statement follows:

Immigration has been a perennial subject of debate in the United States, ever since our Declaration of Independence ascribed a bad immigration policy as one of our reasons for wanting independence from England. This is not surprising, since immigration has been one of the most characteristic and distinctive marks of American history and has contributed enormously to our growth, our wealth, and our international preeminence.

However, I am not unaware that sometimes discussion of immigration palls. The subject has been drowned with a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous.

But the seriousness of today's struggle for freedom, for the right of people to live in decency and dignity, for liberty from oppression and dictatorship, make it all the more important for us to realize that immigration is a continuing challenge. We cannot afford to become weary of the fight for a decent immigration law. Russia's sputnik and lunik have caused us to lose face in the East-West struggle, and threaten to drive non-committed nations in today's divided world

into the Communist camp. We ignore only at our peril the question of how much face we have been losing for years among these same uncommitted nations because of our American immigration law which announces our belief that other groups of people are more desirable than the very noncommitted peoples whose loyalty to the free West is so sorely needed and so assiduously courted.

A decent and nondiscriminatory American immigration law could be a great secret weapon against the efforts of communism to subvert the uncommitted nations. If we could only see ourselves as others see us, we would not wait a moment to discard the present immigration law and substitute for it one more in keeping with the traditional image of America, the country that pronounced the radical doctrine that all men are born equal, the nation that was never afraid of immigrants and always welcomed them regardless of their national origin, creed, color, or race.

But I am a little ahead of myself. If immigration is important not only to our domestic economy, but also to our international relations—to the critical question of war and peace—what should our immigration policy be? As I see it, after a third of a century of intensive study of the subject, there are three major areas in which our present policy is sadly, nay desperately, in need of major overhaul. To accomplish these ends, I have reintroduced my bill of last year, now numbered H.R. 16. These three major areas are as follows:

I. WHO SHOULD BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNITED STATES?

Under the present law, we look to the national origin or race of the prospective immigrant as the over-all criterion of admission. If he comes from some areas of the world, he has carte blanche for admission (subject to some technical health, security and other requirements which I shall not discuss at this point). If the would-be immigrant was born in other areas of the world, he might just as well forget trying to come to this country, because the quotas are so small, and so heavily oversubscribed, that no one but Methuselah will ever be reached in his lifetime.

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this time is the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. In our present discriminatory immigration law, we also have a time-tested example that such American principle of equality is in our own best interest. The present law applies the discriminatory quota system to Europe, Asia, and Africa, but not to the Western Hemisphere. So, for the past 5 years, an average of 45,828 Mexicans entered this country each year, as against approximately 223,716 from Europe, Asia, and Africa together. I have seen no injury to our Nation from this Mexican immigration, nor has it been a subject of complaint by those who urge immigration restrictions against the rest of the world. I point to this fact merely to show the fallacy of the restrictionists' thinking purportedly based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

My bill proposes elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race. This will be achieved in my bill by wiping out the present discriminatory national origins quota system, and by substituting a new formula for the distribution of quota visas. In an attempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among five classes of immigrants without regard to national

origin, race, or any results of the U.S. census as follows: (1) Family unification, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the five classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the five classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill and if agreement is not reached on this first presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the five classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next presidential proposal which, again, will be subject to congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of U.S. citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15 percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guaranty that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The history of our immigration legislation since World War II is a clear example of the ineffectiveness of our present national origins law to meet our national and international needs. When the war ended, and displaced persons in camps had to be moved to new homes, our national origins law was a block to all action of substance. Congress had to amend the law to set aside the rigid and discriminatory national origins quota system. When the country wanted to show its gratitude to our GI's, by permitting them to bring in their alien brides, here again our national welfare was frustrated by the national origins law, so Congress had to enact another law to set it aside for this purpose. After the DP Act expired, there was still more to be done with the remaining refugees, and with new escapees from communism, again the national will was thwarted by the national origins requirement, and again Congress had to set that requirement aside for this purpose. The most recent example of how the national origins law prevents us from doing what is right and proper is the Hungarian situation, where an explosion of freedom fighters against communism enabled us to show our traditional humanitarian belief in the right of asylum only through disregard of the provisions of the law, a disregard which was later ratified, in effect, by

a special act of Congress which was necessary since the some 30,000 Hungarian freedom fighters would have been barred under our quota laws. Something must clearly be wrong with a law that stands in the way of so many important and critical national objectives, and Congress itself has realized that the national origins system was wrong, but has repealed it only for the specific purposes under consideration.

And while I am on the subject of recent legislation, it is appropriate to say that there are many other eligibility provisions, apart from national origins, which are sorely in need of amendment. Some of these were tinkered with—and I am glad they were—in an act passed in 1957, but much more needs to be done here. Among the matters which need change are the now ancient definitions in the law of insanity and other medical conditions.

II. HOW MANY IMMIGRANTS SHOULD BE ADMITTED INTO THE UNITED STATES?

It is of utmost importance to separate the two questions, "How many immigrants?" and "How should they be selected?" I have already indicated that no matter how many or how few are to be admitted, there should be no numerus clausus. Admission should be in terms of the five criteria I have just outlined.

I believe that our present maximum admission of some 156,000 belittles our faith in the United States and shows distrust of our own stability and strength. I agree with the AFL-CIO that the United States should admit 250,000 quota immigrants each year, and that if we do so this will strengthen and reinvigorate our Nation in precisely the same manner which immigration has always done in our history. I have based this annual quota on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade.

Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument is shifting to what will undoubtedly be termed "problems of overpopulation." It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met. In general, these various arguments against change of the national origins formula come from the prophets of doom and express the view that this is the best possible world and that any change means catastrophe. This same sort of argument has been advanced against all forward-looking and liberal proposals and has invariably proved to be false and unwarranted. I am convinced the same will prove true here.

III. WHAT GOVERNMENT AGENCY SHALL EXERCISE JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION?

Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Depart-

ment of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officials of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

So much for what I believe to be the heart of our immigration policy; namely (1), our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration. There is much more in my bill that is new and desirable. Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the nonquota class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools. In the naturalization portion of the law, my bill will not tolerate classification of United States citizens into two categories: native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

My bill would eliminate all retroactive application of grounds for deportation and humanize all the unduly harsh provisions applicable in exclusion. We should humanize the provisions relating to suspension of deportation, through removing the present extremely harsh eligibility requirement, and enact the provisions of my bill designed to prevent the separation of families.

IV. WHAT WE SHOULD NOT DO

I would like to discuss with you one final problem which the Congress will face this year: a very bad and unwholesome bill which is being pressed for enactment. It flies in the face of a provision of my bill which provides for what is basic to our American concept of fairness and decency, a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decision in all immigration proceedings, including rulings on deportation and exclusion. Contrary to this basic concept of American law, a bill (H.R. 13311) was rushed through the House of Representatives last year, designed and intended to curtail judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders. That bill has been reintroduced this year, and effort will be made to push it through. The bill would prevent aliens from seeking judicial review in the Federal district court, and compel them, generally speaking, to go to distant courts of appeal, which are fewer in number. Thus, review can now be had in 94 courts; under that bill, it would be limited to only 11 courts. The court of appeals is what its name indicates, a higher court which

normally hears appeals from lower courts. Litigation in the appellate courts is normally more expensive, both in terms of legal fees and expenses. Furthermore, the bill specifically denies to aliens the rights to obtain declaratory judgments in certain cases, although the Supreme Court of the United States twice ruled that under current law aliens are entitled to this remedy. The bill also restricts the rights of persons who claim to be citizens to litigate their claim. And there are a wide variety of other ways, most of them technical, but highly important in terms of substantive rights, in which this bill would seriously handicap the presently available rights of aliens and citizens to obtain judicial protection against illegal, capricious, and arbitrary action of Government officials.

I testified against this bill; so did the American Bar Association, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, and the Immigration Committee of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. In addition, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., through its Committee on Migration and Refugee Problems, which consists of 20 of the major religious and social agencies working in the immigration field, deplored the bill's effect and urged against enactment. That distinguished body of representatives of the American people warned the Congress that instead of simplifying the process as is the alleged purpose of this bill, it might in fact increase the number of cases on the court calendars.

As a result of statistics provided me by the Commissioner of Immigration, at my request—figures which, by the way had not even been compiled previously—it is perfectly clear that the bill is not only dangerous but quite unnecessary. When I asked for a list of cases which justified so drastic a remedy as proposed in the bill, I was given 7 cases extending over the last 5 years. Imagine, just 7 cases out of a total of many, many tens of thousands which were under consideration during the 5-year period, and yet they would junk a time-honored protection for judicial review! The truth of the matter is that less and less cases are getting into court anyway, and there is no reasonable justification for the bill. It would be like putting all sick people in jail, simply because there may be one or two typhoid Marys around.

After all, judicial review of illegal administrative action is not a matter of grace conferred upon an alien; rather it is a mark of the highest civilization in according equality before the law. Deportation of an alien means banishment from all that may be dear to him. We must not forget that in immigration we deal with human beings, not inanimate or senseless things. An alien or a citizen deprived of the right of judicial review is cut off from protecting his way of life, his very existence. I sincerely hope that the Congress will reject any such unjustified, unwarranted, and unnecessary tampering with fundamental principles upon which our entire jurisprudence is founded.

Immigration is a large and controversial subject. But I would be less than candid if I were to leave you with the impression that a bill such as mine, which I believe to be moderate and reasonable and in our best national interest, will have easy sledding. I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know what Congress will do. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

Nevertheless, one of the hopeful signs of the times is the most recent Gallup poll on immigration which showed that although really very few Americans knew or under-

stood this problem, where they did, they were largely opposed to the present law and in favor of major overhauling of it. This gives us the key to action. A democracy cannot thrive in the ignorance of its people. This subject is far too important to be relegated to senseless name calling, the heat of passion instead of the light of reason, and lethargy. The three major religious faiths of this country have demanded substantial liberalization. Organized labor has done likewise. If the proponents of liberalized immigration laws do their homework, carry their message to the people throughout the length and breadth of the land, and encourage the widest possible discussion and debate of this subject, I am morally certain that we will at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim to the world at large that we have an effective and working democracy.

Hale's Mission of Faith to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ruth Gruber which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1959:

HALE'S MISSION OF FAITH TO ISRAEL

(By Ruth Gruber)

Lincoln Hale died 1 year ago today. He had been in charge of America's point 4 program in Israel. On January 23, 1958, he was standing before the members of the Theodor Herzl Institute in New York, a Christian telling Jews about the land of Israel. He said what he felt about Israel, and then, just before he was finished speaking, in the middle of a sentence, he died.

It was symbolic, somehow. For Lincoln Hale never believed that anything was ever finished, that life was all a process of beginnings.

In 1954 the U.S. Government asked him to take a leave of absence from his post as president of Evansville College in Indiana to direct the U.S. Operations Mission in Israel. For Lincoln Hale, who had been a Congregational minister in Oxford, Conn., going to Israel was the great challenge of his life. His job was to direct American technical aid and economic assistance.

He became part of Israel. Israel's problems became his problems.

Dr. Hale did big things in Israel, but he did them quietly, with wisdom and simplicity. He was the second most important American in Israel, second only to the U.S. Ambassador. Yet his simplicity extended to everyone.

The people of Israel grew to know the mild-mannered, soft-voiced round little man with the bright blue eyes, and his round and happy and wonderfully enthusiastic wife, Sallie. Lincoln loved to meet the people and to talk to them. You could wake him at his home in Tel Aviv at midnight, after an exhausting day in the office or in the field, and tell him that a group of people wanted to hear him speak in Haifa. Lincoln would call his chauffeur, Amnon Gil-ad, and off they would go.

Speaking at the opening of a new road, a new school near the Dead Sea, he said, "We are dedicating a road built by the pioneers of today, and dedicating a school built

for pioneers of tomorrow. Thus too did we build in America."

Countless times at dawn he watched new immigrants who had been brought in by the United Jewish Appeal, come off the ships at Haifa. He traveled with them to their new settlements in the Negev to help them with technical aid and with point 4 money for houses and roads, for water piped in from the north, and for cotton and crops to seed their land.

He became a kind of practical missionary who understood Israel's mission. He saw the newcomers, broken, illiterate, hungry, riddled with disease—and he knew that no other land in the world would have taken them.

His mission grew broader constantly. He was no manager; no efficiency expert. But he knew that if Israel survived, she would have to compete in the world market.

His predecessor, Bruce McDaniel, had strengthened the Institute of Productivity inside Israel's Department of Labor. Lincoln Hale expanded it still further and helped develop a management training program. This was perhaps his greatest contribution—helping Israel keep its strides in agriculture but placing more emphasis on industry.

In November 1954, Lincoln Hale told a UJA study mission what the United States point 4 program was doing in economic and technical aid. He talked of Operation Cowboy to raise cattle, of bringing water to the Negev, of searching for oil and copper, of public health, of training managers, and of the meaning of Israel.

"My friends," he said, "this is a land of beginners. On every hand you see the young tree, the young vine, the new furrow in a long-neglected field. I have gone into factories where production is in its sixth, seventh, and eighth month, and have been amazed at the results, knowing that operation started with three or four trained personnel. Men and women have the confidence that comes from trying the new and novel. It is a land with a dynamic quality. It is a land of faith."

His name was Lincoln Hale. Two names that were the essence of America. And inside of 2 years Lincoln Hale became the essence of America in Israel. Not all Americans understood him, but the Israelis did. For them, he was the symbol of America's compassion, of our desire to help others live a better life by our willingness to teach them what we know.

The Alternative to Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. W. Dykes, a distinguished architect, of Canton, Ohio, has revealed great insight into some of the problems that beset our free enterprise system in an article in the January issue of the Freeman. Under leave to extend, I include Mr. Dykes' article, as follows:

THE ALTERNATIVE TO COMPETITION

(By E. W. Dykes)

From time to time we are told that competition is an evil thing. Few among us will deny that it certainly produces its trying moments. There are, in fact, some persons who will argue that the harm from

competition far exceeds any possible good which may result.

For example, they suggest that the student who does not get good grades suffers damage to his ego and may react in a most unsociable manner. I am sure there have been cases of persons who have failed in business and who have become bitter and despondent—perhaps even to the point of suicide. Some will say that these persons were victims of the urge to make a profit—a compulsion even worse than ordinary competition. Cooperation, they say—not competition—is what is needed for the good society. To equate competition with "the law of the jungle" is to leave little doubt in one's mind of its implied nature.

These ideas of the harmful effects of competition receive considerable support from various sources. Many school systems have eliminated grading on a competitive basis. Labor unions have undertaken to remove competition for jobs and to remove competition between individual workers on specific jobs by setting standard rates for a standard output which the least productive worker can meet. Some businessmen press for fair trade laws which will eliminate price competition on certain items. They may urge tariff barriers to protect them from the rigors of foreign competition. Farmers vote for subsidies and acreage controls to escape the vagaries of the free market. And so on and on, countless examples might be written, all of which show how we try to escape competition.

I suspect that most people believe competition to be neither generally good nor generally bad, but that a middle-of-the-road process will most likely produce a healthy society. They are all for competition in a horse race or in the American League or even among the suppliers of the things they have to buy, while going to no end of trouble to eliminate it, by law if necessary, in their own field as sellers.

Regarding competition, per se, they have no definite convictions. But persons with definite convictions about anything appear to be in rather short supply. Strong beliefs are developed by intimate knowledge of the true nature of the subject. If this be true, then it follows that we need to find the true nature of competition and then judge its merits.

A NONCOMPETING SOCIETY?

It is useful, at times, to examine the extreme point of view to show the probable effects of a particular policy or action and to indicate the direction most likely to produce desirable results. My study convinces me that there is but one alternative to competition. If I can show what the alternative actually is, that may help the part-time competitors in making a clear-cut choice.

Let us assume that we abandon competition in our society as of tomorrow. At once there would be a mad rush of people from their present jobs to more glamorous or more highly paid jobs. Thousands decide to be big league ballplayers. Hundreds of thousands decide to be movie stars. Those ready to become bank presidents are in oversupply. No one hauls garbage. No one waits on tables or digs coal. And since price competition is eliminated, no one knows how much to charge or how much to pay for a particular product. As a matter of fact, the dislocation would be so complete that the economy would come to a standstill. Clearly, competition cannot be eliminated overnight. A great deal of advance work would be needed if such a move were not to result in total confusion.

So let's go at it another way. Assume a society in which competition is to play no part from the very beginning. Our first problem is to decide who will do what. For instance, who will be the doctors? Who will write music? Sell shoes? Make shoes?

What will determine prices and wages? Who decides all these things? Certainly not one person because he would be a dictator. A committee, perhaps, but who shall choose the committee? It's difficult, indeed.

It looks as though we'll have to have some competition—at least enough to select a committee. And so we have to select nominees, take a vote, and of course, accept a decision arrived at competitively. We will select those with the most votes. Now, perhaps, can't we do away with all competition?

WHO SHALL BE THE DOCTOR?

Then the committee is faced with the questions: Who shall be doctors and who shall write music and so on? Before they face up to that one, an infinitely more difficult problem faces them. How many shall be doctors? Will specialization be allowed or shall that become a subproblem after deciding how many doctors? And what about fees, prices, and wages? How will they be determined? Will any persons be appointed to act as inventors? Will anyone be set apart to occasionally don an asbestos suit and step into a flaming oil or gas well out of control? Who will become the lawmakers? This last may give a clue as to where the committee will locate itself.

It is not necessary to labor the point further to show that the committee has its hands full. But let us assume that a formula has been worked out by the committee. An extremely large catalog of possible occupations has been set up which takes account of the innumerable differences in jobs and which describes each in sufficient detail to render selection a little easier. Now we are ready to select the actual people to man these occupations.

"Everybody stand up and count off. The first 2,000 are doctors, the next 1 million go to the factory suboffice and get divided up there." And so on. Ridiculous, isn't it? Of course, that couldn't be the way. "We'll give tests—aptitude tests, of course." And so a long series of aptitude tests are evolved with thousands of subtests and gradations in order to match as easily as possible the many variations in a particular job category. Now, shall the best jobs be given to those with the highest grades? Or is that too competitive? Finally, we decide that we must introduce that much additional competition.

WHERE SHALL HE LIVE?

Where shall people live? Obviously, all the doctors can't be in one town or State and all the blacksmiths in another. The formula must be applied and all the jobs filled in the right proportion. The committee, of course, must decide who lives in what towns, too. Well drillers can be easily placed, you see, because it's well known where oil can be found— isn't it? And this brings up an interesting point. Who decides precisely where the bit shall bite? And how shall a test be devised to find that man? On the inventors' list, what shall we decide to have invented? And if something amazing comes out of it, what will that do to the formula? Dizzy? Then don't get elected to the committee.

And I shouldn't want to sit on the subcommittee which sets prices and wages either. That committee would have to bring wages and prices into balance so that everything produced could be bought. How to decide how much of even one single item should be produced almost defies comprehension. For instance, how many radios will be sold next month? How would we decide how much a doctor would be paid in contrast with a day laborer—or would they both get the same? The committee must decide. There is no other way—the law has been passed.

COMPETE OR SUBMIT

It should be clear from the foregoing that all matters which are not decided by com-

petition must be decided by decree. In other words, if wages, prices, production, jobs, and successful inventions are not set or selected by competition, then an authority has to rule on them step by step.

In other words, the "alternative" to competition can only be the planned society. Every successful attempt to rule out competition in any area is but a step nearer the socialized state. We have taken far too many such steps already. The more we do without competition the more planned is the society. Admitting for one reason or another that some persons of high potential are occasionally and temporarily bypassed in the free, competitive society, it should appear clearly that the way to find the best of anything is to allow competition to decide. Just as the best ballplayers are competitively selected, so it is for surgeons, professionals, bank presidents, and playwrights.

The marketplace operates constantly with millions—no, billions—of decisions each day to elevate the best to the top, and each of us may aspire to reach the top. Consumers, in their market decisions, actually decide who or what shall succeed or fail. Good products are selected by each of us, voting in the marketplace with pennies and dollars as votes. High living standards are the direct result of competition. Competition, far from being the evil thing it is often represented to be, is the guarantee of the best for the least the most often.

OPPORTUNITY FOR COOPERATION

Now let us recall the brief reference, early in the discussion, to the suggested need for cooperation rather than for competition. To search for a clear insight to this problem, ask yourself, "With whom shall I cooperate?" The anticompetition adherents will say, "With everyone, of course." It is a pleasant idea, one which few will argue. It just happens to be impossible. For example, if you purchase a Ford, the sellers of other makes would hardly decide that you have cooperated with them. When a maiden selects her spouse, her other suitors must necessarily have been rejected. Competition, you see, serves to select the persons with whom you would most like to cooperate—and it leaves you free to decide for yourself who they shall be. But this is a subject which, of itself, might be deserving of an essay. Suffice to say that cooperation and competition, diverse though they may seem to be, go hand in hand in the free society. The planned society, as it eliminates competition, eliminates the basis for voluntary cooperation and substitutes planned cooperation, whatever that is.

In planned societies the committee is always replaced by the strong man—the dictator. Competition and a planned society are incompatible. Freedom and a planned society are impossible. Free people and competition are inseparable.

The alternative to competition is to give up your freedom.

Newark Kiwanis Good Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis Club of Newark, Calif., is an outstanding example of an American service club.

Newark is a typical small American industrial city. Her citizens are proud of their home community. Her city fathers are men dedicated to making their town a good one in which to live.

Newark counts no extremely wealthy people as citizens and conversely there is no great element of poor or underprivileged within her borders.

Newark is a better place in which to live because such institutions as her Kiwanis Club reflect the conscience of the community in its drive to improve the social and educational advantages of her people.

Here is the box score of the club's accomplishments as reported in the Newark News-Register of January 8, 1959:

NEWARK KIWANIS GOOD DEEDS

With the installation of new officers of Newark Kiwanis Club this Saturday night at a big event at Castlewood Country Club, Kenneth Foster is to succeed the present president, Herbert Lacey. We are proud of the year's record of Herbert Lacey and officers.

During year 1958 the Newark Kiwanis has sponsored the community projects which were made possible by the financial support of people of Newark.

More than 2,400 hours were devoted to civic and charitable activities, as follows:

BOYS AND GIRLS WORK

Took part in Scout work, sponsored local scout troop.

Purchased flags for scouts.

Gave financial aid toward a scout training program.

Encouraged local scouts to go on in scouting.

Helped recreation department with annual kite contest.

Purchased tickets for community concert series, for music students in local school.

Assisted recreation department in Easter egg hunt.

Put on a magic show for elementary school children.

Helped in annual pet parade.

Paid tuition fees of six outstanding music students for the summer school.

Sponsored boys for the local Little League by paying for uniforms for individuals.

Assisted recreation department summer program.

Held a watermelon feed for children of Newark.

Entertained children of Newark with free movies on Newark Charter Day.

Gave skating party for school children on traffic patrol.

Encouraged local 4-H group providing trophies in contests.

Sponsored Key Club at the Washington Hi and activities.

Provided Thanksgiving baskets for needy families.

Provided Christmas baskets for needy families.

Assisted in planning and financing Newark's toy bank.

Helped set relief program.

Purchased needed clothes and shoes for needy families.

Furnished blankets for families in need.

Sent local children to summer camps.

Maintained a dental loan fund for needy school children.

Assisted in sight conservation.

Worked closely with Salvation Army.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

Sponsored tour of local industries for school children.

Rented vocation guidance films for interested boys.

Helped obtain employment at summer jobs for local high school boys.

Presented plaques to outstanding local school graduates.

Sponsored a science fair at local M. D. Silva School by providing Government bonds for winners.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Worked with local chamber of commerce on civic affairs.

Helped obtain employment for disabled veterans.

Participated in parade for City Charter Day.

Encouraged industries to locate in Newark.

Assisted United Crusade.

SUPPORTED CHURCHES

Published church directory which gave time of all church services. Was in both local newspapers.

Members worked for local church undertakings.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement made on January 26, 1959, by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, to the U.S. Conference of Mayors regarding new Federal housing legislation.

The statement follows:

Mr. HARRY R. BETTERS,
Executive Director,
U.S. Conference of Mayors,
Washington, D.C.:

As mayor of the city of New York and chairman of the New York Metropolitan Regional Council I vigorously support the views of the U.S. Conference of Mayors on new housing and urban renewal legislation and ask that the officials of the conference have this brief statement placed on the record when they testify before the Banking and Currency Committee of the U.S. Senate.

We are gratified that major housing and urban renewal legislation is being considered so early in this session of Congress. No other legislation is of more importance to the continuing health and sound development of cities and urban areas.

We take pride in the fact that New York has pioneered in programs which utilize the resources and assistance of city and State to produce low and moderate rental housing. But in common with all other cities, we must continue to look to the Federal Government for major support. Urban decay is a national as much as a local problem. Its cure far transcends the capabilities of limited local resources alone.

A program which measures up to the needs of this Nation's cities should include the following:

1. Federal contributions to title I redevelopment and urban renewal of \$600 million a year for 10 years. The success of the title I program to date in New York City, as evidenced by 13 projects now underway and five more pending, the backlog of projects that are needed and could be advanced if sufficient funds are forthcoming, and the enthusiastic response of private developers to the new west side urban renewal project where techniques are being developed that should be applicable to deteriorating

areas in cities throughout the country—all testify to the potential of the title I program for stimulating the private investment necessary for the renewal of our cities. So far this potential has been barely utilized. A program of the size indicated is needed to enable us to move ahead of the rate of deterioration, and will therefore result in the smallest ultimate expenditure of public funds.

2. The present two-thirds Federal contribution to write-down costs must be increased, rather than decreased. In view of the acute financing problems faced by all cities, any such decrease would be self-defeating and tantamount to reducing the scope of a program which sorely needs expansion.

3. Continuity adequate to permit and encourage sensible long-range planning and programing. In addition to the basic 10-year program, authorization for advance acquisition in blighted and deteriorated areas, and the provision of two-thirds grants for the preparation or completion of community renewal programs would be of great benefit. The community renewal program would enable cities to survey their older and declining communities and make comprehensive plans for orderly renewal programs.

4. An increase in the amount of funds that may be used for nonresidential redevelopment above the 10 percent now permitted, and elimination of the requirement that such nonresidential redevelopment sites must include a substantial number of slum or blighted dwellings. Whatever the form of blight, it undermines the foundations of a city. A successful renewal program must be broad and flexible enough to meet the particular needs of the community.

5. Liberalized relocation assistance for both the families and the businesses displaced by renewal programs. The amounts of payments should be increased and the ways in which they can be used broadened in order to give maximum assistance in relocation. Every effort should be made to provide equality in treatment to those displaced by the various types of public programs. Relocation assistance should be authorized for families displaced within a renewal project by voluntary rehabilitation or code enforcement on the same basis as for those displaced by clearance. This is of crucial importance to the success of a program such as our west side project, which combines conservation, rehabilitation, and redevelopment. The growing impact of renewal activity on small business and industry requires not only an increase in relocation payments, but assistance through a program of Federal long-term, low-interest loans.

6. The interest charge on funds advanced by a municipality to develop a renewal project should be allowed as a proper charge against the gross project cost. Otherwise a city like New York is penalized because it doesn't borrow Federal funds for this purpose.

7. Restoration of the low-rent public housing program established by the Housing Act of 1949. Even with this, the balance of

annual subsidy contributions will provide less than half of the remaining number of units authorized at current costs. An adequate public housing program is essential to increase the supply of housing serving that sector of the market which no privately financed housing can reach. It is vital to the success of the urban renewal program since so many of the families now living in deteriorating areas which desperately need renewal fall within this sector. The regional administrators and the local authorities should be given greater autonomy to establish more liberal administrative practices, eligibility requirements, and rent and income limits. The acquisition and rehabilitation of existing structures where suitable for public housing purposes should be encouraged. Programs of housing for larger families and elderly persons should be fostered. Continued occupancy of over-income tenants on the basis of nonsubsidized rentals should be authorized in order to promote stability of projects and neighborhoods, and to broaden the cross section of families served by public housing for whom private housing is not available.

8. Strengthening of the FHA multifamily housing program, upon which New York City is singularly dependent, in the following ways:

An increase in the mortgage limits on sections 207, 213, 220, and 221 housing. Because of rises in construction costs the existing statutory ceiling on the amount of mortgage per room and per dwelling unit should be increased. Level payment mortgage plans for sections 220 and 207 housing should be made mandatory in order to reduce rents on new apartments. Increased FNMA special assistance for all multifamily programs is needed to support the apartment mortgage market. Section 221 should be revised to permit the purchase of existing small rental properties. FHA appraisal formulas should be changed to allow for more widespread use of sections 207 and 213 housing in the central portions of the city and to reduce the cash equity requirements now imposed on the private builder.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor, City of New York.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent; *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Civil Rights Proposal of Senator Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, we who serve with him day to day know LYNDON JOHNSON as a driving, dynamic man-on-the-go. His boundless energy is matched only by his unfailing grasp of matters of great import to our Nation. What I am saying, Mr. President, is only a prelude to the distinguished Texan's latest proposal in the turbulent field of civil rights legislation.

Senator JOHNSON's plan for sane and sensible approach to this extremely knotty problem has drawn accolades from all over the country. Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News, is among the Nation's outstanding newspapermen who have commented favorably on the Johnson civil rights proposal. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baggs' comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 25, 1959]

LYNDON JOHNSON COMES UP WITH A GOOD PLAN

(By Bill Baggs)

The people who want integration in the morning and the people who want segregation forever got a chance to shake hands with one another last week.

It was a historic moment of sorts.

For the very first time, the hot integrationist and the defiant segregationist were standing there together on a common piece of ground.

At last they had agreed on something.

SOME SNICKERED

In essence they had agreed that the plan which LYNDON B. JOHNSON pulled out of his hip pocket and tossed on the table of Congress was no good.

Robert R. Nathan, chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, classified the plan as a typical Johnson compromise and dismissed it as unworthy.

Some southerners snickered. One prominent man of the South told the writer:

"What JOHNSON proposes is ridiculous."

The hard political truth is that nothing proposed by Senator JOHNSON is ridiculous.

Or unworthy.

STAMP OF APPROVAL

LYNDON JOHNSON has been described as at least the second most influential American today. He runs the Federal Senate as if it were a commissary. His partner from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, is the proprietor of the House of Representatives. For practical pur-

poses, this gives Senator JOHNSON a congressional stamp of approval most anytime he wants it.

All of which makes anything proposed by LYNDON JOHNSON anything but ridiculous. And what did the man propose?

He suggested a civil rights bill with an accent on conciliation instead of force.

The heart of his proposal is a Federal conciliation agency for civil rights. The agency would get white and Negro leaders of a community around a table, talking to each other, trying to work out their differences.

IT HAS MERIT

This smacks very much of the thought introduced to the Nation by Governor Collins. As I recall, there were some snickers then. But the idea does have merit * * * and especially when LYNDON JOHNSON in person tosses it up on that table in Congress.

Senator JOHNSON admitted that his plan was inspired by the tested concept of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. This is an agency which accomplished much in areas of labor-management trouble.

STEP AT A TIME

Of course, the Mediation Service is helped along the road by certain laws which are precise and are accepted by the American people. Senator JOHNSON did not get into these waters. He is taking this trip one step at a time. He's a practical man.

The Senator admitted his first step was no solution. It was, he said, a step in the right direction.

And what better first step has been offered the American people?

At the moment schools are padlocked in Little Rock and in several places of Virginia.

In Little Rock there are 3,600 young boys and girls outside the public schools. Of these, 1,000 have traveled out of Little Rock to other cities to seek an education.

FOR 600, NO SCHOOL

Of the children left, 830 are going to the "private" school which Governor Faubus and his friends got into business. Reports from Little Rock indicate this school is a poor substitute for Central High, the public school now closed.

Five hundred children in Little Rock are attending church schools of one kind or another.

Four hundred children are taking correspondence courses.

Six hundred children are not going to any school at all.

This is what happens when the public schools close. And there is every reason to believe that it could happen right here in south Florida.

ON A TREADMILL

Possibly most of the readers of this newspaper feel a closed school is better than an integrated one. Maybe you think so. But the young minds of the South go on a treadmill when the schools are closed, and these hasty alternatives to public education lead inevitably to situations where children cannot qualify, actually or technically, for higher education.

Senator JOHNSON has suggested a plan to keep the school door open and meanwhile to work toward a legal and voluntary arrangement for the public education of all children.

As one newspaper in this town, we cast our vote for the Johnson proposal.

Budget To Resist Communist Expansion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of January 24, 1959.

The editorial expresses concern over the President's budget requests for the Department of Defense. As such, it is representative of considerable body of opinion in the country today, and I think it is important that it be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET TO RESIST COMMUNIST EXPANSION?

In his budget message President Eisenhower says:

"It has become increasingly apparent that the Communist bloc is following a policy of deliberately and constantly probing free world positions to test our determination to resist the further forcible expansion of Communist influence. Under these circumstances, it is prudent not to plan for any significant changes during fiscal 1960 in our deployments overseas or in our ready military forces at home."

This is a sound and worthy objective. We hope it can be accomplished with the funds recommended in the budget. But on close examination of its provisions, misgivings arise as to whether the fighting forces and the weapons available in our deployments overseas or in our ready military forces at home would, in fact, be powerful enough to serve as an effective deterrent in 1960.

The administration's estimate foresees an expenditure for military purposes in 1960 only \$145 million more than the current year. Yet the President reports that \$800 million additional will be spent on missiles next year. It is evident, therefore, that all other weapons and forms of offense and defense will have to get along on about \$650 million less than this year—a year in which personnel force levels in all of the military components are being reduced.

Even the \$800 million increase in missiles cannot be considered as a remarkable gain when one considers that to reach this figure the President's budget advisers lumped in not only the procurement of missiles, but missile research, development, test, evaluation, construction costs for launching sites, and even the building of submarines designed to launch the Navy's fleet ballistic missile Polaris. We recall that in his state of the Union message the President stressed the high price of modern defense weapons by saying that each Atlas missile has cost \$35 million. That figure, of course, included the research, development, and testing back to the very beginning but it does serve to show

that the currently recommended increase in this area could not go very far.

The comprehensive reports and analyses in this issue of the Journal show nothing that can be considered as augmenting our strength in areas other than missiles.

The Air Force loses, from 1958 to 1960, both in total manpower (5,000 less) and in total number of combat wings (15 less). The greatest loss in wings is in the tactical category, including the airlift upon which the Army depends for the mobility everyone says it needs, where the loss will be 11 wings. The total active aircraft inventory also drops.

The Army loses another division this year, bringing it down to 14, and that loss will be carried on into next year. The provision for Army procurement is only a small fraction of the extra \$3 billion per year Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor has estimated the Army requires for 5 years in order to achieve the modernization it needs.

The Navy will have 869 active ships—27 less than in 1958. It will have one less carrier group than in 1958. The Marine Corps will keep its three divisions and three air wings. The total active aircraft inventory of the Navy and Marine Corps drops 1,333 below the 1958 level to wind up at 9,200.

These are not encouraging figures; certainly not what one would expect of a force designed to meet any Communist aggression, including "nibbling" and limited wars, in 1960.

When Congress makes its promised detailed inquiry into the sufficiency of these figures, it will run up against the Budget Director's warning to witnesses that they must not urge increased spending. But we are sure that the military representatives who will appear before the congressional committees are fully aware of their obligation to furnish Congress with all of the facts it requires.

Man of the South for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Anniston (Ala.) Star for December 19, 1958, Col. Harry M. Ayers, the distinguished publisher of that paper, had an editorial regarding the recent designation of Mr. Frank P. Samford of Birmingham as Man of the South for 1958.

The title of the editorial is "Magic City Triumvirate," referring to three distinguished citizens of Birmingham who have been honored in such a manner.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGIC CITY TRIUMVIRATE

An excellent selection was made recently by Dixie Business magazine when it named Frank P. Samford, outstanding citizen of Birmingham, as its Man of the South for 1958.

Previously, this honor had been conferred on Thomas W. Martin and Donald Comer, so that the Magic City is alone at this time in boasting a Man of the South triumvirate.

A perusal of the record reveals, moreover, that, if anything, the distinction is even more impressive from a qualitative than from a quantitative standpoint.

Like Messrs. Martin and Comer, Mr. Samford has played a leading role in the upbuilding of this part of the country.

As a young insurance executive, he joined Liberty National Life Insurance Co. in 1921 in the capacity of its corporate secretary. He was elected to its vice presidency in 1932, and 2 years later became its president.

Under his leadership the firm has grown phenomenally—a fact that has meant much to Birmingham and all of Alabama since insurance dollars that otherwise would have gone out of the State have been put to work right here at home.

As an illustration, there is the impressive Liberty National Building on North Noble Street, in Anniston, which is headquarters for a large corps of workers assigned to east Alabama.

Nor is it only in terms of his able guidance of Liberty National that Mr. Samford has made important contributions to the advance of Alabama and the South.

At present he is serving on the boards of directors of a dozen of this region's leading utilities, financial institutions and manufacturing enterprises, including Southern Bell, Continental Gin, West Point Manufacturing, and the Birmingham Trust National Bank.

Furthermore, Mr. Samford has headed at one time or another such highly useful organizations as the Birmingham and Alabama Chambers of Commerce, Associated Industries of Alabama and the Jefferson County Tuberculosis Sanatorium Society—not to mention the year he served as district governor of Rotary and long tenures on the boards of trustees of both Alabama Polytechnic Institute and Howard College.

A great deal more would have to be included in a detailed chronicling of Mr. Samford's accomplishments as businessman and public spirited citizen. But we believe the foregoing is ample to support the newest honor that has been bestowed upon him—that of being named "Man of the South for 1958."

People's Right To Know Is Vital to Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the importance of a free flow of information and a well-informed public is so well recognized that these basic elements of a free society are taken for granted, and thus are in constant danger. The Milwaukee Journal, in a January 27 editorial, explores this problem and points out how the threat to the people's right to know manifests itself at the Federal level of government. This is a matter which should be of utmost concern to all of us. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Battle for Right To Know," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE FOR RIGHT TO KNOW

A democratic government must lean heavily on an informed public. Free government and free information are synonymous. These points, made in a recent telecast called the Press and the People, are too obvious to need enlarging upon.

Yet there is, in Washington as in other governmental areas, a constant effort on the part of officials to keep information from the people. In the last several years in particular, our Federal Government has used secrecy and even distortion and misinformation almost as a policy. Secrecy and misinformation, as Senator HENNING, Democrat, of Missouri, has pointed out, carry in them the seeds of dictatorship. At the very least, they help create an uninformed public, a dangerous state of affairs when the public is also the electorate.

One of the biggest efforts to get rid of unnecessary secrecy in Government has been made by a special House subcommittee on freedom of information headed by Representative Moss, Democrat, of California. The committee has spotlighted secrecy, jogged officials right up to the White House, and fought for the public's right to know. It still has a lot of work to do.

But it is not certain that the subcommittee will be allowed to do that work. Representative HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, a member and an enemy of the subcommittee, says that it has not been renewed. Representative Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the parent judiciary committee, says that it is possible that the subcommittee will not be reestablished. He hasn't made up his mind.

It would be most unfortunate if the subcommittee were not continued. Its fine job to date is widely recognized, even by Dawson. It has a lot more to do. The fight against secrecy can't succeed if it is carried on in fits and spurts. It needs to be waged constantly. Let the subcommittee continue to battle for the people's right to know.

The Destiny of America in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was brought up to believe that an individual should not meddle in the affair of others when he has plenty of problems of his own. David Lawrence, in a brilliant column entitled "Whither America," published in the November 28, 1959, edition of U.S. News & World Report, reminds us all of the real challenge facing the United States today and warns us to accept this challenge or else further weaken our world position. I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER AMERICA?

(By David Lawrence)

What is the destiny of America in the world? How can we best serve mankind and at the same time keep from dissipating our energies and our resources?

These questions go to the heart of public policy today. They are not solely international. They also challenge the fundamentals of domestic policy.

For what doth it profit a nation to seek laurels abroad if it forsake its ideals at home?

We have in America today two basic philosophies at work inside our two political parties.

One philosophy is that the end justifies the means—that the attainment of a meritorious objective must be compelled even if this means disregard of a written Constitution.

The other philosophy holds true to the principles on which this Republic was founded—that we must have a government of laws and not yield to the concept of a government of men. Progress in government achieved at the expense of a violated contract inspires no faith or spirit of permanence. It fluctuates with the will of the mob. The intolerance of majorities has throughout history left in its wake a casualty list of human freedom destroyed.

Too many people in America today would indignantly disavow any thought of totalitarianism, but they are often ready to accept some of its ways. They cry out that the process of amending the Constitution is too cumbersome or time consuming. They do not advocate, as they could, a change in the method of amending the Constitution as already prescribed in that document itself. They prefer usurpation instead—even the seizure of a whole industry to curry favor with labor leaders or the use of Federal troops to enforce a sociological doctrine. It is defended as a quicker process. So is dictatorship.

Too many people believe that the writing of laws should not be confined to Congress but that the Supreme Court of the United States must legislate. Many of the professors in our law schools and many of their deans are resentful of any criticism of the Court and say frankly that it is up to the Court to reconcile the past with the present—to take care of evolution and adapt the Constitution to changing conditions.

This is reminiscent of the speech which Hitler made in the 1930's when, after accepting election under the legal process of the German Constitution, he proclaimed that the courts should take into account public sentiment in writing their decisions.

We have today many perplexing problems to solve in America. We have severe competition now with goods made abroad, where labor is cheaper and trade unions have no such economic power to raise prices as they have here in the United States.

We fought successfully for decades against monopoly by corporations, but today we have in our midst a far worse monopoly power in the labor unions. The unions win political elections by the expenditure of many millions of dollars. They influence a sufficient percentage of voters to swing elections. Labor unions have become a sort of supergovernment.

We have also a serious problem in combating the inflationary trend that has come upon us. We have taxes that are almost confiscatory and a \$12 billion deficit this year.

How can we assume, as some critics repeatedly suggest, that "bold and imaginative ideas"—which means American money for the underdeveloped nations—are all that's necessary to make American leadership supreme and thus counteract Soviet infiltration?

We must continue certainly to spend billions for armament so as to deter a potential enemy. This in itself is draining our resources and frustrating our normal progress. We cannot, however, take on the support of all the rest of the world, too.

There are some things we can do in world trade and through developmental loans, but

these should be largely by private capital. The era of lavish expenditure in the form of grants and gifts is about over. It is time to take a good look at internal America and put our own house in order.

Unless we start now to readjust our domestic position, we shall have a depression in the next 5 years that will weaken our world position. This is not a time for starry-eyed sprees in "welfare" spending.

It is a time, moreover, to examine critically the functioning of our system of government.

It is a time for a crusade to restore the constitutional system our forefathers gave us and to use it as they prescribed. For if we give up government by law and yield to government by the caprice of individuals, we shall destroy the American Republic and find ourselves surrendering gradually to the totalitarian concepts of our chief adversaries.

The best way to advance American leadership abroad is by maintaining solvency and adhering to constitutional government at home. Then we will by example prove that the United States is succeeding and will continue to succeed as a great republic.

For a Better Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "For a Better Senate." There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A BETTER SENATE

The Senate committee assignments, Republican as well as Democratic, suggest that both parties have paid attention to the message of the November election.

On the Democratic side, it deserves to be said first in fairness to Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON that there is no evidence the voting on the filibuster was a factor in determining which posts went to the new Democratic Senators. Eight of the 15 new Democrats voted against the Johnson position either two or three times, and yet they fare very well on committee assignments.

HART of Michigan, who voted against JOHNSON four times, receives two choice committee assignments, Judiciary and Agriculture, committees for which veterans have striven in the past. ENGLE of California, goes to Armed Services and Commerce; McCARTHY of Minnesota, Finance and Public Works; MOSS of Utah, Interior and Public Works; MUSKIE of Maine, Banking, Government Operations and Public Works; WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Banking and Labor.

DODD of Connecticut and YOUNG of Ohio, who voted against JOHNSON on two of the three first rollcalls, also do well. Dodd is assigned to Appropriations, Judiciary, and Space Sciences. Young, who turned the big surprise of the election by ousting John W. Bricker, is appointed to Agriculture, Public Works and Space Sciences.

The six new Democrats who supported JOHNSON on every rollcall do well also, but relatively no better. Alaska's BARTLETT, goes to Armed Services and Commerce and GRUENING to Government Operations, In-

terior and Public Works. The others in this group are: ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, Appropriations and Banking; CANNON of Nevada, Armed Services, Rules and Space Sciences; HARTKE of Indiana, Finance, Commerce and District of Columbia; and McGEHE of Wyoming, Appropriations and Commerce. RANDOLPH of West Virginia, who backed JOHNSON on three of the four votes, goes to Labor and Public Works.

These assignments reflect generally the preference of the Senators in terms of experience and interests. McCARTHY, for example, is a former professor of economics. Joining DOUGLAS, of Illinois, he will make the second professional economist on the committee which handles tax bills in the Senate. GRUENING and MOSS have deep interest in the work of the Interior Committee and HARTKE, former mayor of Evansville, should be a major help on District of Columbia problems.

While no newly elected Democratic Senator goes to Foreign Relations, the Democratic additions to that committee are notable: GORE, of Tennessee; LAUSCHE, of Ohio; and CHURCH, of Idaho. LAUSCHE and CHURCH entered the Senate only 2 years ago.

The practice under LYNDON JOHNSON of giving at least one major committee assignment to every Democratic Senator has finally been adopted on the Republican side under pressure from the Aiken-Cooper-Case-Javits-Kuchel group. The three Republican newcomers, all of whom supported COOPER, of Kentucky, for minority leader in opposition to the Bridges-Dirksen-Saltonstall combine, receive good committee posts. KEATING, of New York, goes to Banking and Interior; SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, to Commerce and Public Works; and PROUDY, of Vermont, to Labor, Public Works, and District of Columbia.

In a harmony move, Minority Leader DIRKSEN even gives up his cherished seat on Appropriations. It goes significantly to KUCHEL, of California, who was elected Republican whip after being nominated by the liberal group. The prize new assignment among the Republicans goes to CARLSON, of Kansas, the only Republican to get a new seat on the Foreign Relations Committee. Significantly CARLSON, too, backed the liberal group. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, gave up Space Science seats to make way for JAVITS, of New York, and CASE of New Jersey, two leading liberals.

With the Democrats outnumbering Republicans two to one in the Senate, the Republicans owe the Democratic leadership a vote of thanks for increasing the size of several of the major committees. Had this not been done many veteran Republicans would have been knocked from committee seats in which they were secure—until last November.

It is being said by some Washington commentators that the effect of the November revolt at the polls has already been swallowed up in the sea of professional politics that surrounds Capitol Hill. On the basis of what the election has done to the Senate committees on both sides of the aisle, we suspect that some of these words will have to be eaten—and perhaps before many months pass.

Our Relations With Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a very thoughtful editorial on our rela-

tions with Latin America appeared in the January 14 issue of the *Middletown Daily Record of Middletown, N.Y.* It emphasizes, quite rightly, the vital importance of our country training dedicated young Americans to supervise our aid programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER REPORT

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University and brother of the President of the United States, submitted a report to the White House the other day on our relations with Latin America. "The whole region," he said, "is in ferment—political, social, economic, financial. It is growing rapidly, with an explosive population rate and inadequate capital."

U.S. policies toward Latin America, he feels, are confusing to the peoples south of our border, because we seem to be too cozy with too many local dictators. "At best," he says, "we should offer them a cool handshake rather than a warm embrace. This calls for a change of heart on our part."

Dr. Eisenhower's report is thoughtful, kindly, and generous. But we wonder whether a change of heart is enough.

Even the U.S. offer to subscribe \$400 million to the capital of a new Inter-American Development Bank is only a small step.

To begin with, we probably need a real understanding of the opportunistic psychology of Latin dictators. Too many do not have any sense of responsibility; they may be despots but they are rarely benevolent. On the other hand, so long as the peoples themselves accept dictatorship, we should recognize that any such government will accept outside help from the United States if that help costs them nothing. But U.S. help should be provided only if we are able to send into each country trained, dedicated young Americans to supervise our aid programs.

The Latin American countries need government grants, private loans, and private capital investment; and it would be in our interest to see that they get these things. But it would surely not be in our interest if they are used merely to line the pockets of the Batistas—past, present, or future. They must be truly useful; they must be truly practical; and they must be supervised in such a way as to benefit the people themselves.

Unless we provide manpower and supervision, our financial, business, and technical assistance will be worthless.

The Missile Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the missile controversy which has been on the front page and in Senate discussion for some time, a very interesting article appeared in the *New York Herald Tribune* on January 26, by Mr. Joseph Alsop, under the title "The Major's Friend."

Inasmuch as a record is being built to dispel the confusion and get at the hard core of fact on this whole problem, I believe this column should be made available to more readers through the medium of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THE MAJOR'S FRIEND

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The day they brought the major in, the forward airbase in east China staged a celebration. The Japs had shot Rex Barbour down north of the Yangtze River. He had been too badly injured to walk. He had been carried several hundred miles on the backs of Chinese guerrillas. He had had several hair's-breadth escapes from Jap patrols. Altogether, a celebration was in order.

Later in the evening, after a good many "kan pels" of the local white mule, someone said, "Rex, tell us about how you got the Japanese admiral." An odd look crossed the major's handsome young face. Perhaps he was tired of describing the last seconds on earth of Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto, commander of all the Japanese Emperor's ships in the Pacific. Yet he told it well, all the same.

One all but saw the brilliant interception—the two little American fighters coming in on the flank of the big Jap bombers and their six escorting Zeros, just at the planned interception point over a steamy, palm-fringed South Pacific island. One all but watched the grim fight against these fearful odds—the Americans' quick, deadly first attack, the two bombers flaming and falling, then fighters diving and twisting in the bright air, and the Zeros also bursting into quick, hot flame, and the two American planes turning for home at last, their mission miraculously accomplished. One held one's breath, indeed, until the major finished:

"But the man who got the admiral was Tom Lanphier. I was his wing man. He led the attack. We each got a bomber. He took the first one, and the first one had Yamamoto on board." There is a current reason for digging this snapshot of the forgotten past out of memory's album. This same Tom Lanphier, whom the major talked about for much of the rest of that happy, long ago evening, is again being talked about here in Washington. But this time Lanphier is being discussed in very different language, by men on the highest level of the American Government.

Primarily, Lanphier is being discussed because he is a very worried man, and because he has attacked the thing that worries him with the same devil-may-care, go-for-the-lead-bomber determination that he showed when Yamamoto met his end. But the thing that worries Lanphier happens to be the Eisenhower administration's complacency about the missile gap. So this new fight against odds is unlikely to be rewarded with the Navy Cross, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Flying Cross, as the last fight was.

When Senator STUART SYMINGTON was Secretary of the Air Force, Tom Lanphier was his Assistant Secretary. Lanphier is still SYMINGTON's close friend; and in the last month SYMINGTON and Lanphier, with Lanphier feverishly spurring SYMINGTON on, have desperately pressed for a cold, hard, new look at the changes in the military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This was a wholly private effort. It was only the failure of the private effort that

drove SYMINGTON to speak out in public, with bitter eloquence, in the Senate last Friday. Twice before the private effort failed, SYMINGTON saw President Eisenhower himself, to beg for bold action to meet the challenge of Soviet progress in ballistic missiles.

Twice SYMINGTON and Lanphier, also saw the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, whom the President told off to soothe the anxious Senator. On the second occasion, which had been planned as a fairly grandiose briefing, Lanphier all but broke up the party by declaring that his own manufacturing experience proved the dangerous overoptimism of the official estimates of Soviet missile output.

Lanphier knows most of the secret facts that are withheld from the American public, precisely because he is a manufacturer of ballistic missiles. But as vice president of Convair, which makes the Atlas intercontinental missile, Lanphier has an obvious interest in bigger Atlas orders from the Air Force. Thus a good many men on the higher governmental level are smugly saying that Tom Lanphier has just been "selling a bill of goods with his furious, worried talk about the missile gap."

That is one way to look at it. The other way to look at it also involves a snapshot from the forgotten past—the tragic picture of Winston Churchill and Sir Austen Chamberlain going to plead with Stanley Baldwin for British rearmament to match Hitler's rearmament, and getting a smug, dusty answer to their anguished and farsighted pleas. The two ways of looking at it are diametrically opposed; and the choice between them deserves further investigation.

Pay for Retired Service Personnel Must Be Equalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the United States is discriminating against a large number of servicemen who served it so well on so many occasions. Under the military pay bill passed by the 85th Congress in 1958, two persons who were in the same service and retired with the same rank can be paid on different scales.

I do not believe this is just, and I feel it makes our service personnel, who have stood ready to answer our Nation's call at any time, feel the Nation is ungrateful to them. Therefore, I have joined in sponsoring a bill to equalize the amounts paid to retired members of the armed services.

The military pay bill of 1958 provides that members of the Armed Forces who retire after May 31, 1958, receive pensions based upon a percentage of the current pay for persons on active duty, which is higher than the percentage granted those already retired.

A straight 6-percent increase was granted those who retired prior to that time.

This bill carries out the recommendation of The Cordiner Report that retirement pay scales be refigured each time

laws pertaining to them are changed.

I have just received a letter from Robert E. Joseph of San Antonio, Tex., a retired U.S. Army colonel, who is commander of the San Antonio Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, with some timely comments on this important subject:

The greatest single incentive to careers in the uniformed services—

Colonel Joseph writes—

is the time-honored principle that retired pay, once earned, will continue to be at the established percentages of active pay.

Colonel Joseph continues—

Young men of character and ability are now asking: "Shall I commit myself to a military career when the rules may be changed before the final whistle has blown?"

Are we to ignore the experience of mankind and established and maintain a policy which will inevitably result in mediocrity in our military leadership? I believe not.

Military men, whether they serve 50 years on active duty or 20 years, have been assured equality of treatment in the computation of their retired pay with those who are to follow them into retirement.

What am I to tell my son and son-in-law, both young regular officers and both graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, who are devoting their lives to military careers? I expect to say to them:

"Continue upon your careers in the profession of arms and the 88th Congress, in its wisdom, will reestablish equality in the computation of retired pay of personnel."

I hope that I shall not be proven a false prophet.

Mr. President, in further support of the necessity for the passage of this new bill on retirement pay for servicemen, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Military Order of the World Wars in national convention at San Juan, P.R. on October 24, 1958.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

"Whereas military retirement and its firm tie-in with active duty compensation is perhaps the most powerful long-term career incentive existing within the military compensation system; and

"Whereas the Cordiner committee said of this recommended feature now abandoned by Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress:

"The committee has therefore concluded that the incentive value of this existing military retirement program depends to a major degree upon its integral relationship with active duty compensation and the confidence which has been built up in the military body that no breach of faith or breach of retirement contract has ever been permitted by the Congress and the American people; and

"Whereas this law should be amended to comply both with the recommendation and with the long-standing tradition which has been, and remains, the major incentive to retention of military personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Military Order of the World Wars in convention assembled at San Juan, P.R., this 24th day of October 1958, That we urge upon the Congress the enactment of amendatory legislation to Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress to restore the incentive feature embodied in this historical relationship between active duty pay and retired pay, in order to insure the highest

caliber of personnel for our national defense."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Military Order of the World Wars to be affixed this 24th day of October 1958.

ROBERT G. KALES,

Commander, U.S.N.R. (Retired),
Commander in Chief.

By the commander in chief:

HARRY F. McCULLAH,

Commander, U.S.N. (Retired),
Secretary General.

Help for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the January 22, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal headlined "Agency Works on New Plan To Spur School Building—Uncle Sam Would Help Local Units Pay Debt Interest, Not Construction Bills."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix immediately following this news story, my press release of the same date, in which I point out that the administration's school-aid proposal, as leaked to the Wall Street Journal, is designed to help bankers rather than schoolchildren or schoolteachers, and that it shifts the cost to future years so the administration will not have to account for the expenditures during its remaining 2 years.

This administration proposal, I regret to say, bears no relationship to the realities of educational needs.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCY WORKS ON NEW PLAN TO SPUR SCHOOL BUILDING—UNCLE SAM WOULD HELP LOCAL UNITS PAY DEBT INTEREST, NOT CONSTRUCTION BILLS—FEDERAL SHARE STILL QUESTION
(By James A. Reynolds)

WASHINGTON.—Administration officials are trying to draft a new program to stimulate school construction that would not involve Federal sharing of building costs.

Instead, it would empower Uncle Sam to pay part of a local school district's debt service load—the interest on money the district borrowed to finance construction of new classrooms. Earlier administration aid-to-education proposals included outright Federal grants for school building.

Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials hope the new approach will appeal to White House budget balancers. They figure no Federal outlays would be required until mid-1960, at the earliest. School districts, they argue, would need a few months to float new building bonds, and a year would pass before the first interest on the new bonds would come due.

WOULD NOT AFFECT NEW BUDGET

Thus, the new plan would not unbalance the administration's \$77 billion budget for the fiscal year which starts July 1. However, Federal payments might run high in later years.

To get an idea how big the Federal program might grow, consider the size of the present

and future school district debt service burden. Federal officials estimate the local districts have obligated themselves to pay \$6.5 billion in interest on the outstanding principal borrowed to finance classroom construction. Within the next decade, it's estimated, the districts must add another \$6.5 billion to their debt service burden if they hope to keep pace with the demand for new classrooms.

But the Federal agency's planners are not proposing that Uncle Sam take over all of this load. The question of how big a share the United States should accept and for how long is, in fact, the toughest problem facing the bill drafters.

Some officials think Uncle Sam and the school districts should split the future debt service payments 50-50, while others believe the States should assume part of the burden. Only a few States at present help local school districts pay interest on their construction bonds, and in these cases the State share is small.

LENGTH OF PROGRAM

Officials doubt the administration will go so far as to propose that Uncle Sam help carry the debt service load for a bond issue's full term, which frequently runs for 20 to 40 years. It's more likely, they say, that the program would run for only the next 5 or 10 years—the period when they figure most building would have to be done, adding to the chore of carrying the present debt.

The new approach, Health, Education, Welfare officials believe, would stimulate school building in two ways. Districts theoretically would find it easier to borrow money—that is, sell bond issues—if they could show that the State and Federal Governments would be responsible for meeting part of the interest payments.

Moreover, they figure many districts that are already heavily in debt might be encouraged to take on still more in an effort to overcome classroom shortages if some of the worry over the cost of future borrowings were shared by the Federal and State Governments.

Currently, officials are studying the new scheme only for elementary and secondary school construction. But if it's tried and works, they add, it might later be used to stimulate construction of college classrooms. The Federal Government already offers low-rate loans for the construction of college housing, but is not seeking any new funds for this program for fiscal 1960.

NEW APPROACH FOR ADMINISTRATION

If it were adopted, the new approach would mark a major change in administration thinking on school construction. Twice before, President Eisenhower has asked Congress for up to \$2 billion of Federal aid to States over a 4-year period to spur building of new classrooms. Both times the program failed to pass when it got snarled in a congressional fight over civil rights. Last year, the administration dropped its school construction efforts, and instead concentrated on winning legislation to step up science and engineering education.

This year, many Democrats are expected to line up behind an aid-to-education measure sponsored by two Montana Democrats, Senator MURRAY and Representative METCALF. They propose Federal grants to States, based on each State's school-age population, for school buildings or teachers' salaries. If the Federal payment was fixed at \$25 per child, the program might cost \$1.1 billion a year.

The National Education Association currently favors the Murray-Metcalf approach, but N.E.A. officials decline to say how they'd view the Health, Education officials' plan.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee today made the following statement:

"The administration's school aid proposal, which was leaked to the Wall Street Journal today is designed to help bankers rather than schoolchildren or schoolteachers. It

shifts the cost to future years so the administration won't have to account for the expenditures during its remaining 2 years.

"The administration proposal bears no relationship to the realities of educational needs.

"The administration would have the Federal Government pay part of a local school district's debt service load. According to the Journal:

"Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials hope the new approach will appeal to White House budget-balancers. They figure no Federal outlays would be required until mid-1960, at the earliest. Thus the new plan would not unbalance the administration's \$77 billion budget for the fiscal year which starts July 1. However, Federal payments might run high in later years."

"In other words, the Eisenhower administration does not care if the Federal budget is unbalanced, provided it will be the budget of the succeeding Democratic administration. Furthermore, the bankers who have done so well under Eisenhower want this program so the succeeding Democratic administration will have to continue paying them high Republican interest rates. I imagine administration officials and their big business friends stayed late at the club several evenings cooking up this bit of mockery.

"It is also evident that the advice of people who know educational needs was disregarded. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated his view that teacher salaries should be doubled. To do this would require approximately \$6 billion annually. According to the U.S. Office of Education it would require about \$5.4 billion to construct the more than 135,000 classrooms needed just to meet present needs.

"S. 2 which 30 Senators joined me in introducing, would permit a start on meeting this great need, by authorizing grants to the States to be used for classroom construction or teacher salaries or a combination of these two purposes, as each State sees fit.

"I would suggest to the administration that in preparation for forthcoming hearings by the Education Subcommittee it begin to consider the needs of education rather than the desires of bankers, and the relative financial condition of States and local school districts as compared with the Federal Government. From 1948 to 1957 our national debt increased from \$252 billion to \$270 billion, but our national income increased from \$223.5 billion to \$364 billion. We as a Nation are like the man who 10 years ago bought a house with a \$6,000 mortgage when he made \$5,000 a year. He recently bought a bigger house which had a \$7,000 mortgage; however, his salary is now more than \$8,000 a year. He obviously is now in a much better position to pay for his new house.

"And he certainly is in a better position than the man who, like many local school districts, is in debt so far, according to his ability to pay, that the banker waves him out the door."

Insecure Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of January 27, 1959:

INSECURE PROTECTION

The multitude of things that can be covered by national security is shown once again in the rejection of a low British bid to supply hydraulic turbines for an Army project in Arkansas.

Under our Buy American Act, a foreign company interested in Federal contracts not only has to bid lower than the domestic competition; it has to bid substantially lower. And if there is heavy unemployment in the area of an American producer, the bid has to be 12% lower. In this case, English Electric's bid was some 19 percent lower than that of Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, which eventually got the contract.

The decision was made by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, which claimed that national security would be jeopardized by awarding the contract to the British firm. The rationalization was that domestic productive capacity for making these turbines would be reduced to a level inadequate for emergency requirements. In other words, if we got into a war we might not be able to produce these turbines fast enough.

This is a weak argument on the face of it; for one thing, Baldwin is not the only company making the machines. Also, as English Electric sensibly retorted, the way for Baldwin or any other American firm to keep busy is by effective competition. Nevertheless, the national security argument is made for protectionism for all kinds of domestic industry, some of whose connection with defense is tenuous to say the least.

In this case hardly anybody even believes the argument. The real reason for the decision appears to lie in Pennsylvania politics. So there is something less than candid about dragging in national security as an ostensible justification for the decision.

Naturally the decision is causing a hullabaloo in Britain, as did a similar celebrated case several years ago. It certainly doesn't make the United States look good when it preaches free trade and practices something different. Then, too, this sort of thing always stirs the temptation on the other side to retaliate; and it is in such widening mutual retaliations that international commerce sickens, to the detriment of everybody.

But it isn't the foreign aspect that most concerns us; we have never believed that the United States should conduct its trade or any other policies simply to please people abroad. What mainly concerns us is that behavior like this hurts ourselves. In this particular affair it is perfectly plain: Unless the decision is reversed, the American taxpayer will have to fork out more than \$300,000 more than is necessary for the turbines.

That isn't much for a Government that spends billions as though they were dimes, but why should the taxpayer have any amount of his money wasted? Moreover, this is an illustration of the way protectionism in general works, whether the protectionism takes the form of tariffs, quotas, national security decisions, or whatever other gimmick.

Protectionist devices amount to a hidden tax on the consumer. He simply has to pay more than he would otherwise have to for the things he or his Government buys. That is the whole point—to shelter some firms from price and other competition.

We aren't trying to say that much freer trade would cure all the ills of the world. We do say it would be in the national interest and spur competition to the great benefit of the consumer-taxpayer and even of the firms that want protection. In the process it would improve our image in the world's eyes far more than all the billions we throw around as foreign aid.

In short, a policy of protectionism may protect a lot of firms—for a while, anyway. But the one thing it does not protect is national security.

Castro Is Betraying His Own Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Capital Times of Madison has won a reputation as a militant fighter against tyranny, dictatorship, and corruption everywhere. For this reason it enthusiastically supported the Castro revolution against the Batista tyranny in Cuba.

For this same reason it has protested against the newborn tyranny of Castro which seems to be developing now in Cuba. In commenting on the merciless violence of Castro toward the conquered Batista forces, the Capital Times writes:

Orderly justice and democratic procedures cannot grow out of such a grisly carnival. Terror spawns more terror.

Castro is betraying his own revolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CASTRO IS BETRAYING HIS OWN REVOLUTION BY A REIGN OF TERROR

A Capital Times reader has written to protest our critical attitude toward the terror loosed by Fidel Castro and his Cuban revolutionaries. Revolutions, he suggests, are not Sunday school picnics. Violence and bloodshed are the trademarks.

Our correspondent misses the point—a point well made in a recent column in the New York Post by Max Learner, the distinguished scholar and author who has been in sympathy with Castro's struggle to rid Cuba of Batista tyranny:

We had better face it: The things that are happening in Cuba today, as the execution toll mounts and the reign of terror moves into full swing, present an unlovely picture of the political animal as revolutionary.

It is one thing to spill blood—to kill and be killed—in the course of revolutionary or civil-war fighting itself. It is quite another thing to keep killing after a revolution is over, and victory has been achieved.

In the one case it is killing in the heat of battle, as part of a war, with victory and survival at stake. In the other case it is killing in cold blood, out of hatred and revenge, with no real justification except the conviction that you are God and can mete out death to those who deserve it.

Nor is it an answer to cry out against the crimes of Batista. Two wrongs have never made a right. The revolution was fought to rid the country of terror, not to substitute one brand for another.

It is argued that there were reprisals against the Tories in the American Revolution, but only a perversion of history could compare it with what is going on in Cuba. Insofar as it did exist it was wrong and should be condemned by all who understand what democracy and justice really mean.

What is going on in Cuba today is more like the terror that came with the French revolution when the guillotines bathed the

streets of Paris with blood to satisfy the lust of the mob. The trials before 17,000 shrieking spectators in the Havana sports area are tragically reminiscent of the days of Robespierre.

Fidel Castro might well reflect on the lesson of the French revolution in which the executioner of one day was the executed the next. If the tide should turn against him the same mob whose blood lust he is satisfying today will call for his blood tomorrow.

Orderly justice and democratic procedures cannot grow out of such a grisly carnival. Terror spawns more terror.

Castro is betraying his own revolution.

A Loan Program for Nongovernmental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. F. J. L. Blasengame, a distinguished physician of the State of Texas, has made the sacrifice of leaving private practice to serve his profession and his country as the executive vice president of the American Medical Association.

A recent letter by him to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, sets out the position of the American Medical Association as approving and supporting a Government-insured loan program of the FHA type for non-Governmental hospitals and nursing homes, whether the ownership is of a nonprofit and proprietary character.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I request that his letter be placed in the Appendix as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., January 26, 1959.

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I am writing this letter to you to express the official views of the American Medical Association with respect to title II of S. 57, 86th Congress, which I understand, is now pending before your committee. Our position with respect to this proposal, which would make proprietary nursing homes eligible for mortgage insurance, is one of active support.

Our deep interest in the subject of the health care of the aged and the occurrence of some significant recent developments have prompted me to mention certain activities in this field before outlining the specific reasons for our support of title II of S. 57.

Since its beginning, more than a century ago, the American Medical Association has been deeply concerned with the medical aspects of caring for the aged. In recent years, however, our interest and activities in this connection have kept pace with the ever-increasing amount of national attention being given to the subject both within the Government and among groups and associations outside Government. This general trend is understandable, of course, since the proportion of our population over age 65 is increasing at an amazing rate. In 1900

there were only 3 million of these elderly citizens whereas now there are approximately 15 million.

For the past several years the American Medical Association has had a committee on aging, composed of some of the leading medical authorities in the United States in this field, which has devoted its full effort to this problem. In addition there are 45 committees on aging actively at work in the State medical societies. To facilitate and coordinate the work of these committees, a set of guides for their organization and operation has been developed and made available to them.

As a climax to a series of five regional meetings which were held last year, and in an effort to prepare a positive program for use by the State committees, an AMA National Planning Conference for Medical Society Action in the Field of Aging was held in Chicago on September 13-14, 1958. This conference was attended by over 175 people, including official State medical society representatives from 46 States and the District of Columbia, as well as 27 State health departments. A copy of the official proceedings of this conference, together with a related brochure entitled "Health Aspects of Aging," are enclosed for the information of the committee.

In our consideration of the health problems of the aged we have also given serious thought to effective methods of financing medical and hospital care. In considering this facet of the problem, it should be noted that enrollment of older people under voluntary health insurance has increased substantially in recent years. In the last several years alone the percentage of coverage has gone up approximately 100 percent. Presently, exclusive of the approximately 3 million older persons who receive public assistance, more than 50 percent of those over age 65 have some form of health insurance. Nevertheless, in our opinion, there is a need for further expansion of voluntary health insurance coverage among the aged.

During the last year the association has conducted or participated in numerous meetings and conferences with commercial insurance carriers and with State and national Blue Cross and Blue Shield commissions to encourage still greater efforts in the development of new insurance programs and in the expansion of lower-cost protection for persons over age 65. These companies, as well as Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans, are now engaged in intensive studies designed to develop new types of policies tailored to meet the needs of the aged ill; present retirement financing of health insurance policies with paid-up status at age 65; use of life insurance after 65 to pay for health care; and the application of deductible and coinsurance to permit coverage of costly illnesses at a low premium rate, among others.

In order to stimulate further the interest of State medical societies and individual physicians in this movement the house of delegates of the association approved the following resolution at its clinical meeting which was held in Minneapolis in December of 1958:

"For persons over 65 years of age with reduced incomes and very modest resources, it is necessary immediately to develop further the voluntary health insurance or prepayment plans in a way that would be acceptable both to the recipients and the medical profession. The medical profession must continue to assert its leadership and responsibility for assuring adequate medical care for this group of our citizens.

"Therefore, the Council on Medical Service recommends to the house of delegates the adoption of the following proposal:

"That the American Medical Association, the constituent and component medical societies, as well as physicians everywhere, expedite the development of an effective volun-

tary health insurance or prepayment program for the group over 65 with modest resources or low family income; that physicians agree to accept a level of compensation for medical services rendered to this group, which will permit the development of such insurance and prepayment plans at a reduced premium rate.

"This recommendation has been studied and restudied by the board of trustees and has received its wholehearted endorsement."

In addition to the numerous and varied medical, scientific, and socioeconomic activities being pursued in this field, physicians through their associations have, for some time, recognized the need for additional organizational weapons to attack these problems. For many years the American Medical Association was an active participant in the affairs of the Commission on Chronic Illness, in cooperation with representatives of the general public, industry, labor, agriculture, education, religion, social sciences, journalism, health and welfare. One of a number of studies which were conducted was entitled "Nursing Homes, Their Patients and Their Care." A copy of this study which was published by the U.S. Public Health Service is also attached for the information of your committee.

Last year the American Medical Association joined with the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, and the American Nursing Home Association in the formation of the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged. In broad outline the program of the joint council will include a coordinated plan of research designed to:

(a) Determine the extent, utilization and availability of facilities and the economic status and resources of the aged.

(b) Spearhead the expansion and experimentation in all types of voluntary health insurance coverage for the aged.

(c) Encourage the expansion of health care facilities for the aged.

(d) Encourage the development of community health services for the aged.

(e) Urge State and local legislative bodies to provide realistic financial support for medical, hospital, and nursing home care of aged public assistance recipients and

(f) Appraise the problems of the aged who are mentally ill and provide an intensification of education, research, and action programs directed toward health problems of the aged at National, State and local levels.

In its work in connection with the overall medical care problems of the aged, the American Medical Association has long recognized the importance of proper nursing home facilities. For this reason the association has had a close relationship for some time with the American Nursing Home Association to work toward the development of higher standards for medical care in nursing homes. In February of 1958 the first National Conference on Nursing Homes and Homes for the Aged was held in Washington. Our association was an active participant at that meeting. On December 16, 1958, a conference on Nursing Homes and Related Facilities between representatives of our association, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Homes Association, Public Health Service, and public assistance agencies was held in Chicago to discuss current activities and projected programs concerning facilities for the chronically ill and the aged. The purpose of this meeting was to seek a coordinated effort on the part of interested national organizations.

In addition the AMA is currently making a survey of nursing homes throughout the United States. The American Nursing Home Association is also engaged in such a project and is surveying approximately 5,000 member homes to obtain data on the cost of care to the patient, the type of patient in the homes and the type of medical care provided.

As an outgrowth of all of these various related activities in connection with the health care of the aged, our Council on Medical Service has prepared a 6-point program, the details of which are outlined in the attached brochure entitled "Medicine's Blueprint for the New Era of Aging."

In conclusion I should like to comment more specifically with respect to the provisions of title II of S. 57, 86th Congress. As stated at the outset, the American Medical Association has approved and supports a Government-insured loan program of the FHA type for nongovernmental hospitals and nursing homes whether their ownership is of a nonprofit or proprietary character.

We have taken this position because we believe there is a critical need for new and improved facilities tailored to the specific health requirements of older citizens. It is our understanding that representatives of other organizations such as the American Nursing Home Association have or will appear before your committee. They have evidence accumulated over recent years showing that they cannot provide service of the desired quality or quantity because they are unable to obtain the credit they need on reasonable terms to permit them to increase the number and size of adequate nursing home facilities.

Under the Hill-Burton program the Federal Government has for years been assisting public and nonprofit institutions through money grants. It is also our understanding that the Federal Housing Administration is presently offering mortgage insurance for construction of large nonprofit institutional-type homes for the aged which may have a section for those needing nursing care. In our opinion the immediate need is for a similar program of loan guarantees for proprietary organizations, since, according to the latest statistics, over 70 percent of nursing home patients are cared for in such facilities.

In the administration of a grant program under the Hill-Burton system and a loan guarantee program under the Federal Housing Administration, we recognize the desirability of cooperation; however, we believe that the loan guarantee program proposed under title II of the pending bill should be administered by the Federal Housing Administration without mandatory supervision or coordination with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I would like to request that this letter and attachments, to the extent possible, be made a part of the record of the hearings of your committee. If you or any of the members of the committee desire additional copies of the attached material or any further information from our association, we shall be happy to provide you with anything we have.

Your willingness to permit the American Medical Association to present its views on the pending proposal is sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,
F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.,
Executive Vice President.

People Can Help Check Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, inflation is the major enemy on our domestic front. It is an insidious economic smog that penetrates all levels of life in

the United States. It is an enemy that cannot be fought by the President alone, or the Congress, or business, or the consumer. In order to lick this foe, we must all get on the front line and fight.

The press in the United States has a major role in reminding the American people that they are all in this up to their ears, and must get in there pitching if they don't want to see their dollar shrivel to the worth of green paper.

The editor of the Flint Journal in my State of Michigan, has given brilliant evidence of his realization of the responsibility of the press in this respect with the attached editorial, of January 25, which I submit herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

PEOPLE CAN HELP CHECK INFLATION

President Eisenhower has put defense of the value of the dollar in the "must" category of national policy. He declares that inflation, which means the decline in the value of the dollar, must be checked if America is to avoid economic decay.

The President says control of inflation and retention of the value of our money is the task of everyone—Congress, business, labor, consumers. He wants Congress to avoid deficit spending, business to hold down prices, labor to refrain from excessive wage demands, consumers to shop carefully.

Unless self-discipline and restraint in economic matters are provided, Mr. Eisenhower warns, it may be necessary for the administration to ask Congress for wage and price controls such as this Nation had during World War II.

Dangerous, destructive inflation will result unless some kind of restraint is imposed. Already we have experienced too much inflation. It has been the slow, creeping kind, but it could get out of even partial control and become a vicious spiral as it feeds upon itself.

We have been fortunate in America that the inflationary spiral has not been completely destructive. World history contains many instances of inflation ruining nations. Inflation in Germany after World War I wrecked the German economy and created conditions which contributed to the rise of Hitler. Right now Argentina is experiencing inflation so serious that an economic revolution is a possibility.

It is amazing that there is so little public concern about inflation. It is amazing that there has been no loud public demand that Government institute policies which will stop the spiral. Instead, results of the last election indicate voter endorsement of spending programs which, if adopted by Congress, will put more fuel on the inflationary fires.

Perhaps the absence of public agitation results from a lack of realization of the extent of inflation in the last 20 years. Some figures from a Saturday Evening Post article by Roswell Magill, chairman of Tax Foundation, Inc., may make the picture clearer. He writes:

"Inflation has been called the cruellest tax of all—and we are paying it, whether or not we realize it. In the last 20 years the value of our dollar has been cut in half; just since the end of World War II the purchasing power of our dollar has been reduced by 23 cents. Since the war, inflation and taxes together have taken such a toll that the man who earned \$5,000 in 1946 would have to earn \$7,343 today—nearly 50 percent more—just to hold his own in buying power."

Mr. Magill, who was Franklin D. Roosevelt's Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1937-38, has some other comparisons. The man with an income of \$3,000 in 1946 would have to earn \$4,445 in 1958 to stay even in purchasing power. The man earning \$10,000 in 1946 now needs to earn \$14,485.

Mr. Magill wonders if we are on the downhill road of inflation that ends in economic disaster. He wonders if we will come eventually to the dollar which is worth only 10 cents in purchasing power; perhaps to the 1-cent dollar.

Take just one of the inflationary factors—deficit spending by the Federal Government. The public can control that if we will accept the danger and become vocal enough so we will be heard in the House of Congress and in the bureaus of the executive branch.

We can insist that Federal spending in the coming fiscal years be tailored to fit income so that the highly inflationary process of borrowing will be avoided. We can insist that the new spending programs, which are being offered in Congress, be rejected until the money is on hand to pay for them.

We know defense spending will have to continue high because of the threats from Russia, but we can insist the military services stop competing for the defense dollar. We can insist that they stop duplication and give us a defense system that is worth every cent it costs.

We can demand the budget be limited to essentials. The desirable can be postponed until the Federal Government again shows a budget surplus. We can demand that Congress ignore the pressure groups that constantly seek more Federal handouts.

Inflation will continue to build up under deficit spending. The people, if they want their dollars to have some value, can be a pressure group for fiscal policies which will put brakes on the inflationary period.

Labor's Attack on Mikoyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Columnist John Herling, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 27, 1959:

LABOR'S ATTACK ON MIKOYAN

(By John Herling)

Back in Moscow, Anastas I. Mikoyan, the No. 2 man in the Soviet Union, this week-end filed one large-scale complaint about his U.S. visit. He charges the spokesmen of organized labor in the United States are unfair to the Soviet dictatorship.

He can't get over the way he was handled in the United States. He got the roughest handling, not from the capitalists, but from the union leaders. The rudest statements, he said, came from labor spokesmen.

What bothers Mr. Mikoyan is not the lack of etiquette on the part of any section of American society. What eats at him is his failure to hit the main Communist target in this or any country; the workers and their organizations. Here he fell flat on his face in his efforts to flatter, cajole, or mollify organized labor.

In the United States, five American trade-union presidents gave him lunch and then proceeded to spoil his appetite by telling him off with words that a top Soviet political boss never hears from the representatives of the state-controlled Soviet labor unions.

A couple of days later, AFL-CIO President George Meany, who sent his regrets to the luncheon, unloaded a personal and political attack on Mr. Mikoyan for his doublecross

of the Hungarian revolution, climaxed by the murder of Imre Nagy, Hungarian Prime Minister.

Even more all-out in its attack was a group headed by the officers of the United Hat Workers and Upholstery Workers who bought an ad that said: "Mikoyan, Go Home." In Moscow, Mr. Mikoyan tried to do, verbally, what Communist tacticians have always tried to do with their opponents: drive a wedge in the opposition and so weaken it before moving in for the kill. In this instance, Mr. Mikoyan has tried to exaggerate the difference of opinion between Mr. Meany who wouldn't break bread with him and those who did: IUE President James B. Carey, Auto Workers President Walter P. Reuther, Letter Carriers President William C. Doherty, Karl Feller, president of the Brewery Workers, and Communications Workers President Joseph A. Belrne.

This obvious maneuver by Mr. Mikoyan had already been anticipated in American labor circles. One key labor observer said: "What is the difference between Mr. Meany's position and that of Messrs. Reuther and Carey toward Mr. Mikoyan? I'll tell you what it is: Mr. Meany believes Mr. Mikoyan isn't fit to live with pigs and Messrs. Carey and Reuther say he is." There is cold comfort for Mr. Mikoyan in this distinction.

Mr. Mikoyan's version of his conversation with the trade union leaders reveals that two of the main international subjects in their talk had to do with the Berlin crisis and the Hungarian revolution. Evaluating his own achievement, Mr. Mikoyan said he repulsed the attacks by the American labor leaders on those subjects.

Mr. Mikoyan said that despite the strong dispute, the meeting with the trade union spokesmen was friendly. Like many another salesman, Mr. Mikoyan likes to claim he made contact, especially when he has lost a sale.

What rankled Mr. Mikoyan especially is this exchange between him and the U.S. trade union leaders:

Mr. Mikoyan: "You fellows are more vicious than the capitalists. They don't talk to me the way you do."

Trade union leaders: "We know you better, Mr. Mikoyan."

late have been utilized for various reasons, and in many cases they find themselves dependent to some degree on relatives or friends, or on the various welfare agencies, for the additional help they need. To remove this restriction on the amount of income which can be earned would certainly make it much easier for them and their families.

At the present time the retirement age for men under the Social Security Act is 65; for women 62. Under the second provision of my bill this would be changed. Men would become eligible for full retirement benefits at the age of 60; and women would be entitled to full benefits at the age of 55. We hear much talk today of early retirement, and our older workers are encouraged to retire as soon as possible to make way for the younger employees. This could be an actual reality and not just a dream if the retirement age were lowered and the benefits liberalized. The life span of the individual is growing longer and it is estimated that within 20 years we will have over 20 million Americans over the age of 65. It is the responsibility of the Government to see that an adequate program for the care of these citizens is put into effect.

The final section of the bill deals with the elimination of the requirement that a person must have reached the age of 50 before he can become eligible for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. Many times an employee is injured and disabled through no fault of his own, and under the current provisions must wait many years before he can collect benefits. This proves to be a hardship for him and his family. My bill would permit such an employee to file immediately for benefits to which he is rightfully entitled, thus assisting him in some measure to contribute to the support of his dependents, and preventing his absolute dependency on others.

As Members of Congress we must look to the welfare of all our citizens whether they are young or old, able or disabled. If it is necessary to revise some of our programs to meet the challenge of the changing times then this we must do.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to give every possible consideration to the enactment of my bill.

The Last Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article from the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, of January 26, 1959:

THE LAST REPUBLICAN

To the Editor:

Will Rogers used to say all he knew was just what he read in the News and Observer, or words to that effect.

According to your newspaper it is about time for Mr. Joe Nathan Daniels to write himself a new book, entitled "A Democrat Discovers a Democrat." A man named James Fennamint Cooper wrote a book one time called "The Last of the Mohicans."

It is also about time for John Frosty Dulles or Henry Cabbage Lodge to write a book called "The Last of the Republicans." It would compare favorably with Hoover's book called "Ragged Individualism."

The southern Democrats committed ambush on themselves when they let the two-thirds rule be abolished in the national convention. Now the two-thirds Democrats tell the southern Democrats to shut up, integrate, or get out. When Democrats begin casting out Democrats, where will the benighted southern Republican appear on the scene? He becomes an innocuous desuetude. If he follows the national leadership, he must abandon all his ideals of racial integrity and come out wholehearted and barefooted for integration and this makes him about as popular as illegitimate twins at a family reunion.

The southern Democrat and the southern Republican have been treated by the national leadership like the preacher who got mad with the congregation and wouldn't preach, so he took up collection and left. Every election year involving the Presidency a group of Yankee Republicans drift South over the Potomac and appear on the scene in the Southern States. They beat on toms-toms and gather a multitude of Republicans together at some central point. Then they brag long and loud an Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt. Then they cuss out the Democrats in general, Truman in particular, and communism and high taxes just to be cussin'. Then they get real mealy-mouthed about a two-party system down South, and how they are going to help out with it. Then they take up a big, fat, juicy collection and flee back across the Warren-Nixon line behind the nylon curtain and that is the last you hear of them.

This method of building up a two-party system in the South is like the man who used to always put vitamin pills in his liquor, so he could build himself up, while he was tearing himself down.

"CHUB" SEAWELL,
Ex-Republican.

The Family Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we who compose the militant minority of economy-minded Members of Congress know that those at home appreciate and understand our efforts to eliminate wasteful, unnecessary Federal spending. As another budget battle approaches, I am gratified that such an outstanding newspaper as the Cleveland Plain Dealer continues to share my conviction that a sound fiscal policy is compatible with efficient government and a strong defense. Under unanimous consent of the House, I insert an editorial from the January 27 Plain Dealer which sounds a sharp warning to those who would jeopardize the economic integrity of the Federal Government:

THE FAMILY BUDGET

At one time or another the head of every prudent family tries to make out a budget. He or she first writes down the amount of income the family can reasonably expect during a given period. Against that there are certain expenses which must be met, such as rent or mortgage payments, taxes, utilities, food, clothing, transportation, and insurance.

Too often, alas, these amounts eat up all the anticipated income, but sometimes, after the necessities have been provided for, there is something left over for other things, such as entertainment, vacation trips, new furniture, and so on. The problem then is to decide which of these other things the family can afford. Obviously, the family can't have everything it wants because if it could there would be no budget problem to worry about.

But the leftwing Democrats who are complaining that President Eisenhower's \$77 billion budget isn't big enough would go about things in a different way. First they would list everything that the family wants under the heading of necessities and, if there wasn't enough money coming in to pay for them, they would borrow the balance.

That's what has been done all too often in the past, so that the Federal debt is now above \$280 billion, a staggering amount. But the people who have loaned this money to the Government expect to earn interest on it, and that includes the holders of \$25 U.S. savings bonds, as well as the banks and insurance companies that buy larger amounts of Government bonds in long and short term issues. As a result, interest on the Government debt is one of the big, irreducible items in the Federal budget. It amounted to \$7½ billion this year and will be over \$8 billion next year.

That brings us to the spokesman of the Democratic leftwingers, the Democratic Advisory Council. It complains that the only people who benefit in a big way from the new budget are those who have money and lend it to the Government. That's because the Government has had to increase its interest rates in order to induce the owners of capital to lend it to the Government. If the people who have money to lend can get better interest rates elsewhere, or if they fear that inflation will erode the value of their money if they put it in Government bonds, they will invest in something else.

As Raymond Moley pointed out in a column on this page last week, the time might come when the Government couldn't borrow any more money to finance its deficits. Then it would have to resort to the printing press and runaway inflation would be upon us.

The Democratic Advisory Committee is completely oblivious to this potential disaster. It wants the Government to spend more, to borrow more, and to cut down on interest rates, thus leading to a situation when the Government could no longer borrow. It's the classic road to ruin, whether it happens to your family's budget or the Government's.

an estimated cost of \$575 million was scuttled 18 months ago in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is little doubt that approval of this legislation in committee would have resulted in final passage in the House of Representatives. I refer, of course, to the controversial high Hells Canyon project.

Now, after a relatively brief lapse of time, we should take inventory of just what has happened, for certainly there is a lesson to be learned by those who are inclined toward Federal spending versus free enterprise.

I personally take pride in the vote that I cast against this proposed half billion dollar-plus project in the face of what has since transpired. The Idaho Power Co. as you know, took on the job as a private enterprise. Now let us look at the situation as it now stands.

The first of three dams has been completed. At Brownlee, just 2 weeks ago, the fourth generating unit in the power-producing facilities of this project was placed "on the line" and is now furnishing 360,000 kilowatts of electric energy to serve the Pacific Northwest. Not only does this constitute a major milestone of progress, but it stands as evidence that costly Government programs which can be handled by private enterprise should be discouraged at every opportunity.

Proponents of this legislation fought to put the Federal Government into the power business at a tremendous expense to the taxpayers of this Nation. Several efforts were made from 1949 until a year and a half ago. When it failed, and while the Idaho Power Co. was proceeding with the job, the taxpayers of my State of Illinois alone were saved exactly \$38,023,620, their share of the estimated original cost.

Brownlee Dam is now the second highest rockfill dam in the world and takes its place among the major power-producing installations in the Northwest. Construction is now proceeding vigorously at Oxbow Dam, second unit of the development and preliminary work has already been started on the third unit.

The Idaho Power Co.'s total investment in its three-dam development was approximately \$110 million as of the beginning of this year. Power production equipment on special order total several more millions of dollars. Total cost of the entire project will be about \$164 million. In addition to generating tax revenues of \$10 million annually for the local, State, and Federal governments, the development is providing substantial public benefits in the way of flood control, navigation, fish conservation, and recreation.

The first of two upstream-migrant fish facilities is in operation and the second will be completed by March 1. Concrete placement for the Oregon side spillway is nearing completion. The embankment's impervious clay core and downstream rockfill section are under construction. Excavation of two power tunnels starts next month. Nearly 230,000-volt transmission lines to carry the development's electricity into the Northwest power pool are either completed or under construction.

Just as the crocodile tears of public power pressure groups trickled into the

waters of the Snake River and disappeared, so have the ill-conceived arguments for the Federal project been washed away by what has been achieved without astronomical Government spending in this instance.

Not only will the full capacity be made available several years sooner than if the Federal Government had done the job, but it will be completed at a cost far less than if Uncle Sam had taken on the responsibility. Public interests will be served better as the private operation flourishes. Instead of spending tax moneys it will bring in revenue. Yes, the high Hells Canyon story is a case in point.

And it brings to mind, too, the words of Abraham Lincoln, who 100 years ago said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that people can do for themselves, government ought not interfere.

There are many good citizens who apparently have yet to learn that Federal spending for projects that can be accomplished by free enterprise is basically wrong. From this lesson, we learn, too, that the Federal Government invariably spends far more to do the same job than it costs private industry or local government. Will we ever learn that we cannot continue merrily along the road to coddling by the Federal Government in so many areas of our national life? The folks who think that they are getting something for nothing because Uncle Sam takes over the responsibility are either misinformed, too frequently, or they simply will not face the facts of life. In the first place, dollars spent at a Federal level shrink from 25 to 35 percent through administrative costs. And an additional loss occurs through the tremendous interest payments on the national debt.

From all this, we will do well to learn and practice prudence. Perhaps we need some other yardstick by which to measure our spending activities in Washington than the superficial benefit of transferring responsibilities to the Federal Government which do not belong with it. Instead, perhaps we can develop a demand for fiscal responsibility on the part of elected representatives by the electorate in this way.

Yes, it will be a great day for this Nation when political popularity contests are not won by pork barrelling, especially when it involves deficit spending.

Private Versus Public Power: A Lesson in Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, by a slim margin of two votes, a public power at

The Story Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at a time when racial problems are in the forefront of public attention, it is a

real satisfaction for me to be able to call the attention of this House to the successful and unnoticed culmination of a struggle which began during the early years of World War II and has just now become a matter of historic rather than immediate interest. The treatment of the Japanese American residents on the west coast was a shameful episode in our Nation's history. It was especially so as far as the States bordering on the Pacific, including my own State of Oregon, were concerned, because we could not even plead long-lived historic social patterns as an excuse for our behavior.

To the credit of the United States, the mistakes of this program were eventually recognized and restitution made. To the credit of the people of the West, the atmosphere of hysteria was eventually replaced by an atmosphere of sorrow and regret. But to the Americans thus discriminated against belongs the greatest credit of all. They have never demonstrated the bitterness which should have been expected. Within the very concentration camps in which they were herded, their young men volunteered in unequal numbers for service in the Armed Forces, serving in, among other units, the famous 442d Infantry Central Postal Directory, the most decorated unit in the war. Their families and these returning heroes themselves came back to their homes after the war and have demonstrated by their lives in these postwar years a pattern of devoted citizenship, which has been unequalled by few and surpassed by no ethnic group in the Nation. It is with deep satisfaction that, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of November 19, 1958, from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, concerning the completion of restitution to America's proud Nisei citizens:

STORY ENDS

Too little noticed in the public prints was a quiet ceremony in Washington, D.C., last week. There in the Office of the Attorney General was completed restitution to the Nisei (Americans of Japanese origin) who were herded into concentration camps on our west coast a little less than 17 years ago. It cost the Government \$36.9 million to make amends for the indignities heaped upon loyal Americans by their jittery fellow citizens.

We're still waiting for the book, the book that will set out in shameful detail the injustices wrought here on the west coast. We picked on these people because of the color of their skins, the slant of their eyes, and the national origin of their parents. Before we here in the Northwest feel too superior about Little Rock, we should reflect upon our own cultural lapse.

The story ends more happily, to be sure. As Mike M. Masaoka, the Nisei representative at the ceremonies, observed, this restitution program demonstrates that "democracy can take care of its mistakes." And that's something. But it does not eliminate from the memory of the white westerner that when he needed to be calm and strong, he responded to fear—and sometimes avarice—with a base Ku Kluxism that was made worse because it had the approval of his free Government.

The Highway Trust Fund and Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise my colleagues that I am today introducing legislation providing for the dual purpose of first, strengthening the solvency of the highway trust fund; and, second, reducing to 5 percent the Federal excise taxes applicable to automotive vehicles and parts and accessories. In order that all of you will be familiar with the objectives of my bill I am including in my remarks the following news release I have made on this very important subject:

Congressman VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan, today announced introduction of legislation providing for the dual purpose of (1) strengthening the solvency of the highway trust fund; and (2) reducing to 5 percent the Federal excise taxes applicable to automotive vehicles and parts and accessories. In addition, Knox's bill would ultimately repeal these excises. The present rate of tax applicable to automotive vehicles is 10 percent and in the case of automotive parts and accessories it is 8 percent.

The bill would provide that the rate reduction to 5 percent would be retroactively effective to sales occurring on or after January 1, 1959. This retroactive date would assure that the benefits of the tax reduction would be available to consumers purchasing automotive vehicles or parts on or after the beginning of the year. Congressman Knox stated that in addition to immediate tax reduction his proposal would also provide (1) that the funds collected from these reduced tax rates would be entirely earmarked for the highway trust fund beginning with calendar year 1959; and (2) that the reduced rates would be repealed outright on July 1, 1972, at the conclusion of the present Federal-aid highway program.

In summary form the excise tax reductions that would be effective beginning January 1, 1959, and the revenue additions to the highway trust fund from earmarking for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 that would result from the bill are as follows:

1. The present 10 percent tax on passenger automobiles would be reduced to 5 percent. The additional revenue to the highway trust fund from earmarking would be \$265 million in fiscal year 1959 and \$625 million in fiscal year 1960.

2. The present 10 percent tax on automotive trucks, buses, and trailers would be reduced to 5 percent. This would have no effect on trust fund receipts because one-half of the present 10 percent tax is already earmarked for this purpose.

3. The present 8 percent tax on parts and accessories would be reduced to 5 percent. The increased highway trust fund revenues resulting from the earmarking of the parts and accessories tax would be \$50 million in fiscal year 1959 and \$100 million in fiscal year 1960.

Total additions to the highway trust fund would be \$315 million for fiscal year 1959 and \$725 million for fiscal year 1960. Under the KNOX proposal the revenues resulting from

the earmarking of these tax sources would continue to augment the trust fund receipts for the duration of the present highway program and the taxes would be repealed outright effective July 1, 1972.

Congressman Knox stated that one of his objectives in sponsoring this legislation was to achieve the meritorious result of immediate reduction in automotive costs imposed on the American people. At the same time he would bolster the economic strength of the automobile industry which is such an important factor in determining the level of overall national prosperity.

Another important objective in the sponsorship of this legislation, according to Congressman Knox, was his desire to provide a feasible alternative to the budget message proposal to increase highway trust fund revenues by imposing an additional 1½ cents per gallon tax on gasoline. Mr. Knox stated that by providing an alternative solution to the possible need for added revenues in the highway trust fund he was giving the Congress and the American people opportunity to express a preference for the possible solution desired—either higher motoring taxes; or lower highway taxes better used.

The Michigan legislator stated that while the automobile industry had sustained a promising start toward a more favorable year in 1959, he favored the immediate reduction and ultimate repeal of the automotive excises so as to remove the depressing long-run effect that the onerous Federal excise taxes have had on the industry. He called attention to the fact that nearly 1 million workers look for their employment in industrial plants producing automotive vehicles, parts and tires and that 9 million more individuals look for their employment to other phases of highway transportation. Added reason for a strong automotive industry is found in the fact that one of every seven persons works in the manufacture, distribution, service, or use of motor vehicles.

In demonstrating the benefits that would be realized by industries serving as material suppliers to the automobile industry Mr. Knox set forth the facts that the manufacturers of motor vehicles and parts buy 23 percent of all steel, 69 percent of all plate glass, 72 percent of all upholstery leather, 41 percent of all lead, 29 percent of all zinc, and 10 percent of all copper sold in the United States.

Congressman Knox called attention to the fact that another reason supporting his proposed excise tax reduction on automobiles and equipment can be found in other reductions of Korean war excise taxes that have occurred since the termination of that conflict. Mr. Knox stated that the excises applicable to automotive products are virtually the only rates on any major products that have not been substantially reduced in the intervening period.

Congressman Knox pointed out that while the enactment of his legislative proposal would tend to reduce highway user taxes presently going into the general funds of the Treasury, the American public is already overburdened with taxes, taxes of every variety. He stated the need for additional highway funds should be met by greater utilization of taxes presently collected from highway use sources and not in higher discriminatory taxes. He also stated that, consistent with his past position in advocating Government economy, he expected to continue his support of Government economy in more than sufficient measure to offset any general fund revenue reduction resulting from his bill.

Draft Law Issues: Waste, Unfairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the haste with which this administration has urged the extension of the draft is, I believe, not in keeping with the importance of this issue and with the tremendous impact of the peacetime draft upon America's domestic condition, our defense posture, and our foreign policy. It is my hope that sufficient time and attention be given to this legislation, both by the distinguished Armed Services Committee and by the entire House, to bring all the relevant facts into the clear light of day.

Opposition to draft extension, Mr. Speaker, is not limited to any one part of the spectrum of American thought. There are responsible business leaders, labor leaders, and men in religion and education, who have expressed doubts about extending the draft. Certainly, in view of these doubts, extended consideration is called for. As one example of the questions that have been raised, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, appearing in the November 1958 issue of the Nation's Business, published by the United States Chamber of Commerce, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DRAFT LAW ISSUES: WASTE, UNFAIRNESS

Rewriting the Nation's military manpower laws will be a priority task when the new Congress convenes in January.

Authority to draft men into the armed forces expires on July 1, 1959. A month later the basic reserve forces statute, enacted in 1955, expires.

Businessmen have a fourfold interest in what Congress does about these laws.

As citizens, they are concerned with providing armed forces that are adequate, both in quality and quantity, to the requirements of national security in an era of rapid advance in weapons technology.

As taxpayers, they are concerned with staffing the armed forces in an economical and efficient way.

As employers, they are concerned with minimizing the disruptive effects of military service on civilian careers, and with avoiding an excessive drain on manpower resources.

As parents, they want to be sure that the draft and reserve programs operate fairly, and that they do not exact unnecessary or unreasonable sacrifices from any young American.

Devising new legislation that meets all of these tests will be difficult. Congress may be tempted to take the easy way out by pushing through a simple extension of the present laws. This temptation must be resisted for two reasons:

1. Peacetime conscription is deeply repugnant to American traditions. It is tolerated by public opinion only when people are satisfied that the draft is necessary and that it is being carried out in a way that is scrupulously fair. Millions of Americans today are not satisfied on either of these points.

2. Radical changes in military strategy and manpower requirements have taken place since the present draft and reserve laws were enacted. In the words of Thomas R. Reid, Ford Motor Co. executive who heads

the manpower subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the assumptions on which the 1955 laws were based are now "obsolete."

The basic assumption of the 1955 laws is that the Nation's need for trained military manpower can be met only by compelling every qualified youth to serve. It is clearly reflected in the official title of the draft law which is not the "Selective Service Act" but the "Universal Military Training and Service Act."

It places on all physically and mentally qualified men between the ages of 18½ and 26 a legal obligation to perform at least 6 years of military service. This may be fulfilled by various combinations of active and reserve duty—the Armed Forces currently offer 34 alternative enlistment programs. Theoretically, any qualified youth who fails to sign up for one of these programs will be drafted for 2 years of active duty.

The flaw in this universal service plan is that it cannot be applied fairly without yielding far more manpower than the armed services need or want.

A little arithmetic will show why this is true.

In 1955, the number of youths flowing into the draft-age manpower pool was 1.1 million a year. About 300,000 of those were physically or mentally disqualified for military service. That left 800,000.

The Armed Forces at that time had an active-duty strength of 2.8 million. To maintain this strength, they were taking in from civilian life about 600,000 men a year—through the draft, through draft-stimulated enlistments, and through call-up of reservists.

Congress saw a prospective surplus of 200,000 men a year. So it wrote into the law a program which a House Program Committee report frankly labeled a control factor over the manpower pool. This is the now-famous 6-months-training plan, under which a youth can avoid being drafted by signing up directly in a National Guard or Reserve unit for 6 months' active-duty training followed by several years in drilling Reserve status.

Several factors have rendered the plan obsolete. New weapons, including missiles, have sharply altered military strategy and have reduced the need for massed manpower. The services this year are paring down to an active-duty strength of 2.5 million men. This strength can be maintained with a total intake of 450,000 civilians a year, or 150,000 less than were needed in 1955.

The postwar baby boom is beginning to be reflected in the late teen-age groups. The number of youths reaching the threshold age of 18½ rose this year to 1.2 million; by 1960, it will be 1.3 million; by 1965, nearly 2 million.

Finally, the Armed Forces have displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm for 6 months' trainees as a source of manpower for the Ready Reserve. Instead of the 250,000 a year authorized by Congress, the services this year took in only 55,000. The largest number they have accepted in any year since the law was passed was 95,000.

The net result of all this has been to confront Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and his 4,000 local draft boards with an embarrassment of riches. They are trying to enforce a law which envisions universal military service in a period when the Armed Forces are no longer interested in training every able-bodied youth, even for reserve duty. This dilemma has been solved—if such an expedient can be termed a solution—by rigging the manpower pool.

By Presidential order, all youths who become fathers before induction are automatically moved to the bottom of the call-up list. General Hershey can rightly say that they have not been exempted from the draft, because they are theoretically still classified 1-A. But with draft calls running

at a level of 10,000 a month, there is no conceivable likelihood of their actually being called. About one youth out of six is beating the draft via this escape hatch.

Two young men out of every six are avoiding service on grounds of physical or mental unfitness. General Hershey suspects that some of them are deliberately flunking the mental examinations which are formulated and administered by the Army at induction stations. The flunk rate will almost certainly show a substantial rise in coming months as a result of a law, passed at the last session of Congress, which authorizes the Army to raise the present passing grade on mental tests. With an abundance of 1-A's awaiting call, local draft boards have been liberal in granting deferments to students and to vital workers in agriculture and industry. Anyone who gets such a deferment theoretically remains liable for induction until he is 35 years old. But by Executive order, men with this extended liability go to the bottom of the call-up list, along with the fathers, as soon as they turn 26. So the actual prospect of being inducted is virtually nil.

Other relatively small groups of youths are draft proof because they are clergymen, divinity students, aliens, public officials, conscientious objectors, or sole surviving sons of families bereaved by war. This brings us to an eye-opening fact:

Less than half of the young men in the draft age group are actually seeing military service under the present universal service laws.

The public is increasingly aware of this fact. That's why Congressmen, stumping the hustings this fall, have heard so much grumbling about the unfair and discriminatory draft.

Meanwhile the draft is under heavy attack from another quarter. A growing body of Americans—including some business leaders—believe that the draft is an inefficient, and, in the long run, uneconomical way of filling military manpower needs.

These Americans have rallied around the professional forces concept outlined last year by a high-level Defense Department study committee. The committee was headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, then president and now chairman of General Electric Co., and included a number of other prominent business executives.

According to the committee, the real personnel problem in the Armed Forces today is quality rather than quantity.

"Strategy and tactics are undergoing radical change," the report said. "Yet strangely enough, the principles and practices which guide the recruitment, motivation, compensation and development of men have not changed substantially in the history of our country."

"It is foolish for the Armed Forces to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate, and to maintain such equipment."

"The solution is not to draft more men to stand back and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities."

Congress responded to the Cordiner report by enacting this year a military pay bill which granted raises of at least 6 percent to all men with more than 2 years' service, and which set up a brandnew proficiency pay system under which the services will henceforth offer incentive pay boosts, ranging up to \$150 a month, for specialists and technicians.

Although this pay bill is expected to cut losses of highly skilled servicemen who have been trained at great expense, Pentagon leaders say emphatically that it will not eliminate the need for draft authority.

"The draft is still absolutely essential if we are to maintain the military strength levels that are necessary for national security," says Charles C. Finucane, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Mr. Finucane says the Army has concluded, from extensive recent studies, that it could not maintain a strength of more than 535,000 men on the basis of voluntary enlistments alone. The Army's present authorized strength is 870,000 men.

While the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are now meeting all their requirements through voluntary enlistment, Mr. Finucane says these services admit that their success in recruiting has been at least partly due to the stimulus of the draft.

He adds that draft-inspired volunteers are also of crucial importance in keeping the National Guard and other Ready Reserve components up to strength.

Mr. Finucane agrees that professional armed forces, composed entirely of volunteers, would be vastly preferable to a partially conscripted military establishment.

Modern armed forces require increasingly larger proportions of technical and skilled manpower—jobs requiring extensive and expensive periods of training. We know that enlisting men voluntarily for 3, 4, or more years produces a more effective force at less cost than inducting them for 2 years. We have been trying for the past several years to make military service more attractive in order to increase our voluntary enlistment and reenlistment rates.

He ticked off some of the career incentive measures placed in effect during the past 4 years—improved survivor benefits, medical care for dependents, better housing, larger reenlistment bonuses, dislocation allowances on change of station, Government-guaranteed home loans, and better promotion opportunities.

As a result of these measures, Mr. Finucane says, reenlistment rates have improved appreciably. The average reenlistment rate for first-term regulars (the most critical retention group) rose from 15.7 percent in fiscal 1955 to 27 percent in fiscal 1958.

"We hope that all of these career incentive programs will eventually require less and less resort to compulsory military service," he says. "But it would be folly to abolish the draft next year in the mere hope that volunteer programs would do the job."

Outside the Pentagon, several proposals have been made for speeding the day when the services can rely entirely on professional volunteers.

One is to raise the starting pay of recruits, which the Cordier pay bill left untouched at \$78 a month.

Dr. J. K. Galbraith, Harvard economics professor, believes that the increases in basic pay required to attract much larger numbers of men to the Armed Forces would not be astronomical.

Another suggestion, from a study sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, is to make more widespread use of civilian personnel and civilian contractors in construction, procurement, warehousing, supply transportation, housekeeping and record-keeping operations, thereby reducing the need for men in uniform.

If one accepts the Pentagon position that some kind of draft law will continue to be necessary after mid-1959, the next question is what changes are needed to bring the law into reasonable conformity with actual military requirements and to make it more equitable in operation.

Here is where Defense Department manpower experts part company with General Hershey.

Defense officials are greatly concerned about the rising age level of inductees. In an effort to maintain the congressionally decreed concept of universality of service, draft boards are filling their quotas with the

oldest eligibles on their lists. But as the pool of surplus 1-A's grows, the average age of the men being called creeps steadily higher. It is now about 22 years and 9 months. This is at least 3 years and 9 months past what the military regard as the prime age for recruits.

There is growing sentiment in the Pentagon for two fundamental changes in the law. They call for:

1. Reducing draft age limits so that a youth is liable to call-up for only about 2 years after his 18th birthday instead of remaining eligible until he is 26 (or until he is 35 if he gets a deferment).

2. Recognizing that the Armed Forces need only a fraction of the youths in the draft-age group, and selecting by lot those to serve.

These changes would achieve several results. They would insure the Army's getting the younger men it wants. They would ease public criticism that the present draft throws a pall of uncertainty over a youth's life for an intolerably long period. Finally, they would end the hypocrisy of the universal service slogan, and would put the selection of draftees on a basis that Americans have traditionally regarded as the fairest possible.

There is, however, one flaw. It is spotlighted by General Hershey's question to an interviewer:

"Are you going to have a real lottery . . . or a phony one?"

To General Hershey, a real lottery means actually inducting the man whose number comes up—unless he is found to be grossly unfit for any kind of service. It means wiping out the special categories—students, essential workers, fathers, etc.—and throwing all able-bodied men into the pool from which the choice would be made by lot.

General Hershey well knows that the Pentagon is likely to balk at such a lottery. What the Army manpower planners really want is to continue the present system of screening out all of the less desirable draft candidates—the fathers who would rate dependents' allowances, the men who may need a lot of dental care or arch-supporting shoes, the slow-learners who create problems for training instructors (just as they create problems for high-school teachers and shop foremen). The lottery would then be applied to those who are left.

In General Hershey's view, this would be just as discriminatory as the present system.

General Hershey acknowledges that the present draft setup is not ideal but he believes that many complaints voiced against it would disappear if the Defense Department would operate the 6-month-trainee program at the 250,000-men-a-year level authorized by Congress. This would soak up a lot of the surplus in the 1-A pool and slow the risk in the average age of inductees.

It would also, General Hershey says, provide the Nation with something that it needed badly at the time of the Korean war and may need again—a large reservoir of ready reservists who are trained but have not served.

Defense officials would prefer to move in the opposite direction if they could.

The 1955 law authorized a Ready Reserve of 2.9 million men, and provided elaborate arrangements for channeling into it, not only 6-months trainees, but draftees and enlistees at the conclusion of their active duty service. Provision was made for enforcing the obligation of ready reservists to participate in regular drill sessions, under penalty of being called to active duty or even being court-martialed.

This much-publicized paraphernalia for compelling service in the drilling Reserve has come to a rather farcical end. The plain fact is that the Armed Forces are unwilling to invest their limited defense dollars in a

Ready Reserve force of the size Congress contemplated. Less than 1 million men are now on drill-pay status—which is the real criterion for determining who is in the quick call-up components of the Reserve. The Defense Department tried valiantly this year to reduce the total still further by making 10 percent cuts in National Guard and Army Reserve personnel drawing drill pay. But an uproar from State Governors and Congress blocked the move.

The situation at present is that the Ready Reserve components generally have more men who are eager to draw drill pay than they have vacancies. Once in a while they have to invoke the compulsory clause to avoid the ultimate scandal of a 6-month trainee abandoning the weekly drill periods which alone bring his service into rough balance with the draftee's 2 years of active duty. But there is little point in threatening to recall or court-martial a former draftee or enlistee who fails to keep up the 3 or 4 years of postgraduate drilling Reserve participation which ostensibly is required of him by the 1955 law.

Obviously, both the draft and Reserve laws have already been amended by history. The only question now is whether Congress will lend history a hand, and try to put our military manpower statutes on a fair and rational footing.

Merit and Public Service Long Unrecognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the specialist, the politician, the successful businessman, the stage or picture celebrity, and many others, receive public acclaim through the press, radio, and TV.

Unfortunately for the youth of the land, we get comparatively little information about the activities or character of many individuals who render long, valuable, distinguished public service in a quiet manner.

Many an individual, trained in law, ignores the opportunity to become wealthy, attain fame by selling his talents in the open market. Many such a man accepts a judicial position, retires to judicial chambers, and there spends his life in the effort to bring equal justice under law to those who present issues to the court which he serves.

The law is said to be a jealous mistress. She demands the full attention and loyalty of those who serve her.

Those who benefit, because of the ability, the courage, and the determination of a judge, seldom recognize the service rendered.

Nor does the public often consider the loyalty, the patriotism, and the sacrifice of the judge who protects our freedom, insures opportunity to the average citizen.

The occasion for this comment is an editorial printed in the Dowagiac Daily News, Dowagiac, Mich., of January 27, 1959, and which reads:

The man on the cover of the Michigan State Bar Journal magazine this month is Raymond W. Starr, chief judge of the U.S. district court, western district of Michigan.

While Judge Starr and many of his counterparts are recognized for their value to American justice by those closely associated with courts outside of their own profession, their sacrifices, compassion and tremendous responsibilities are little known to the layman.

Judge Starr is one of the several Federal judges whose courts fell in our journalistic jurisdictions during our hectic and turbulent 25-year career, and the impressions he left are indelible.

A Federal judge is like a physician who works 18 hours a day. The only difference is that the judge can pick out what 18 hours he wants to work.

Judge Starr's district embraces 31 counties in western Michigan, including Cass County.

Even prior to World War II, the duties of a Federal judge were cumbersome. After that Federal judges were swamped with the addition of various new duties involving numerous Government agencies that sprang into existence such as the OPA, WPB, and others such as farm control programs.

It amazed us when Judge Starr was appointed to the bench in 1946 after serving 5 years as a member of the supreme court of Michigan. He rejected several lavish offers to go into private practice.

A mercenary-minded reporter asked him "Why?" He replied that he thought he could best serve his country on the Federal bench.

Judge Starr served on the board of control of Ferris Institute; was chairman of the Michigan Crime Commission, the Michigan Public Debt Commission; president of the Blodgett Home for Children, Michigan's Children's Aid Society and was a member of the so-called Little Hoover Commission prior to going on the bench.

One of his most important achievements was in 1911 when he established a legal aid service in connection with social welfare work. It was one of the first of its type in the United States.

Just to give you an idea how tough a job like that can be, Judge Starr studied chemistry nights for 6 months before he felt that he was ready to rule on an involved case.

About the only time we can remember when the soft-spoken, gray-haired, and dignified judge looked out of character was one day he was caught playing a pinball game in his chambers—black robes and all.

The reason—he had to rule on a patent case involving a pinball machine and wanted to study its operation.

It never was my privilege to appear in the Michigan State Supreme Court when Judge Starr was on the bench, though I did have the opportunity of appearing prior to that time before many a distinguished Michigan justice of the State supreme court.

I have read many of the decisions rendered by Judge Starr while a justice of that court and have noted some of the decisions he has made while serving as a Federal judge in the western district of Michigan.

He was a worthy successor to Judge Knappen, Judge Sessions—whom I served as office boy while he was with the firm of Smith, Nims, Hoyt & Erwin of Muskegon, and of Judge Raymond.

Not only the citizens of western Michigan but of a large section of the Midwest are indebted to Judge Starr for the exceptionally able, unselfish service which he has so quietly, so unobtrusively, rendered to them and to our people as a whole.

Can the Republican Elephant Be Whitewashed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of the farm belt at Des Moines, Iowa, last week some very plain words were spoken by leading Republicans. The chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Meade Alcorn, and other high officials in the Republican Party called for more leadership from the White House and also a statement of principles to define what the Republican Party stands for.

The Republican leaders cheered loudly when these suggestions were made.

At the Des Moines meeting, it was reported that Claude Robinson of the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., stated that surveys showed that the Republican Party is suffering from political anemia and can only be cured by strong medicine, that the Republican Party has come to be regarded as the party of the rich and privileged—the upper crust—whereas the Democratic Party is regarded as the party of the common man, the masses.

It was further reported that Mr. Meade Alcorn agreed with Robinson's statements, and Mr. Alcorn added:

We must immediately undertake to change the false image of the Republican Party as the party of big business the party of the vested interest and so on. It's time we snatched off the big business false face that the Democrats placed on us years ago. It's time we erased the dollar signs painted on our vests.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party can try and try to put a coat of whitewash over its elephant, but the elephant will still look as though it were made of gold.

Many years ago P. T. Barnum advertised far and wide that he had imported a white elephant which he would present at the circus. Mr. Barnum got scores of newspapermen together and plied them with lots of liquor before he brought them out to view his white elephant. One of the journalists who never took a drink caught up with Mr. Barnum, however, and exposed the hoax when he scratched off some of the white paint with his fingernails. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the same thing will happen if the Republican Party tries to whitewash its elephant.

Mr. Speaker, it took great courage for Mr. Alcorn and the leaders of the Republican Party at Des Moines to speak out so forcefully, and to demand that the White House provide the country with some leadership. That is exactly what we Democrats have been saying for 6 years, but it takes courage for a Republican to speak up and confirm what we have been saying. Yesterday, one of our newspaper columnists wrote that there were rumors of a great revolutionary movement going on: now that Sherman Adams has left the White

House, it is even rumored that President Eisenhower will seize power.

On November 4, 1958, an election was held. The voice of the people spoke. And it spoke in favor of action rather than drift, leadership instead of the Alphonse-and-Gaston approach, and an end to the part-time attention to full-time problems.

We Democrats in the 86th Congress intend to provide the leadership which the people of our country demand to carry out a program in the interest of all the people. And then in 1960 we will restore to our great country and the free world the leadership on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue which we have not seen since Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

G. Robert Dodson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last December Brig. Gen. G. Robert Dodson, chief of staff of the Oregon Air National Guard, died, having been taken ill the previous summer while on field duty with the guard. This distinguished Oregonian and outstanding American has been memorialized by an article on his career which appeared in the magazine the National Guardsman for February 1959. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include this article in the Appendix of the Record.

IN MEMORIAM: G. ROBERT DODSON, BRIGADIER GENERAL, OREGON AIR NATIONAL GUARD, JULY 25, 1904-DECEMBER 18, 1958

Stricken while on duty at summer field training, the chief of staff of the Oregon Air National Guard, secretary of the National Guard Association of the United States, and chairman of the Air National Guard Section of the Air Staff Committee on Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Policy, died in Portland, Oreg.

Commissioned in the old Air Corps Reserve in 1938, General Dodson was appointed commander of the Oregon National Guard's 123d Observation Squadron in 1941. Entering active Federal service that same year, he commanded the 70th Observation Group and the 70th Tactical Reconnaissance Group, later commanding the 1st Liaison Group and the 3d Combat Cargo Group in the China-Burma-India Theater, and earning the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

As a colonel, he plunged into the postwar reorganization. His active participation in National Guard Association affairs stemmed from that time, also, with attendance at the first postwar general conference in 1946. He served on the Air Force's Air Section 5 Committee from 1951 until early 1954, and then again from 1956 until his death. Meantime, he also served on a number of National Guard Association committees—continuously on the former Air Advisory Committee and its successor, the Air Affairs Committee, from 1953 until late 1957, and on the executive council from 1955 until his election as the association's secretary in October 1957. Pilot of his private aircraft, General Dodson also held command pilot

rating, with nearly 4,000 hours of military flying time.

In civilian life, he was vice president of Jantzen Knitting Mills.

General Orders No. 111, December 19, 1953, issued by Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Rilea, The Adjutant General of Oregon, summed up General Dodson's life, and his death, in this manner:

"An officer and gentleman unexcelled, an irreplaceable leader, the loss of General Dodson in the prime of his life is a tragedy to the State and Nation. The standards he set and the course he followed will long serve as guideposts to the officers and men who have had the privilege of serving with him throughout his career."

Ike's Better Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is most heartening to note the favorable comment which has been expressed throughout the Nation in the form of editorials, articles, and general discussion concerning the President's labor reform bill. This is particularly impressive at this time because it points up the desire of the general public to obtain complete and effective labor-management legislation in the President's measure as compared with the noncontroversial and inadequate provisions of the Kennedy bill, which, as we all remember, failed to pass the House last session.

The two following editorials from today's Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune emphasize that it is imperative and mandatory for Congress to take the full step toward labor reform rather than half steps as proposed in the piecemeal Kennedy program.

The Sun-Times article, "Ike's Better Labor Bill," emphasizes the fact that responsible collective bargaining can be carried on with full protection to the rights and freedoms of workers and with adequate guarantees of the public interest, and can be secured by support of the administration's bill.

The Tribune story, "Diversionary Exercise," points up the attempt by the proponents of the Kennedy measure to divert the public spotlight from the shortcomings contained in that measure:

[From the Chicago-Sun-Times, Jan. 29, 1959]

IKE'S BETTER LABOR BILL

The big difference between President Eisenhower's antiracket labor bill, sent to Congress yesterday, and the bill of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, that was introduced last week is in their respective provisions concerning picketing.

Both bills contain provisions that would stop certain racket practices within some unions, especially the Teamsters Union. These provisions would undercut the power of James Hoffa and his hoodlum associates. They would, for example, make it illegal for such men to use union dues to build their own personal financial kingdoms. They

would restore to union members control over their own affairs.

The Eisenhower bill goes further than the Kennedy bill regarding picketing. The Kennedy bill would ban only shakedown or extortion picketing, set up in the hope of getting a personal payoff. The AFL-CIO agrees that such picketing is clearly a crime but says it is punishable under State statutes.

The Eisenhower bill is written to outlaw other union activities that have been uncovered by the McClellan rackets committee—activities that have put some companies out of business because they refused to cave in to union demands. The Eisenhower bill would strengthen secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and would prohibit picketing to force an employer to recognize a union against the will of his employees.

KENNEDY concedes that these provisions deserve consideration by Congress but that they are so controversial they would bog down his bill in acrimonious debate and delay swift action against organized labor's Hoffas.

The Eisenhower picket and boycott provisions are controversial only because labor leaders oppose them. They fear that they could be used to hamper reasonable union activity.

The truth is, however, that the provisions have become necessary because some unions have been unreasonable and unfair in their dealings with employers—and with employees, too. They have brought about a need for the kind of legislation proposed by the President. Even Senator KENNEDY recognizes that there may be a justification for such legislation but he wants to delay an all-out argument about it until after he puts through his agreed-on, noncontroversial measure.

Certainly the legislation needed to curb the Hoffas should not be delayed or imperiled by arguments over legislation not directly concerned with racketeering unions. But, as we said last week, any bill designed to strike at the excesses of the Teamsters Union must contain prohibition against racket picketing, not just shakedown picketing.

If there is to be a battle in Congress over picketing law changes, then let us get on with it, the sooner the better. While the public wants union members protected from their racket leaders, the public wants businesses protected from them too. And this calls for protection against the kind of coercion, threats, and picket activity the Teamsters Union has used to force employers to do business with them or drive them out of business.

As the President said, his proposals will not impose arbitrary restrictions or punitive measures on the legitimate activities of honest labor and management officials. The McClellan committee files are filled with cases that cry out for legislative relief—cases honest labor union officials should not condone. They should support, not oppose, the Eisenhower bill.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 29, 1959]

DIVERSIONARY EXERCISE

Robert F. Kennedy, counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, which has been digging into union abuses, announces that he has asked for a transcript of the Edward R. Murrow radio show, "The Business of Sex." This program, presenting testimony from disembodied voices, purported to show that prostitutes carried on company payrolls are used to influence clients to purchase goods from or sign contracts with the employing company.

The National Association of Manufacturers, anticipating a move of this sort, predicted that the principal beneficiary of the

Murrow stunt would be the labor unions. It said that they desperately need something to divert the public spotlight from their own wrongdoings to the sins of business, even if, as in this case, the sins turn out in the end to be mostly a hoax."

Young Mr. Kennedy is, as is well known, the brother of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who has been knocking himself out to get the Democratic nomination for President in 1960. He has been most scrupulous not to give offense to Walter Reuther and other union bosses and unquestionably would like to take the heat off this crowd, which wields great political clout. It certainly is handy to have brother Bob in a strategic spot, and, of course, sex is always good for attention.

Extension of Public Law 480

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President is recommending an extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly described as Public Law 480, an authority we have used during the past 4½ years to make effective use of our agricultural abundance at home and abroad. All of us can take pride in the results achieved under this authority.

The four programs operating under Public Law 480 have moved, or will move shortly, agricultural commodities valued at about \$7½ billion. Some of these programs supply commodities at the cost that the Commodity Credit Corporation has invested in them. Even so, the value of these commodities at world market prices exceeds \$5½ billion.

The largest and most important program under Public Law 480 is the title I authority to sell commodities to friendly countries for foreign currencies. These sales are opening up markets in many countries, particularly those that are less developed, where the demand for American farm products is high, but where the dollars to make such purchases are extremely scarce.

Two donation programs are authorized. One permits the President to send CCC surpluses abroad to meet the needs of countries suffering from natural disasters such as drought or flood or other emergencies; the other donation program provides for the distribution of commodities from CCC stocks to needy persons in many countries of the world through United States voluntary relief agencies. And, of course, Public Law 480 is the law under which food is furnished to needy persons in the United States.

The fourth authority is the barter program by which we exchange CCC surpluses for strategic and other materials which may be stockpiled or used by U.S. Government agencies.

TITLE I FOREIGN CURRENCY SALES

More than 60 percent of total programming under Public Law 480 has come under title I, a unique approach to the use of U.S. farm production. This device has proved useful far beyond our original expectations. It has been largely responsible for expanding U.S. agricultural exports in recent years, thereby keeping large quantities of commodities from going into Government warehouses. It has increased farm income. And through the use of the foreign currency sales proceeds, it is contributing to the economic development of our friends and allies abroad.

Title I agreements already concluded provide for the sale of 800 million bushels of wheat, of which 600 million bushels have already been exported; 200 million bushels of feed grains, of which about 180 million bushels have been shipped; 3 billion pounds of fats and oils, such as soybean oil, of which 2.5 billion pounds have been shipped; 3.5 million bales of cotton, of which 3 million bales have been shipped; 29 million bags of rice, virtually all already shipped; 225 million pounds of tobacco, of which 190 million pounds have already been exported; 235 million pounds of dairy products, of which 185 million pounds have been shipped; and other commodities.

Program operations under the current authorization are moving along very well with signed agreements having committed about \$800 million of the \$2½ billion authorization. These agreements were concluded since last September when the new authorization was made available to the Department of Agriculture. I understand from the Department that additional programs are being developed which will bring the total commitments to more than \$1 billion very shortly.

These new agreements, plus unshipped quantities from previous authorizations, have enabled the Department to increase exports under the program during the first 6 months of this fiscal year substantially as compared with the same period of fiscal year 1958. During the first 6 months of this year, for example, title I has resulted in the exportation of about 100 million bushels of wheat, 40 million bushels of feed grains, 365 million pounds of soybean oil, and 45 million pounds of dairy products.

OTHER BENEFITS OF TITLE I

The commodity importance of title I is obvious. There are other important collateral benefits of the program. A substantial portion of the sales proceeds is loaned back to participating countries for projects which will develop the economies of these countries: electric powerplants, roads, distribution facilities, railroads, and similar basic improvements which are being made to raise standards of living, increase jobs, and in general accelerate economic development plans already started by many of the less fortunate countries in the world.

Under agreements concluded during the past 18 months up to 25 percent of the sales proceeds are loaned to private

business firms, mostly U.S. firms, for business development or to establish facilities to increase the consumption of U.S. agricultural commodities. Loans to U.S. businessmen have been made, for example, in Mexico, Israel, and France and loan applications are now being reviewed for the use of currencies in many other countries.

The title I program also helps attain U.S. foreign policy and mutual security objectives. In certain countries currencies are made available for military assistance purposes and grants are being made to improve and expand health and education programs.

Not the least important is the use of currencies to develop markets for U.S. farm products. Millions of dollars in foreign currencies are being used in various ways to maintain and expand our markets throughout the world.

I know that the President can count on the support of the Congress for the extension and enlargement of Public Law 480.

The President's Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give the strongest possible endorsement to the recommendations in this special message on agriculture. This is the fourth special message which the President has sent to the Congress during his tenure in office. It is a sound message. It is a constructive message.

These are critical times. The men in the Kremlin talk about their desire for a thaw in the cold war. But there is no evidence that the temperature of that conflict is rising by so much as one single degree.

We must keep our economy sound, strong, and vigorous. We must live within our income as a Nation. The recommendations of the President's farm message are a long step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the high cost of our farm programs. When the President tells us that the outlay for these stabilization programs this current fiscal year will be \$5.4 billion, I am deeply concerned. And I think the American people should be, and are, also deeply concerned.

The net income of our farm operators last year was about \$13 billion. In other words, these prices and income stabilization programs are currently equal to more than 40 percent of the net income earned by our farm operators. This is an alarming situation—a dangerous situation. It is a situation that the American people will find hard to understand.

If these costs were only temporary—if they were solving the problem—if they were leading to a better balance between

supplies and markets—taxpayers would feel that such heavy costs were justified.

But we all know this is not the case. Under the old farm programs these costs are not only continuing year after year; they are continually rising.

Instead of solving the problem the programs under which these vast sums are being spent are creating additional problems. They are causing distortions throughout the agricultural economy. They are making agriculture more and more dependent on Government. More and more of our farm products are finding their way into Government warehouses—and a Government warehouse is not a market.

Instead of cutting down the surplus, the programs responsible for these heavy costs are leading to increased accumulations. The wheat surplus is now far larger than ever before and it is expected to go on increasing at least until the end of the 1960 fiscal year. The feed grain surplus is also at an all-time high.

By next July the Government will have an investment of over \$9 billion in price supported farm commodities.

By the time the Government completes its takeover from last year's crops, it will have acquired—since January 1953—25 million bales of cotton and 2½ billion bushels of wheat.

This is a fantastic situation. Do the Members realize that 25 million bales of cotton is more than twice as much as our whole cotton crop last year? Do the Members realize that 2½ billion bushels of wheat is more than our 1957 and 1958 crops combined?

But even these figures do not tell the whole story.

Mr. Speaker, when the 1958 crops have come into Government ownership the cost for storage, interest, and other charges of managing the inventory of supported crops will exceed a billion dollars a year. Think of it. More than a billion dollars a year, not for price support loans to farmers, but simply for keeping these inventories. And we are told that unless fundamental changes are made, this annual cost of over a billion a year will rise.

We must move promptly toward sounder, more realistic, farm programs—toward farm programs that make sense. The President has wisely warned us against jumping from the frying pan into the fire by attempting programs that would be even more costly and dangerous.

We must not fall into the trap of direct payments. These would make our farm people dependent for much of their income on the Federal Treasury. Direct payments could cost from \$7 billion to \$10 billion a year.

Multiple price programs are also unsound. They would tax American consumers to permit the sale of farm commodities for feed and export at lower prices.

Let us be sound. Let us be realistic. We owe it to farmers and consumers alike. Let us adopt the President's recommendations.

Let's Save Our Historic Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have this week introduced in the House a bill designed to save from destruction many historic buildings, landmarks, and works of art owned by the Government throughout the country. Such treasures continue to be threatened intermittently with demolition.

It is my privilege to sponsor this legislation jointly with my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. The bipartisan nature of this endeavor is particularly gratifying to me.

The bill has been referred for action to the House Committee on Public Works, on which I am privileged to serve, and I am confident of a sympathetic hearing in that committee. Similar legislation is being introduced in the other body by Senator CLARK.

The need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker, was first made evident by the protests of the Federal Commission on Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Studies by these groups and by others have made it obvious that literally thousands of the most priceless treasures of our national heritage have been plowed under and utterly destroyed by the bulldozers of a ruthless progress during the past few years. The tragedy is that in most such instances, the destruction was wholly unnecessary. The valuable historic objects could have been preserved without retarding progress.

We obviously should not permit this thoughtless and wanton destruction of these last relics of our past, because they provide, in many cases, the only visible links to connect us with periods of our own national history. They remind us of the greatness of our past, of the hardships endured by those who with such painstaking care laid the foundations of our history.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to cite just a few illustrations as examples of the thoughtless destruction of priceless edifices by various governmental agencies.

A number of historic buildings dating back to the Revolutionary period, including the ancestral homes of the Lee family of Virginia, are right now in danger of being obliterated to make way for the new Chantilly Airport. These homes should be preserved and if necessary relocated.

The old San Francisco Mint, one of the few buildings to survive the famous earthquake and fire of 1906, a classic building of great historic and architec-

tural value, has been declared surplus by the General Services Administration. The site is wanted for a parking lot.

A historic Dutch mansion, built around 1790, was acquired by the Government along with the surrounding land on the Hudson River for a Veterans' Administration hospital. This building certainly could have been preserved on the site as a museum and used as a waiting cottage for visitors. Instead, it was sold to a wrecker for \$32. The wrecker dismantled it, sold the facade for \$3,200 and disposed of the remainder in piecemeal sales.

A number of extremely ancient Indian pueblos, probably dating to a prehistoric period, have been destroyed in the path of bulldozers on highway work throughout the Southwest, notably in New Mexico. One is reminded of the supposed American visitor to Pompeii. The dynamic fellow's only remark, upon viewing the ruins, was "just think how fast a few bulldozers and razing cranes could level this outfit and let them start all over."

Only a very few of the remaining log cabins in Texas have been preserved, and the rate at which they are going out of the picture may leave us without adequate links to our western frontier.

I certainly do not want to stay the hand of progress, Mr. Speaker, nor retard the necessary developments of our advancing civilization, but I do feel that progress can and should move forward with an eye to saving the truly valuable and inspirational remains of our proud past.

This bill would direct the Administrator of the GSA, the real estate arm of the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior to preserve such objects when they come into the Government's possession. I respectfully petition the support of my House colleagues in this worthy effort.

Federal-City Relations Vital to Whole National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, not long ago the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made a most interesting and provocative speech at the Boston convention of the American Municipal Association. The story was carried as the opening article in the January issue of the Alabama Municipal Journal, one of the very best publications of its kind in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERAL-CITY RELATIONS VITAL TO WHOLE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK)

I propose to speak today about some aspects of what seems to be emerging more and more clearly as the central issue of our public life. That central issue is whether the United States is going to come to grips with the great problems of the nation and the world, and master them—or whether we are going to fumble the ball.

Every city official in this room knows what our problems are. They are recognized, identified, admitted. They are just not being mastered.

PROBLEMS ARE NOT MASTERED

What are some of them?

National security is the most important.

The Soviet Union has attained a faster momentum than we in the race for modern weapons. That fact is recognized, identified, admitted—but not dealt with.

The Communists are making tremendous gains in their campaign to drive Western influence out of Africa and Asia. That problem is recognized, identified, admitted—but not dealt with.

Education is the next critical problem. The deterioration of our public schools, the inadequacy of our higher educational facilities, the decline of the teaching profession, our primitive failure even to build enough classrooms, the fact that hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of boys and girls who would profit from a college education won't get it, all this is recognized, identified, admitted—but it is not being mastered.

ECONOMIC SECURITY A PROBLEM

Personal economic security is a pervasive problem. The poverty of our retired citizens; their total inability, for example, to pay for medical care; the collapse last year of our unemployment compensation system—these problems are known, recognized, and admitted—yet not dealt with.

City slums are a problem every mayor knows, one that is visible, tangible, measurable, yet they are getting worse, not better, every year.

The crisis in school desegregation, the twin problems of recession and inflation, the great problems arising from metropolitan growth, of declining central cities and suburbs without adequate public services, of water resources inadequately conserved, of traffic and transportation strangulation, all these are known, recognized, admitted, but not grappled with and mastered.

LOCKED IN A COMPETITION

And so it goes. We suffer from a paralysis in our public life. The scope of our action is determined not from a forthright analysis of the facts which all admit, but by preconceived limitations growing out of inertia, timidity, and outmoded thinking.

Perhaps time was when we could sit like Ferdinand the bull smelling flowers under a tree and still survive. But that time has gone forever. We are locked in a competition with the Soviet Union and Red China in which our very existence as well as the survival of the good society is at stake. Our adversaries can mobilize their resources in ways we can't and wouldn't if we could. We must find alternative ways of mobilizing our own resources, or the ways of freedom will be lost in a universal state ruled by international gangsters.

ALARMING SIGNS OF SOFTNESS

Let us start from the frank assumption that we may not win this fight. Twenty earlier civilizations have risen, flourished, grown soft, and been overrun by brutality and tyranny. Nor need we look far to see

alarming signs of softness in America. The self-indulgence, the emphasis on luxuries, the juvenile—and adult—delinquency, the lack of self-discipline, the tendency to sweep hard facts under the rug, the unwillingness to ask the people for any sort of sacrifice—all these are danger signs.

But against these danger signs there are indications of some hope. Please believe that I do not speak as a partisan politician when I say that one such sign was the result of the last election.

A PROFOUND PUBLIC DISCONTENT

That the election returns indicate a profound public discontent with the way things are going seems clear beyond doubt. The people voted for candidates of both parties who look to the future and not the past, who represent and promise action rather than more complacency and inertia. The men who won are not happy about present day America.

The election was not a mandate to stand still. It was a mandate to move forward. It was a mandate to political leaders to get on top of our problems, to master them, to take control of our destiny.

Now, what stands in the way?

The answer we always get—whether the issue is national defense, or mutual security, or education, or housing, or urban renewal, or social security, or the development of Asia and Africa is, "We can't afford it," or "We must cut costs and balance the budget."

OUR PROBLEMS COST MONEY

Now let me admit that most, although not all, of the problems that confront us do cost money. And let me also state my own strong belief that governmental budgets at all levels, local, State, and national, should be brought into balance.

So the issue of whether we master our problems becomes, in concrete form, the issue of taxation and public spending. And that, as Walter Lippmann has said, will be the great debate of 1959.

I want to enter that debate by chopping away some of the folklore that surrounds the subject of public spending. Perhaps no topic in our time, has been the victim of so much nonsense. If we can dispel the nonsense and the fallacies, then we can put the Federal budget, as well as your city budgets, not only in perspective, but in balance and we can get ahead with the job that needs to be done.

FIVE MAIN FALLACIES

There are five main fallacies.

Fallacy No. 1 is that private spending is inherently good and public spending inherently bad—and therefore public spending should always be minimized and private spending increased to the maximum the gross national product will permit.

This fallacy is assiduously cultivated by conservative molders of opinion. The word "government" is equated with other nouns having an evil connotation—such as "waste," "extravagance," "socialism," "bureaucracy." Taxes are never referred to except as a burden. Private spending is described with fair-sounding words, such as "enterprise," "free," "competitive." The semantics are all wrong.

This is a pernicious tendency. Taxation and public spending are the means by which we divide resources between the public and private sectors of the economy. Those activities which are in the public sector are there not because they are naughty and ought to be destroyed, but because they are essential and cannot be adequately performed by private enterprise.

EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT

Activities in the private sector are there not because they are necessarily good and useful, but merely because they are not illegal and can be conducted at a profit.

There is, unfortunately, often extravagance in Government services, but I suspect that

objective appraisal would show more in private business. Just compare, for example, the luxurious motor cars of today with the inadequate highways on which they must move; compare the extravagance of our country clubs with the spartan character of State and national parks; compare the lavishly appointed corporation and national labor union headquarters with our disgracefully rundown public buildings; compare the compensation of TV entertainers with that of great schoolteachers. We can only conclude that the private sector is comparatively plush and the public sector relatively starved. Indeed, as Prof. J. K. Galbraith has recently pointed out, the private sector of our economy is so plush that to get the private product purchased requires the strenuous efforts of huge advertising firms to create synthetic wants and needs that people do not even know they have. There is no problem at all, on the other hand, in identifying huge backlogs of essential public services for which we appear unwilling to pay the price.

WE MUST DIVERT RESOURCES

If the distribution of our national resources is to reflect the true value judgment of the American people, we must divert resources not from Government to private spending but in exactly the opposite direction.

Fallacy No. 2 is that the Federal Government is crushing the people and endangering the economy with a growing burden of taxes, expenditures, and debt, and that this threatens the health of our free enterprise system.

What is overlooked, of course, is that the ability to carry taxes and debt is related to income. Other things being equal, a man making \$10,000 can pay at least twice as high taxes and carry without hardship twice as large a debt as a man making \$5,000. And the same is true of the country as a whole. And taxes, expenditures, and debt are actually less today—as a proportion of gross national product—than at the end of World War II.

RATIO OF DEBT TO PRODUCT

In 1945, our gross national product was \$213.6 billion, while the public debt was \$278.7 billion. The ratio of the debt to the gross national product was 130 percent. In 1957, gross national product had risen to \$440.3 billion, and the national debt had declined to \$275 billion. The ratio of the debt to the gross national product was 63 percent.

Our debt is accordingly less than half as burdensome to the country as it was 12 years ago. Total debt has been almost stable, since the war, while the gross national product has more than doubled. The fact is that we could, if necessary, more than double our national debt and not be in any more peril of national bankruptcy than we were with the debt we carried without alarm or danger in 1945. Fortunately it isn't necessary.

TAXES PROPORTIONATELY LOWER

Similarly, Federal taxes, as a proportion of national product, are less now than they were 10 years ago, or 5 years ago, or 3 years ago. If people were going to be crushed by our present tax load, they would have been crushed long since. Lower taxes are always desirable, of course, when national needs are being met, but let us not say that there is a compelling economic necessity for reducing them. There just isn't.

This is a growing country. Our population is rising. The public services required by urbanization and national security are growing. Our civilization is becoming constantly more complex. States and localities are increasingly incapable of meeting new and growing needs. Naturally, the Federal Government should grow too. The Federal budget should rise. Given normal growth in our economy, it can increase by \$3 to \$4 billion annually with no change in the tax rates and no increase in the real burden—

which gives us considerable room for expanding public services. And, if our public services need more than that—which I suspect they do—we can get most of it without raising tax rates by closing the outrageous tax loopholes which have made our Federal Internal Revenue Code a veritable sieve.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING NOT INFLATIONARY

Fallacy No. 3 is the notion that Federal spending is inflationary. Government spending is no more inflationary than private spending—provided the Government balances its budget. Deficit spending can be inflationary, of course, but even this is the case only when demand for goods and services exceeds supply, a condition which does not exist today.

Industry is far below capacity and unemployment is far above what it should be.

Our recent inflation arose from causes other than Federal spending. The Federal budget is being made the scapegoat by those who seize on any argument to stop Government programs which they have always opposed.

WHOSE FOOT SHOE IS ON

Fallacy No. 4 is that all Federal expenditures are alike. If a private bank makes a loan that is called an investment; if the Small Business Administration makes a loan, that is called spending. If a private power company builds a dam that is called investment; if TVA builds a dam that is called spending. One would have thought that this businessman's administration might have introduced business concepts into Government bookkeeping, but they have not done so. It may be that for bookkeeping purposes, we must continue to lump all accounts of Government disbursements together. But there is no reason why intelligent people, for purposes of public discussion, should not distinguish between operating expenses, loans which create accounts receivable, and investments which are offset by created assets, just as corporations make this distinction and just as municipalities distinguish between current and capital budgets.

SHOVING FUNCTIONS BACK TO STATE

Fallacy No. 5 is the notion that if the Federal Government shoves its functions back to the States and cities this constitutes economy. It is not economy at all if the functions are performed. The question then becomes simply which taxing system is used, and which administrative structure is employed.

There are good reasons for decentralizing administration. But that does not mean the financial burden should be thrown back on the States and cities too. The Federal tax system is far superior in justice and efficiency to those of State and local governments, and there is great merit in using it for urban functions. Taxpayers cannot threaten to flee the Nation, as they can and do the city and State. The Federal tax burden falls evenly across the land, based in large part on ability to pay. There is every reason to use it in preference to State and local systems where the choice exists.

I shall oppose proposals to turn Federal functions back to the States and cities. This would result in crippling essential functions. Important services now being rendered would be abandoned. An unjust tax system would be substituted for a better one.

I will press for Federal help in new fields, especially education. I hope the mayors of America will join me in these stands as they have done so effectively in the past.

The Federal Government must give greater, not less, support to the urban areas of America, because the great domestic problems of the second half of the 20th century are urban problems. We are no longer an agricultural society.

NO DEPARTMENT FOR CITIES

This brings me to my final point. A visitor from outer space, looking at the structure of our Federal Government, would conclude that America is still a rural nation. We have a Department of Agriculture, which devotes itself to the problems of the farm. We have a Department of Interior which reflects the interests and needs of the more sparsely settled States. But there is no department with responsibility for the problems of the tens of millions of people living in forced congestion in sprawling metropolitan areas—one of which stretches unbroken all the way from Portland, Maine to Alexandria, Va. City people, too, need an advocate in Washington.

To illustrate: The Senate became disturbed last year about the plight of the Nation's railroads. The Department of Commerce was concerned; so was the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commerce Committee of the Senate has a standing subcommittee with jurisdiction over railroads. So it organized a study.

Those of us who have been worried about a related problem—namely, the plight of the commuter and the deterioration of mass transit in the cities—tried to make sure that urban mass transit problems would be covered in the general study that was organized. The answer was "No." States rights intervened.

MASS TRANSIT A REAL PROBLEM

No department of the Government has any interest in what should be done about commuter transportation services. No committee or subcommittee of the Congress has any jurisdiction.

Yet you know that mass transit is not merely a State and local problem. Much of the traffic crosses State lines. Some of the railroads involved serve many States. Let's face it, State and local governments are incapable of dealing successfully with this problem in most localities—just as urban renewal was generally beyond their competence until the Federal Government stepped in to help.

Maybe the ultimate answer is that mass transit should not be a Federal problem, even in part. Maybe the same applies to air and stream pollution, and water supply. But what concerns me most is that, at the present time, we have no mechanism even for examining such problems comprehensively and making intelligent national decisions.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

I believe the first step should be the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level with the responsibility of keeping abreast of urban and metropolitan problems and developing recommendations for Federal, State, and local action. The Department would represent the urban viewpoint in the administration of nationwide programs which particularly affect cities and their suburbs, notably, highways and water conservation. It would be assigned initially, at least, only those operating programs which are peculiarly urban, and these are clustered already in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the Department, to my mind, would be something far beyond the present HHFA. The additional element would be a hunting license to study, research, and recommend, and a responsibility to listen to representatives of groups like this one, understand their problems, and reflect that understanding in the policy forming processes within the executive branch. Urban extension is a procedure and a program we could well adopt from our agricultural friends.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS EVOLVE

I have seen the criticism that a new department should not be formed until a philosophy of Federal-State-local relations is developed and agreed upon as the new department's basis. Personally, I think the

logic points in just the opposite direction. Governmental philosophies do not spring full blown into being; they evolve. But they cannot evolve unless someone in government has responsibility for thinking creatively about them. We will get the philosophy far quicker if we establish the mechanism first.

Some of us in the Senate who are former mayors put in a bill 2 years ago to create a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. We will do so again in January, and I hope the mayors of America will make the enactment of this bill an important policy objective and give us their full support as we attempt to push this bill through the various stages on the long road toward enactment.

German Cartels Rebuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on January 7 I introduced H.R. 1345 which would permit the sale of vested enemy assets by the Attorney General with the proceeds to be held pending final outcome of litigation as to ownership.

The largest single property in the alien property problem is the General Aniline & Film Corp. There are many strong arguments against the return of GAF to its onetime German ownership. One of these is mentioned in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times by Mr. Arthur W. Rhodes of Darien, Conn. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this letter pointing out that there is ample evidence of a rebirth of industrial cartels centered in Germany. My bill would insure that GAF does not return to become a component of a German cartel, but it offers assurance that the claimants eventually determined as owners by the courts would receive adequate compensation.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1959]
CARTEL REBIRTH FEARED—RECENT STEEL MERGER VIEWED AS SIGN OF RELAXING CURBS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Approval of the merger of two large steel companies in Germany by the high authority of the European Coal and Steel Community is cause for alarm.

According to the account of Sydney Gruen in the New York Times of January 7, "One of the allies' painfully achieved deconcentration orders against big German industry . . . has apparently been jettisoned."

These orders were issued in 1946, when memories of the disastrous effects of the international cartels were still vivid. The deadline for Herr Krupp, head of the industrial family, to dispose of large sections of his holdings was March 1959. To permit the purchase of additional industry is a complete reversal of the original order. Why scrap these painfully achieved curbs now?

Certainly we welcome a strong and free Germany as a NATO ally. But we do not welcome the rebirth of international cartels. The files of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice contain ample evidence of the dangers of permitting industrialists of any country to gain too great a

control of the world economy. International cartels can control prices, production, and distribution of vital goods. The cartels can then manipulate the economy according to their own desires.

GERMAN OBJECTIVES

There are evidences that the German industrial empire is rebuilding. In November 1958, the 10-year-old case to sell General Aniline & Film Corp. was given a new legal complication. As an out-of-court settlement appeared likely, the German I. G. Farben interests came out in the open to claim that Interhandel, the former owner, was an instrumentality of Farben. This maneuver has striking similarities to the incidents reported by Joseph Borkin in the book, "Germany's Master Plan," by Joseph Borkin and Charles A. Welsh (1943). American business ethics, our democratic procedures, and the justice of our courts have been used whenever it is convenient to foster the primary objective—German control of the world economy.

There appears to be no lack of concern and effort on the part of our Government to restrict monopoly powers and mergers of U.S. companies. The many companies that have pending antimerger cases against them portend no letup in the trust-busting activity in this country. Cannot this same type of vigilance be applied by the allied control council to West German business?

We should have learned that German cartels are of vital concern to our national security and world security. Surely those people who formulate the policy and enforce the orders of the allied control council are aware of the facts of economic history. Can there be a reasonable explanation for this reversal of policy?

ARTHUR W. RHODES.

DARIEN, CONN., January 17, 1959.

Code of Ethics of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, according to reports of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the Federal Government allocated to the States for schools, hospitals and civil defense last calendar year property which originally cost \$334,109,167. This was made possible pursuant to Public Law 61 which I introduced in the 84th Congress. Under this law the various States are required to designate a responsible State agency to operate the program in the State to insure fair allocation to many institutions, etc. The State agency representatives have organized themselves into a national association known as the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property—NASASP. This organization has been most helpful to the Congress in presenting the problems and the needs of the States with respect to the donable program.

At the national meeting of the association in San Francisco in July, 1957 I suggested to the association that since

the donable program had now reached such large proportions that the group might consider the adoption of a code of ethics under which it would voluntarily operate. Since that time the group has given much thought to this matter and I am in receipt of an excellent code which they have recently adopted. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, place the wording of the code in the Record at this point:

CODE OF ETHICS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGENCIES FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

We, the members of this National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, do ordain and declare that this code of ethics is a true expression of the desires, attitudes, and objectives which govern the activities of all representatives of State agencies for surplus property. We, the members of this association, further proclaim that we will give first consideration to the expressed purposes of this association's constitution and the beliefs, purposes, and principles of this code of ethics.

BELIEFS

Excess Federal property, before being declared surplus, should be utilized to the fullest extent practicable in these United States of America by the Federal Government.

Once property has been declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, the highest and best secondary utilization is by public and private organizations of this Nation that are dedicated to the education, training, health, civil protection, and safety of our people.

Only after these requirements have been satisfied should surplus property be disposed of by other means.

PURPOSES

We dedicate ourselves to the purpose of accomplishing the will of Congress through fair, honest, and unbiased execution of the duties and responsibilities entrusted to us. Fully recognizing the responsibility that is ours, we accept the call of duty with a sense of humility, and with the firm resolve to give our best efforts at all times to those tasks that are inherent in the surplus property utilization program.

PRINCIPLES

Individually as members and collectively as an association, we subscribe unreservedly to the following principles to motivate and guide us in the proper conduct of the affairs of the surplus property utilization program:

To be guided by honor, honesty, and integrity in order that we may merit the respect and confidence of our associates and the public whom we serve.

To hold as dishonest any personal gain or profit obtained through abuse of our public trust.

To decline personal gifts or gratuities which might influence strict impartiality that must prevail in all business relations.

To foster and promote fair, ethical, and legal business practices; to measure each transaction on its own merit; and to grant all eligible organizations equal consideration.

To conduct all public relations and business affairs without prejudice; and to disavow all political, religious, or racial bigotry, or bias.

To be willing to submit any major controversies to arbitration.

To respect the policies of our immediate superiors, and to advise them on problems and progress of the program.

To counsel and cooperate with our membership; to subscribe to the association's objectives; to respect State boundaries in the screening of property; and to promote a spirit of unity among member States.

To promote the maximum utilization of surplus property through an educational program for all eligible organizations.

To maintain minimum service charges by the elimination of all unnecessary practices and procedures that do not directly benefit those we serve.

To accord prompt and courteous treatment to those transacting legitimate business missions.

To recognize and appreciate the total problem of surplus property disposal; and for this purpose to cooperate with Federal holding, custodial and disposal agencies.

To maintain professional attitudes at all levels of State agency service.

Tour of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is a historic city, with many interesting places and monuments. So often, however, visitors to our city have only a limited time to sightsee and can cover only some of the highlights.

To them particularly I commend the tour recommended by the distinguished political columnist, John C. Calpin. His recent article appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. He recommends a 2-hour tour by car of about 25 miles whereby one will see some of old and new Philadelphia.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jan. 4, 1959]

SIGHTS OF OUR CITY—TWENTY-FIVE-MILE TOUR TAKES 2 HOURS AND IS WORTH EVERY MINUTE OF IT

(By John C. Calpin)

Many Philadelphians, it is said, have never seen Independence Hall. Also, many people do not know city hall, except as that tall building in the wide space where Broad and Market Streets meet.

Others, secure in their own neighborhoods, have not seen many other points of interest. There have been so many changes in recent years that most anyone who is interested could see things to their advantage—even those who come into town every day to work.

To someone with 2 hours to spare and an automobile to drive or to be driven, a tour of old and new Philadelphia could be covered by traveling only about 25 miles.

Start at city hall, where the tower is open the 5 week days during the winter. There is no other view like it in Philadelphia. Even a tour of the city hall offices would be worthwhile.

SKATING RINK, TOO

Across the street is Penn Center, stretching from 15th Street to 18th Street and containing new, modern office buildings, a transportation center, a hotel, a concourse shopping center, landscaped courts and a skating rink.

Going north on 20th Street to the parkway, one finds the north triangle area, which was cleared by the Redevelopment Authority, and on which 4 buildings with 971 apartments are just about completed. The cost is over \$16 million. This adds further majesty to the view out the Benjamin Franklin Parkway and also from the west.

Cross over the Spring Garden Street

Bridge and the next stop could be the Powelton area, which once contained many of the best homes in the city, but which now is seedy and rundown. The feature here is the effort to restore the homes rather than raze them and start all over again.

Site clearance is only one way to fight blight, and there will be more effort to save what is salvageable. The Powelton area will be one of the tests.

EDUCATIONAL CENTER

Next, turn down 34th Street to our educational center south of Chestnut Street. It combines the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel Institute of Technology. Part of it, for the time being, is a rubble heap, where hundreds of houses and buildings have been torn down to make way for more college buildings.

Football fans for generations have been going to Franklin Field, and in recent years the Palestra has been one of the Nation's basketball centers.

Hundreds of thousands of people have been in the Convention Hall, but not one-tenth of them took the time to go to Commercial Museum, next door, where the amazing Philadelphia panorama is on view. This display of city planning could well be the finest in the world. The University of Pennsylvania Museum also is worth anyone's visit. As a view of one of the greatest hospitals in the world, there is Philadelphia General.

From here go south on Vane Avenue to Passyunk Avenue, seeing along the way, some of the city's big industrial plants. Go out Passyunk Avenue to Essington Avenue and then south on Island Road.

EASTWICK PROJECT

This brings you to the Eastwick section, where one of the biggest efforts in the world will be made to reclaim an area for both residential and industrial use. On 2,500 acres there are 1,600 substandard homes. Private groups will develop it. The work is underway and the city has just let a contract for the pumping of 9 million cubic yards of fill for the lowlands.

At the southwestern tip of the city lies the new Tinicum Wildlife Preserve of 140 acres. So far, 230 species of birds have been sighted at the preserve. During the spring and fall migrations, it is an important feeding place for waterfowl who use the Atlantic flyway.

Coming back to the east, there is the International Airport, one of the busiest and best equipped along the Atlantic coast. The visitors gallery is always open.

OUR FOOD CENTER

Returning along Penrose Avenue through the area of the oil tank farms the trip switches to Pattison Avenue to the Food Center, which is being built to replace antiquated Dock Street and the produce market. It will bring better, cheaper, and more sanitary food to the people of the entire region.

To the south is League Island Navy Yard, and to the north, the \$85 million Walt Whitman Bridge, which was called, when opened, the most beautiful bridge in the world. About 17,500,000 vehicles already have crossed it.

Heading north along Delaware Avenue one sees a small part of the city's waterfront, including piers 38 and 40, which have been rebuilt into a general cargo pier. Three ocean-going ships can be accommodated at one time.

Between Lombard Street and Market, and from the river to about Eighth Street, plans are underway for restoration of the "Old City"—nearly 300 years old. The restoration, by private individuals, was triggered by the work on Independence Mall.

Entire blocks of the Society Hill-Washington Square section will be restored to their historical character. The area could become one of the most desirable in the city.

The section around Independence Hall, Independence Square, and 18 additional acres has become the Independence National Historical Park. The State has improved the section as a mall, north to the Benjamin Franklin bridge plaza. The Federal Government has appropriated millions for the work, under the urging of a committee headed by former Judge Edwin O. Lewis.

By 1963, about \$17 million will have been expended.

These are only a few of the things worthy of seeing and cover only the southern section.

On This Thy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Frederick J. Forell, D.D., executive secretary of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism has called to my attention a solemn and moving appeal by the Right Reverend Bishop D. Otto Dibelius, Lutheran Bishop of Berlin, in which the bishop called for the daily prayers of the people of Berlin to save the city from the catastrophe of Communist control and for freedom for all the people of Germany.

Bishop Dibelius' sermon was delivered in his cathedral, the Marien-Kirche, in East Berlin under the very noses of the Communist oppressors, on the second advent Sunday, December 7, 1958. Bishop Dibelius has long stood out as a symbol of Christian courage in the face of the Communist conspiracy to destroy religious values in the lives of the people of Germany and, indeed, in the entire world. Coming at this crucial time in the struggle for the control of men's minds and hearts, as symbolized by the current crisis threatening the freedom of West Berlin, I believe that it is highly important that the people of the free world be aware of and join in the crusade of prayer for which the heroic bishop pleads as with the voice of a prophet of old. I, therefore, ask that his sermon, with an accompanying foreword by Merwin K. Hart of the National Economic Council, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today at the conclusion of these remarks. The honest, pious prayers of a truly religious people would have prevented the destruction of the city of Jerusalem which Jesus foresaw and over which He wept. Let us take our lesson from that terrible story and pour forth our prayers in a mighty torrent to the throne of the Almighty so that Berlin, Germany, and the entire free world may be saved from such a righteous judgment.

FOREWORD

Public affairs and Christianity are closely knit. Seldom has this been more apparent than in the critical situation in Berlin today.

Here in our Christian country in the days ahead, as in Berlin, Christianity and personal liberty are going to survive together or go down together.

In recent months the Soviet authorities in East Germany have put into effect a rule that

no person who adheres to the Christian faith may enter high school or university, thus condemning any youth, no matter how great his talent, who refuses to conform to Soviet edict to become an artisan or fieldworker.

By agreement among the United States, Britain, France, and Russia, following World War II, the Berlin area was divided into four sectors, and control of a sector was assigned to each of those countries. The sectors assigned to the United States, Britain, and France, like all of West Germany, have made an amazing recovery. But, aside from the narrow strip containing the street called Stalin Allee, East Berlin has continued largely in ruins.

A few weeks ago Khrushchev suddenly demanded that the other three powers get their forces out of Berlin. There is much evidence that Soviet Russia will this time not relent. Meanwhile, the United States, Britain, and France have refused to yield an inch.

We are assured by close German contacts that the loss of Berlin to the West would be a catastrophe psychologically, and might lead to the loss of all Germany and perhaps all Europe. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that there are such weaknesses in the Soviet setup that Khrushchev believes his only safety lies in striking a blow now, such as this proposed attempt to seize Berlin.

One of the greatest men of our time is 78-year-old Otto Dibelius, Protestant Bishop of Berlin and Brandenburg, and holder of honorary doctorates from Yale, St. Andrews, Toronto, and other universities. Till he was absolutely forbidden a few weeks ago, he continued to preach throughout East Germany, and brought courage and comfort to millions in that unhappy land.

On a recent visit to Berlin, as vice president of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism, I spent an hour with the bishop in his Berlin home. Like everyone who has met him, I was greatly impressed with this great Christian. With Adenauer, he has been a pillar of strength, not only to Germany but to the whole Christian world.

On Sunday, December 7, Bishop Dibelius preached in his cathedral in the eastern sector of Berlin. In his sermon, given below, he calls for 10,000 Berliners to pray daily for the saving of the German people.

Washington prayed at Valley Forge. At Benjamin Franklin's suggestion, when the Constitutional Convention was deadlocked, the members turned to prayer. We have no greater weapon in this present German crisis.

We of the National Economic Council, believing deeply in the efficacy of prayer where offered in the name of Christ, urge all Americans to join the Berliners in their prayers.

We urge all priests and ministers, Catholic and Protestant, to lead their congregations in this plea to the Almighty for the people of Germany. We ask them to secure from their flocks pledges to pray daily; and to forward the pledges to Rev. Dr. Frederick J. Forell, executive secretary of the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism, at 325 Central Park West, New York 25, N.Y. That will enable Dr. Forell to let Bishop Dibelius know that Americans care.

(The following translation from the German is by his son, Rev. Dr. George W. Forell, of Chicago.)

MERWIN K. HART.

ON THIS THY DAY

"When Jesus was come near, He beheld the city, and wept over it, saying: If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace. But now they are hid from thine eyes." (Luke 19: 41-42.)

"Was this fellow Jesus also for peace?" This was the question which a cabdriver asked his passenger here in East Berlin in the course of a conversation; for he had noticed the passenger was a minister. This cab-

driver had apparently only the vaguest notion about Jesus Christ, and he was only able to think in terms of the slogans with which political propaganda blankets our people day after day.

"Was this fellow Jesus also for peace?"

Yes, indeed, He was for peace. When He beheld His Jerusalem and realized that soon this city would be rubble and ashes as the result of a cruel war, His eyes were filled with tears. The Gospel reports only twice that Jesus wept. Once He wept at the tomb of Lazarus where He was overcome by the fearful power which death holds over the life of men. Here we read: "Jesus wept." (John 11: 35.) The other time was in this passage where He thought of the judgment over His Jerusalem. He was always for peace.

But, of course, this was not an outward peace where for a time atomic weapons are scrapped and guns put away only to await the next opportunity when one will use them again. And meanwhile one expresses hostility by means of the weapons of the cold war. Christ's concern was a peace which descends from God's forgiveness into the hearts of men. This peace changes their attitudes and finally makes the very thought impossible that human beings and brothers should shoot at each other, knowing that others are just as close to God's heart as they are themselves.

Indeed, He was for peace. This is what He lived for. To bring this peace into the hearts of men, He went to the cross.

But mankind was not interested in this kind of peace. In the prologue to the Gospel of St. John, we read the sad sentence: "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." (John 1: 11.) These words are a summary of the entire life and suffering of our Saviour from that day on until now. "He came unto His own and His own received Him not."

To be sure, nobody wanted war. Whenever war came mankind felt sorry for themselves and nobody would take the responsibility. But they did not want to be bothered with the things which belong to peace. They did not want to prepare for the change necessary in man as he is now in the event that the dark threat of war should ever disappear from this world. They wanted to eat and to drink, and were willing to accept a little anxiety in the intermissions. To change their lives was far too inconvenient. In fact, to this day, this is too inconvenient. Men still say: "Whatever will be, will be. Better not think of it. This is all that is left to us." This is what they still say in Berlin today.

But it seems to me that in the case of most people, the soul announces its presence from time to time. Perhaps only very quietly, but the soul, the very soul they wanted to suppress, speaks up. "Can we live like this? Can we be so shallow and irresponsible?"

Boris Pasternak's Dr. Zhivago says: "No man can do violence to his soul for very long without suffering the penalty."

And because this is a fact, man is ever and again confronted by the question: "Should you really do something?" Physical blindness is something that we have to accept as God's will, and bear it in faith. But blindness of the soul, the blindness which refuses to see and which is quite satisfied if the decisive fact is hidden from our eyes, this blindness is always guilt. And all guilt must be paid for in Heaven and on earth.

Dear friends, this brings us to the theme of the second Sunday in advent. According to the tradition of our church, we must speak of God's judgment over man's unbelief on this day.

These judgments of God are always present. They take place in man's outward life, but above all in his inner life. No one should deceive himself into thinking that he can throw away his faith and remain the

same person he was before. He will notice how, step by step, he will become more selfish, more uncharitable, more inconsiderate, more untruthful. And should he fail to notice it himself, others will surely realize it. And even if others fail to realize the change, the Holy God in Heaven will surely see it. What the consequences will be in all eternity we can only anticipate.

God's judgments are carried out every day. There are hours in every life when these judgments gain special meaning. Then Jesus' lamentations about us are heard: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace. But now they are hid from thine eyes." These are the decisive hours in the life of men and nations.

It appears to me that our city of Berlin, and, indeed, our entire German nation, is now passing through such a decisive hour.

We all know what is at stake.

The worship service is not the proper place for political discussions. But this is the place to talk about the concern of man's soul. This is the church's task. In the 33d chapter, verse 7, of the Prophet Ezekiel, we read:

"So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore, thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me."

What was first assigned to the prophet as an individual has come to be entrusted to the whole church of Christ. And as a watchman the church must now say three things:

First. The attempt is now being made to change the way of life of the 2 million people who live in West Berlin and—this is also openly admitted—later include the 50 million people who live in West Germany. In deed, this is to be done without asking the people whether they want this new way of life or not. In short, the same is to be accomplished as happened immediately after the last war 13 years ago when millions of human beings were thrown around like pieces of baggage and no one was in position to defend himself.

But all this is contrary to the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This Gospel proclaims that God wants free men, not men who are treated like things. He wants free men, not slaves, since faith can unfold only in an atmosphere where man is not the victim of overwhelming powers, but rather is able to make free decisions about his life, for or against the glory of God.

Since this is a fact, since our faith cannot live, in the long run, unless it breathes in a world of freedom, the church of Jesus Christ must warn all those concerned against subjecting the earth to brute force.

If you ask what belongs to our peace, the answer is not more barbed wire, but rather more freedom for all.

Indeed, freedom for all. That is the second point I must make. This does not merely affect the men and women of the West; the men and women of the East are just as much involved. Should a new barbed wire fence at the Brandenburg Gate in the center of Berlin, in the future, mark the border between two countries—this seems to be the fashion nowadays—the last chance will have been lost for human beings from both sides of the border to come together, to greet each other, and to exchange ideas. Then the last chance will be lost for mothers to see their children, who might live on the other side of this barbed wire. New suffering, new bitterness, will engulf millions of people. Against this development rises the love which our Lord Jesus Christ has commanded us.

We are told that sources of tension are to be cleared away. Yes, indeed, clear away these sources of tension, of which every Christian will say that they are unhealthy

and unnatural. But watch out that you do not clear them away by bringing new heartbreak over mankind. Rather, clear away the sources of tension by doing what the church of Jesus Christ has been asking for in our country all these 13 years. Give back to the German people their national unity, and with the unity, peace and freedom.

The third point can only be stated with some hesitation. Nobody should be able to accuse me that I am trying to overdramatize the situation and that I am unduly pessimistic. But 10 years ago we had the very same experience, and we all know where it led. Violence breeds nothing but more violence.

Again I remind you of the Prophet Ezekiel, who says in the 33d chapter, verse 6:

"If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand."

The bishop of Berlin stands today under this word. For this reason, I can only raise my voice and entreat all those whom it may concern: Abandon violence, grant freedom, and grant peace.

There remains but one question: What can we do in this situation? What can each one of us do? Is there anything that can be done? When our Savior spoke the words of our text about Jerusalem, the case of Jerusalem had already been closed in God's council. Nothing else remained but sorrow and lamentation. I do not know whether in the same council of God the case of Berlin is by now also closed. There is none of us who knows. But because we do not know, these words "On this thy day," tell us not only to obey but also give us hope that in God's mercy there may be possibilities for salvation. And this hope demands that we redeem the time.

Therefore, let me ask again: What shall we do? On the day when the Russian note was released, I met a western statesman whose findings will influence greatly what will happen in the next 6 months. We had little time for long conversation, but he looked at me, shook my hand, and said three words: "We must pray."

What this layman told the pastor is ultimately what the pastor has to tell the congregation. Our duty now is to pray for our city of Berlin and for our entire German nation. The Prophet Jeremiah says expressly: "Pray to the Lord for your city." The whole New Testament is full of such sayings: "Pray without ceasing." Indeed, while you pray, all nervous strain will vanish from your hearts. Your soul will become calm through trust in God. This will belong to your peace, and to the peace of the whole city.

In such an hour of decision, no Christian can pray in any other way than his Savior and Lord prayed in Gethsemane, namely, with the conclusion: "Nevertheless not My will, but Thine be done."

Here we find the calm confidence which realizes that even if God should have decided not to answer a certain prayer or, to put it more accurately, to answer it differently than man had anticipated, God's grace is at work. To say it with the words of a German hymn:

"Nothing can happen to me
But what God has decreed
And what leads to my salvation."

Even through darkness, God can lead us to the goal which His mercy has destined for us.

But these other words of Jesus are no less sure, they belong to the great paradoxes of our Christian faith which no logical effort can dissolve but which are, nevertheless,

most real. "Ask and ye shall receive." Whoever asketh receiveth. "Whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." I stand on this promise and because of this promise I cast away all anguish and sorrow, and I trust that no faithful Christian in this, our city, will lose himself in his own anxieties. United in prayer, let us face the coming months in quiet confidence.

Abraham prayed to God: "If only 10 righteous men be found in the city of Sodom, wilt not thou, O Lord, save the city from destruction?" That means only 10 men who want to serve God and pray to Him. And God said: "I will."

Sodom was a small town; Berlin is a big city. Let us apply it to the larger scale of our city. If there are found in Berlin 10,000 people to pray in these months every day faithfully to their God, asking Him that nothing should happen that would bring new heartbreak to its people, then God will say: "Yes, for the sake of these ten thousand, I will."

Will you be one of these 10,000? Amen.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following column by Mr. Walter Lippmann that appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, January 13, 1959:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Granted that the President's first message to Congress is bound to be rather general in character, what the President had to say on Friday throws very little light indeed on the state of the Union. He said in effect that we are ceaselessly challenged, and that in meeting this challenge all that we can afford to do, without raising taxes, is all that we need to do.

This is a remarkable coincidence—that we are able to meet so great a challenge without any additional effort and sacrifice during the coming fiscal year, and that in the following year we may be able to relax and to reduce taxes. We are confronted, said Mr. Eisenhower, with a question which is as old as history, whether a government based upon liberty can endure when it is ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship with growing economic and military power. And what is the answer to this question which is as old as history? It is that we can indeed endure by doing no more than we are doing now.

But just what is the use of asking this tremendous question about whether we can endure if the answer is that we are already doing all that is necessary? The explanation, I am afraid, is that the President is trying to ride two horses at once—to be hard when he talks to Moscow and soft when he talks to our own people. We are to defy the challenge abroad and are to reduce taxes at home.

This does not sound as if the President expected the Nation to take the ceaseless challenge very seriously. For if it is true, as in fact it is, that the Soviet Union is challenging us with an economic and military power of great and growing strength,

how is it conceivable that we can look forward to a tax reduction just before the coming national presidential election? This is the kind of softness and self-indulgence which is as old as history, and again and again in history has meant the ruin of great states.

To be hard on the outside and soft on the inside is to invite trouble. For this is a changing world in which the power and the influence of the challenger are growing. We cannot long hope to succeed in meeting this challenge by a policy of standing pat in all things—on all of our positions abroad and on our efforts at home.

The right position is that of Churchill's when he said "we arm to parley." We should arm more strongly and we should negotiate more readily. We should be not inflexible but we should be tough, remembering that what is inflexible is usually brittle.

Wheat—And the Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, wheat is in serious trouble. Surpluses of the bread grain have built up so fast and so high that they now represent the biggest single problem we face in agriculture. And present trends show that the situation would get worse if we continued along the way we have been going.

We are nearly smothered under excess wheat now. The surplus pile will reach really impossible levels in the near future if we fail to take necessary action. Let's take a quick look at the facts—the highlights of the wheat situation.

We made a little progress in whittling down the wheat surplus between 1956 and 1958. Through aggressive and expensive efforts, we managed to cut production temporarily through programs like the soil bank—and to expand exports through special programs under Public Law 480.

Last summer, however, the dam broke. Excellent weather, combined with price support incentives, brought both yields and total production to alltime records. The gains of 2 or 3 years were more than wiped out. Surpluses shot up to new peaks in a hurry.

Total wheat production in 1958 was about 1,450 million bushels. Added to a carryover of 880 million bushels of old wheat on hand last July 1, this gave us a total supply for this marketing year of more than 2,300 million bushels—a record, 14 percent above the previous high.

To see what this means in terms of surplus, let us check our outlets for wheat—the total annual disappearance. Domestic use has been running around 600 million bushels; exports, with the aid of special subsidy programs, around 400 million—or total annual disappearance at about the billion-bushel mark.

And so—unbelievable as it may be—we had enough wheat on hand after last summer's harvest to meet all our domestic

and export needs for 2 full years, and more. Put another way, if we did not grow a bushel of wheat this year—1959—we would still have enough to fill all available outlets until the 1960 crop came in. And, in fact, we would have a 300 million bushel carryover to start off that 1960–61 marketing year.

In carrying out mandatory price-support programs, the Government has had to invest tremendous sums in wheat. One and one-quarter billion bushels are being held in inventory or under price-support loan. The investment in this hoard of wheat is \$3 billion—well over a third of the total price-support investment.

When the Commodity Credit Corporation takes over 1958-crop loan wheat later this spring, it will be paying \$700,000 a day for wheat storage alone.

I said the wheat surplus figures might be almost unbelievable. They are, but unfortunately they represent hard, realistic facts. Action to reverse this blind trend toward catastrophe is past due.

In his farm message, the President has faced up to the wheat crisis. He has done so clearly and constructively, recognizing the basic problems and giving us clear guidelines for alternate courses of action.

Rigid, too-high support prices have obviously been responsible for much of our current trouble. The President wisely calls for adjustments to correct this weakness. One course would be to relate price supports to the average market of recent years. The other would be to provide the same discretion in setting price levels, as a percentage of parity, which now holds for all crops except the half dozen so-called basics. Either course would be a long step toward a sound basis for the wheat program.

Production and marketing controls represent the other major part of the basic wheat program problems. Those we have been trying to use have not worked. The President outlines two possible changes. One would relax controls, giving wheat farmers the freedom to produce and compete for markets, and using the conservation reserve of the soil bank to help cushion the transition. The other would tighten controls and eliminate present loopholes in the operation of the program—at least during an emergency adjustment period.

As the President points out clearly, the tighter control route would mean a degree of regimentation more drastic than Congress has been willing to impose in the past. It would mean lower acreage for wheat producers, more positive production controls, and heavier marketing penalties.

Virtually everyone agrees that we must do something about wheat now. The President has courageously recognized the inevitable. He has outlined alternate choices of action, with the final decisions properly left to the Congress. The action we take can reverse adverse trends and lay the foundation for continuing sound growth of our great wheat industry, or it can permit the already crucial situation to build toward the impossible.

Tariff on Coal to West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the unprecedented decision by West Germany to close its ports to American coal by the imposition of an unrealistic, unreasonable, and uncalled for embargo tariff is only a forerunner of what we can expect from our stupid approach to reciprocal trade agreements.

This comes from so-called gentlemen's agreements to take foreign affairs out of partisan review and criticism.

A person fears even the word of "partisanship" in talking of foreign trade and aid.

The time has come for a hardheaded Yankee businessman approach based upon the economies of the situation.

Compromise and confidence are two way streets. We cannot open our borders to unrestricted foreign imports while our funds restrict and close their borders.

The statement of the John S. Routh of the Coal Exporters and Tom Pickett of the National Coal Association tell but a part of the story.

When you get the full story on glass, toys, textiles, rubber goods, and so forth, you may find part of the answer to our chronic unemployment of 4 million American workers.

I attach the following statements from the coal industry.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The National Coal Association, whose members produce most of the Nation's commercial bituminous coal, urges the Department of State to protest most vigorously the announced intention of the German Federal Republic to impose a prohibitive tariff of \$4.76 per ton on coal. Most of West Germany's coal imports come from the United States.

This arbitrary, unilateral action will effectively deprive the United States of about 60 percent of its largest overseas market for bituminous coal. So onerous is the tariff that its effect will be to hold German imports of U.S. coal to the 3,500,000 tons allowed to enter duty-free.

This is only the latest damage done the coal industry in the field of international relations. In the name of free trade and international friendship, we have seen coal's normal markets on the Atlantic coast submerged by an ever-increasing tide of imported residual fuel oil.

In spite of the heavy damage to the coal industry, our own Government has failed to stem this tide, and I am informed the State Department has had an important voice in this refusal to act. While facing unrestricted foreign competition in this country, the coal industry encounters prohibitive tariffs when it tries to sell its product in West Germany.

West Germany's action is all the more arbitrary because long-term contracts between U.S. exporters and German importers are still effective. No indication was given that such a prohibitive duty of any kind was to be assessed.

The Bonn government's move is disappointing because American taxpayers—the coal industry and its workers not the least of these—have furnished West Germany more than \$13 billion in aid since 1948, exclusive of U.S. expenditures in West Germany for military purposes. Much of this money went to rebuild the German coal industry. The hand that fed West Germany has now been bitten.

The effect of this action is also severe on the U.S. railroad industry, which transports coal from mine to tidewater.

The bituminous coal industry is placed in an extremely serious situation. We sincerely hope the Department of State will do its utmost to impress on the Bonn government possible consequences of its action.

Very truly yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Executive Vice President.

NEW YORK, January 27.—John S. Routh, president of the Coal Exporters Association of the United States, Inc., today called the new West German tariff on U.S. coal shipments stupid and prohibitive.

Mr. Routh urged the State Department to oppose enforcement of the new tariff, which was approved Friday by the West German Cabinet and is expected to be debated by Parliament Wednesday.

West Germany set a quota of 3,500,000 tons of American coal which could be imported duty free, with the rest subject to a levy of \$4.76 a ton. Since the quota is retroactive to January 1, Mr. Routh said the 3,500,000-ton mark would be reached by May, leaving the rest of the year's shipments subject to a duty of \$4.76 per ton which practically equals the price of coal at the American mine.

"In my 40 years in coal exporting I have never heard as much furor as this contemplated action is entailing," Mr. Routh said in a telegram to W. T. M. Beale, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The Administration's Labor-Management Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker I wish to say a few words in support of the administration's labor-management proposals. I am particularly happy to see that provision is made in these proposals for the regulation of union trusteeships. In this respect, I think this bill is an improvement over the administration's legislative recommendations in this area last year.

The extensive hearings of the McClellan committee have shown that one of the principal means by which a few unscrupulous labor leaders have grasped and retained unfettered control over local unions is through imposing trusteeships. There are, of course, times when it is necessary for a national or international union to assume such powers, but there is never any excuse for continuing a trusteeship beyond the time necessary to put the local's affairs in order. The administration's bill makes adequate provision for imposing such control under proper circumstances, but

it also provides machinery by which it may be terminated if improperly imposed or continued beyond the time actually needed.

I believe the provisions the President asks will go a long way toward eliminating and preventing abuses of power and corruption not only on the part of labor leaders but also by unscrupulous employers. I heartily endorse this bill and hope it will soon be enacted.

The Elkhart Truth Speaks: "Let's Get U.S. Aid to the Disabled"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial published this month in the Elkhart Truth, an editorial which criticizes the head-in-the-sand attitude of the leaders of the Republican Party in Indiana.

This responsible and thoughtful editorial points to the burden placed on local property taxpayers because "our State of Indiana refuses to participate in the Federal aid to permanently and totally disabled program."

I cannot understand why the Indiana GOP supports this reckless giveaway of nearly \$3 million, much of it the money of Hoosier taxpayers, to the other 48 States.

I commend the Elkhart Truth for opposing this radical Republican spending of our citizens' resources.

We Hoosiers pay Federal taxes. We have a right to share in Federal grants-in-aid programs.

He who feeds the cow has a right to at least some of the milk.

The editorial follows:

[From the Elkhart Truth, Jan. 10, 1959]

LET'S GET U.S. AID TO DISABLED

A count November 1 showed 77 totally and permanently disabled persons receiving aid from the tritownship relief office in Elkhart, which serves Concord, Osolo, and Baugo Townships.

Local property taxpayers have this burden for one reason alone:

Our State of Indiana refuses to participate in the Federal aid to permanently and totally disabled program.

In fiscal 1957, the Federal Government parceled out \$106,927,775 to the States for this assistance.

Indiana could have had close to \$3 million of this sum, which could have been administered by our county welfare department.

Instead, we got not a thin dime. We paid for the aid in Federal taxes, but other States got all of it.

It seems to us that the State legislature should vote to take this Federal grant.

The legislature should look into the entire problem of grants-in-aid.

Indiana at last report has been participating in only 41 of 64 Federal grant-in-aid programs.

In 1957 Indiana received \$59,385,210 under these Federal grants, which was 1.5 percent of the amount paid to all States.

But in the same year, we were paying in 2.36 percent of the Federal revenue.

We are being shortchanged, by our own choice.

Now we share some of the misgivings about Federal aid. We agree that some of these programs well could be turned back to the States.

In fact, a joint action committee appointed by President Eisenhower has already suggested turning back vocational education and waste treatment construction to the State levels.

This seems reasonable. No doubt the prospect of getting Federal grants has actually deterred construction of some sewage-treatment plants in Indiana. Elkhart built its own plant on its own.

We do not agree with the Indiana commission on State tax and financing policy (in its recent report) that pressures should be placed on Congress to return to the States all Federal-aid programs which are not absolutely essential to national security.

Some programs should have national administration, and highways are a prime example.

But in any case, we see no immediate prospect at all of a mass abolition of Federal-aid programs.

On the contrary—judging by the election results in November—there will be heavy pressures for more aid programs.

Therefore Indiana should carefully scan the existing programs and decide which have merit and which do not. If an aid program can be better handled at the local level, our Congressmen should fight for legislation to do this.

But so long as a Federal grant-in-aid program exists, Indiana should get its share. We should stop cutting off our own noses.

We should take what is coming to us—both as a matter of right and to take some of the burden from local taxation, as in the case of the permanently and totally disabled category.

Another Berlin at Panama?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, January 13, 1959, as well as a news story from the Washington Post of Thursday, January 15, 1959, regarding the announced intention of Panama to extend its territorial waters from 3 miles to a total of 12 miles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 13, 1959]

A CLOSER BERLIN?

Is another Berlin about to be created in the Western Hemisphere?

That appears to be the prospect if the Republic of Panama goes through with its already enacted law for extending territorial limits 12 miles at sea on either side of the Isthmus.

This means the United States-owned Panama Canal would be boxed in at both ends over an area extending 12 miles at sea. Technically, it means Panama would have the right to control shipping crossing this stretch while approaching or leaving the canal.

In effect, this vital and strategic waterway would be completely surrounded by the Republic of Panama, just as West Berlin is cut off and landlocked, subject to the whims or mood of any changing government.

For some time there have been reports of Communist encouragement of a long-range plan to get control of the Panama Canal away from the United States. So-called internationalization of the canal has been persistently pressed, along with the growth of nationalism in Panama. It is a familiar pattern.

Was the United States caught by surprise when this Panama territorial-limit law went through the National Assembly last month and promptly was signed by the Panamanian President? It would appear so.

In any case, we are acting now—after the fact has been accomplished. The State Department has asked Panama to reconsider its action, pending a study of the whole question. And we have notified Panama we do not recognize the new law. The U.S.-Panama Treaty of 1903 specifically guarantees free and unlimited access to the canal. Few nations have declared a 12-mile territorial limit on their waters, as compared with the usually recognized 3 miles. Interestingly, the 12-mile nations include the Soviet Union, Red China, Communist Romania and Nasser's Egypt.

It's something we'd better watch closely from now on.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 15, 1959]

PANAMA STANDS FIRM ON NEW 12-MILE LIMITS

PANAMA, January 14.—The national assembly unanimously rejected last night a U.S. request for reconsideration of its laws extending Panama's territorial waters. The extension to 12 miles boxes in the Panama Canal entrances.

An assembly resolution asked friendly nations to support the extension from the previous 3-mile limit. The law passed last month promised free passage to innocent shipping.

During a debate on the U.S. request, former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd called for Panama to receive half of the gross revenue from the canal, which is operated by the United States under long-term treaty.

Boyd asserted that the United States makes \$100 million from the canal while paying Panama only \$1,000,000 a year. He said Panama was not seeking a voice in canal administration.

The Panama Canal Co. reported that in the year ended last July 1 it collected nearly \$43 million in tolls and made a net profit of \$2,656,000. The United States pays Panama \$1,930,000 a year for use of the 10-mile-wide canal strip, which includes 3 miles of the water off each end.

Other assemblymen criticized U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who touched off the debate by telling Congress the territorial waters extension created another Berlin.

Our Federal Timber Sales Program Needs a New Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Federal forest resources constitute a tremendous national asset. Our timber sale policies are of great importance in re-

alizing the greatest return from this asset. Robert E. Wolf, forest consultant, at the request of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, upon the suggestion of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, made a personal study of these policies last fall. Under a previous consent I am including in the RECORD at this point the summary of his report and the conclusions and recommendations. The report is entitled "Review of National Forest Timber Sales in Three Western Regions," and includes a memorandum of the chairman to mem-

bers of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, together with the staff study by Mr. Wolf.

Mr. Wolf is highly competent. His findings and recommendations are worthy of close attention by Members of Congress.

SUMMARY

In order to view in perspective the Forest Service timber-sale program it is well at the outset to examine briefly the changes that have taken place over the years.

This table illustrates the growth of the national forest timber-sale business.

TIMBER SOLD

Fiscal year	Region 1		Region 5		Region 6		All regions	
	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)
1920	0.15	0.4	0.35	0.9	0.24	0.4	1.26	2.9
1925	.10	.3	.16	.4	.68	1.4	1.32	3.3
1930	.08	.3	.16	.4	1.72	5.6	2.77	8.6
1935	.11	.4	.04	.7	.71	1.1	.67	1.6
1940	.20	.7	.17	.3	.69	1.6	1.78	4.7
1945	.25	.7	.19	.7	.96	4.7	2.39	10.4
1950	.33	1.9	.34	3.9	1.38	14.0	3.43	33.0
1955	1.11	6.9	1.11	16.3	2.39	50.9	19.63	100.4
1956	.64	7.8	1.19	21.5	2.45	69.6	6.84	129.3
1957	.68	6.5	.81	14.1	3.00	65.9	6.33	111.1
1958	.90	5.8	1.03	11.9	3.92	62.8	* 13.29	* 112.6

TIMBER CUT

Fiscal year	Region 1		Region 5		Region 6		All regions	
	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)	Volume (billion board feet)	Dollars (millions)
1920	0.13	0.3	0.15	0.3	0.25	0.4	0.81	1.8
1925	.13	.5	.21	.6	.30	.7	1.02	2.8
1930	.13	.5	.40	1.4	.51	1.3	1.65	4.8
1935	.07	.2	.12	.3	.23	.6	.75	1.9
1940	.14	.5	.30	.6	.67	1.8	1.74	4.8
1945	.30	.9	.46	1.3	1.28	5.0	3.14	13.0
1950	.30	1.7	.41	4.0	1.50	14.6	3.60	30.7
1955	.86	4.9	.84	10.0	2.63	37.3	6.33	70.8
1956	.94	7.1	1.06	18.0	2.63	49.4	6.91	97.6
1957	.91	8.4	.97	17.5	2.75	64.7	6.97	115.6
1958	.77	6.3	.95	11.8	2.62	54.4	6.42	94.2

* Includes a long-term sale in Alaska: Volume 3 billion board feet; value, \$6.2 million.

* Includes a long-term sale in Alaska: Volume 5.25 billion board feet; value, \$10.7 million.

Except for the depression years there has been a generally steady growth in the volume of timber sold and cut. Some of the unusual increases in timber sold in various years resulted from large long-term sales. Timber cut has shown a steadier growth better reflecting the real availability of timber sold. The phenomenal aspect is the tremendous increase in the value of timber cut which was \$2.20 per thousand board feet in 1920 and stayed at about this level until 1940 when it rapidly climbed to \$8.50 per thousand board feet by 1950 then to \$14.50 per thousand board feet by 1958. Timber cut climbed from under 1 billion board feet in 1920 to 3.5 billion board feet by 1950. Then up to almost 7 billion board feet by 1958.

With such a great growth both in volume and value in recent years it is evident that national forest timber is increasing in importance. It is neither surprising that there have been problems nor that with the increase in business some of these problems have become more difficult while others have been solved.

This report does not deal with the problems that have been successfully solved nor

does it dwell upon accomplishments. The record, and the generally high regard which the public have for the Forest Service make this unnecessary. Rather it reviews the one particular segment of the Forest Service program which has accounted for 86 percent of the \$1 billion in cash income which the national forests have deposited in the Treasury since 1905. The review is an effort to identify the steps that may be helpful to making the record better in the years that lie ahead.

The review was made at this time because groups in the forest products industry alleged that the Forest Service was not adhering to published timber sale announcements furnished the industry and that there was a substantial gap between timber sales and allowable cuts. Additionally, groups indicated concern about other elements of the timber-sale program such as sale size, opportunities to salvage timber, access roads, and right-of-way needs.

The field review was conducted to assess both the validity and dimensions of complaints and to determine their cause.

The review showed the following record for the three regions studied in detail:

Financed program—Regional office quotas

(Million board feet)

	Timber to sell, fiscal years—					Timber to cut, fiscal years—				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1	1,045.0	920.0	1,245.0	3,230.0	820.0	920.0	1,000.0	950.0	2,870.0	
Region 5	1,190.0	1,176.0	1,565.0	1,452.0	5,413.0	905.0	1,231.0	1,189.0	4,147.0	
Region 6	2,471.1	2,869.5	3,188.5	4,150.0	12,779.1	2,590.7	2,855.1	3,231.3	12,995.0	11,672.1

* Based on revised quota for year. Exhibit 5, p. 124, gives revised quotas. The table on p. 34 and exhibit 10 are computed on the original quotas.

Timber cut and sold

[Million board feet]

	Timber sold, fiscal years					Timber cut, fiscal years				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1.....	1,109.0	636.8	679.4	901.0	2,216.9	865.0	944.4	910.3	773.0	2,627.7
Region 5.....	1,099.0	1,178.0	800.0	995.0	4,072.0	820.0	1,043.0	858.0	932.0	3,753.0
Region 6.....	2,392.0	2,446.0	2,979.0	3,919.0	11,753.0	2,633.0	2,633.0	2,775.0	2,616.0	10,656.3

Percentage of financed program accomplished

	Timber sold, fiscal year					Timber cut, fiscal year				
	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total	1955	1956	1957	1958	Total
Region 1.....		61	74	71	69		103	91	81	92
Region 5.....	92	100	50	69	75	100	115	78	78	90
Region 6.....	97	85	93	102	194	102	92	86	84	91

¹ These percentages are based on revised goals. Figures originally supplied by the region were on a different base. Revisions were made only in total figure.

The above tables show the volume of timber that the regional offices estimated would be sold or cut with funds provided and the actual record expressed as a percentage each year when the funds are allotted the Washington office first sets quotas. Regions 1 and 6 usually set forest quotas which in sum were for about the same total volume as the Washington quota. Region 5, however, set selling quotas which for the 4-year period show a performance record of 75 percent against one of 91 percent when measured against the Washington office quota. Region 5's optimism on accomplishments has not been matched by its sales record.

The record on timber sold is well below financed levels except for region 6. While regions 1 and 6 have shown improvement, region 5 has not. The industry cut about 90 percent of the financed cut in each region but the Forest Service did not offer as large a percentage of sales as they were financed to handle. On a quantity basis the volume sold has exceeded the industry's removal of timber except in region 1 where the reverse is true.

The record based on financed plans is reasonably good. It masks the fact that if the industry had cut the full amount of timber the Forest Service estimated it would cut there would have been a further drain on funds and less money would have been available for sale preparation. The recent fair sales record in regions 1 and 5 and the good record in region 6 would have fallen to a less satisfactory level.

In region 6 when funds were reapportioned sales goals were revised upward and cutting goals downward in fiscal year 1958. This had the effect of reducing sales performance percentages while raising cutting performance percentages. However, the region was also financed to prepare for sale an additional 800 million board feet for future years. Immediate sales goals were only 94 percent met and cutting was 91 percent of the revised goal.

Sales goals for fiscal year 1959 are 3,802.9 million board feet compared to 4,150 million for 1958, while cut goals have rise in 1959 to 3,534.5 million board feet compared to 2,995 million board feet in 1958.

Revised goals for 1958 were not met and the position of the 800 million board feet in additional sales preparation is not readily ascertainable. This backlog of partially prepared sales should be helpful in meeting 1959 sales goals.

In addition, measured against available data on announced plan accomplishments, region 6 sold only 79 percent and region 1 49 percent. It was the failure to adhere to

timber sales plans announced on the various national forests, plus an inability to offer sales at full allowable cut level, which are the focal points of industry complaints.

The Forest Service did announce annual sales plans for volume substantially above these subsequently made. Except in region 1 (Montana and north Idaho) the announced plans have been for volumes well above the level of sales activity financing. The closer to the forest, the more optimistic forest officers are about the timber sales volume that can be processed. To some extent this represents an effort to respond to local demands for timber and the hope of obtaining a larger share of each region's allotment to meet this demand. It also stems from a realization that not all scheduled sales will materialize due to technical problems.

Among the major obstacles found to marketing announced national-forest timber sales were cancellations which occurred because needed rights-of-way and cost-sharing agreements had not been obtained from intermingled landowners who generally are members of the forest products industry. Another obstacle is the cost of needed mainline roads required. When timber purchasers are required to build the needed road, particularly in timber stands with marginal value species salability is diminished. Financing for timber sales has not been adequate to build a backlog of prepared sale so that varying market conditions can be met. Currently when an obstacle to planned sale cannot be overcome a new sale must be layed out if program goals are to be met.

Forest Service timber-sales programs rest on decade revised timber-management plans which describe overall management goals on the forest, annually revised 5-year cutting budgets which attempt to define and locate general sale areas, and an annual timber business report which combines a budget request for the fiscal year 2 years off with a request for an allotment from the next year's budget.

There is no common anniversary date for timber-management plans thus they provide only a broad guide for management. The 5-year cutting budgets do not have a common anniversary date either but they can be coordinated, while the annual timber business reports afford a current device for fiscal coordination. Until recently these reports showed timber to be cut but did not show timber to be sold. This has been a basic weakness in operations planning and budget presentations.

The volume and rate of timber cutting is largely affected by the economic situation of the industry, the extent to which alternate

log supplies are used, the size of contracts, roads needed to permit cutting and the operating pattern of customers. It is the element which the Forest Service has made the least effort to consciously direct but it has been the biggest element used to relate fund requirements to program goals.

The Forest Service timber-sale program really consists of three interdependent parts:

1. The presale activity which leads up to programming sales for detailed preparation work;

2. The actual layout of the timber for sale and its advertisement; and

3. The supervision of sales under contract.

In the timber-sale business, the future is governed by the present, but the present is governed by the past. An effective timber-sale program requires that the three elements move forward in harmony.

The volume under contract creates an inescapable workload which influences the amount of presale preparation and actual sale layout work can be accomplished. The sales activity determines the workload in the future and the size and conditions of sales made coupled with the desires of purchasers influences when the timber will be cut.

There is no publically set forth long-range program which the Congress or the public can examine to determine the goals that the Department of Agriculture has for national forest timber management. This review of current problems in the national forest timber-sale program must be considered against this background because the operational and budgetary difficulties that presently exist stem from the lack of a clear goal with quantitative accomplishments related to time.

Finally the Forest Service annual plans and accomplishments reports do not presently give a complete picture of the operational problems or a quantitative assessment of situations requiring policy consideration.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problems found in this study are cumulative and growing because the basic tools for their solution have not been fully utilized. The study made leads to these conclusions and recommendations:

1. National plan needed

In the public mind the Forest Service timber-sale program has as its only announced goal reaching something called the "full allowable cut" at the earliest practical date. Because of the rapidly growing importance of the national forests, as a timber source, for recreation and other uses there is an urgent need for definite management goals, fixed to a point in time, explained as to objective, and relating operating and investment requirements to benefits. The Department of Agriculture has just completed publication of Timber Resources for America's Future, the most complete analysis of the Nation's timber resources that has been made. This review includes forecasts of timber supply and demand both for the years 1975 and 2000.

A national plan should be made setting forth forest-management goals for the future which adequately describes:

- (a) Timber-harvesting goals;
- (b) Reforestation and silvicultural work needed to attain optimum forest production;
- (c) Recreation, watershed protection, grazing goals, and land-use adjustments needed to harmonize multiple uses;
- (d) Estimates of the role the national forest will play in the Nation's economy;
- (e) Road and servicing facilities needed for management and operation;
- (f) Cost estimates to reach stated goals within the first 5-year period, as well as overall costs.

The overall program should be utilized to formulate short-term goals and as the background for budget requests. Special attention should be given to developing presentations which evaluate how program goals are being met.

2. Lack of access held up sales

The major factor holding up planned timber sales in the period studied was lack of rights-of-way. This includes obtaining bare-land rights-of-way in order to construct a Forest Service road, purchase of the right to use an existing road, and agreements for cooperative construction of new roads serving two or more ownerships. Information furnished in region 6 showed that over 1 billion board-feet in unmade or delayed planned sales was due to these problems. In region 1 over 500 million board-feet in sales delays stemmed from the same source. In addition, there are substantial volumes ready to put into sales that never enter plans because of unresolved right-of-way difficulties. While on the one hand, it is a fact that the Forest Service has not been financed to sell all the timber that theoretically could be sold, on the other, it is clear that the Service, under present policies, has expended considerable time in fruitless negotiations where it is unlikely that agreements will be forthcoming.

Policies have not been set forth and backed up with funds so as to enable the Service to utilize the full range of possibilities in negotiations. Thus, the United States is at a disadvantage in negotiating both with parties who proceed in good faith, as well as with those who do not.

Progress has been made under the present ground rules but the true measure is the relation of this cause of delay to other causes and its effect on the sale program. Timber management is not possible without permanent access arrangements.

The Department of Agriculture should set forth a right-of-way policy and an active adequately financed program geared to solving problems in an orderly, firm, and fair manner.

3. Inadequate records

Forest Service records on timber sales are not sufficient to reveal significant and important facts on a timely basis for its \$100 million annual business. The Forest Service has emphasized "timber cut" as an expression of timber-sales accomplishments. This measure is incomplete and misleading because it fails to properly describe accomplishments. The Service should clearly show the entire program and the interrelationships that exist. The minimum elements of the sale program that should be included are:

- (a) The volume of timber in the various stages of sale preparation.
- (b) Sales planned for the coming year with appropriate information on sale-size components, the cost of accessory timber, purchaser roads, and the anticipated rate at which the sales will actually be loggable.
- (c) The volume of timber under contract and the rate at which it will be logged in the forthcoming year.

These key records, adequately briefed and highlighted for use by the Chief, the Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress, should form the nucleus of the budget justification for timber sales, and would be the basic tool for timber-sale policy and program decisions.

Adequate facts would then be available to aid in securing necessary funds to maintain a suitable backlog of work in the various stages of preparation, to maintain an even flow of sales from preparation into production, to gear sales to meeting the requirements of prospective customers, to assuring that sales preparation and administration work is of a high quality and that increases in timber cutting can be met without later jeopardizing other elements of the timber-sale job.

Red Berlin Threat May Revise U.S. Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of Tuesday, January 13, 1959:

RED BERLIN THREAT MAY REVISE U.S. MILITARY POLICY

(By Waldo Drake)

PARIS, January 12.—The Soviet threat to oust the West from Berlin comes at a critical moment, when the United States is at the threshold of momentous decisions which may revise the basic strategy of our national defense.

The Army and the Navy have consistently sought adoption of a policy which would at once safeguard the Nation against surprise nuclear devastation and prepare its Armed Forces for immediate action against limited warfare, or armed encroachment, anywhere in the world. The Air Force has, in effect, opposed this policy with a program that has progressively reserved a larger and larger share of military appropriations for that service. Under the Eisenhower level budget growing Air Force appropriations have simply meant less and less for other defense activities of all sorts.

A revised strategy following the historic recommendations of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and a growing body of disinterested but informed opinion would result in the defense budget's being reapportioned so that all three services could be welded into an instrument of team policy, effective either for unlimited war or to resist Communist nibbling operations around the periphery of the Iron Curtain.

Advocates of revision contend that current American defense policy—based on spiraling number of intercontinental bombers and eventual ballistic missiles as a strategic deterrent—is wrong. Why? Because the Soviets' weapons achievements already have thrown the mutual destruction stalemate out of balance and have made SAC's air-breathing nuclear delivery systems obsolete; because the newly projected bombers-missiles warning net would be too fabulously expensive for the Nation to bear; and because fiscal neglect of other areas of defense effort leaves the Russians and the Communist satellites free to pursue nibbling operations (such as Korea, Indochina, and more subtle economic warfare) throughout the world.

In bare essentials, the new plan proposes that:

1. The Strategic Air Command's role, as the massive deterrent against Soviet nuclear attack, would be shared with the Navy's new missile-firing atomic submarines, which will be armed with the solid-fueled Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile. The term "massive deterrent" which has been the Air Force's license to steal in the past would become a tailored deterrent with dimensions. Its objective would be to put enough of the Soviet population and governmental paraphernalia at risk to deter. Many studies from various sources agree that this could be done at a fraction of the expense and effort now programed.

A program of this sort would recognize that in the area of nuclear stalemate deterrence must have dimensions; that national political-military problems cannot be solved

simply by spending more and more to achieve damage beyond significant dimensions or to provide for excessive losses of vulnerable delivery systems. A deterrent effort with dimensions demonstrates cognizance of national objectives, i.e., "to maintain U.S. institutions and ideals" and does not permit unbridled pursuit of an objective which looks more and more like bluff and bravado and less and less like a balanced, rational, and stable program.

2. With the resultant savings in defense funds and manpower the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps would be rebuilt in to a highly mobile integrated team, ever ready for all contingencies: First, the deterrence of the big war of fantastic mutual nuclear destruction; second, deterrence or capability to fight the so-called compatible or little war against Communist encroachments; and finally a capability for the "broken-backed war" of survival which would follow the nuclear devastation of Eurasia and North America, if deterrent forces perform their retaliatory role.

Studies indicate that less than 20 percent of the annual defense budget would provide the "tailored deterrent," convincing Moscow that nuclear attack on the United States, or her allies, could trigger unacceptable devastation in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

The remaining defense budget would be divided between the several armed services for development of a balanced team, ready to defend American interests anywhere and in a variety of suitable ways.

FIRE BRIGADES

The Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, for example, would have specially equipped battle groups, ready to move into immediate action. The U.S. fleet would be ready to support and sustain these fire brigades and to bring the necessary sea-tail reinforcement of airborne movements.

The newly defined deterrent of the defense team would call for a sizable contribution from Polaris submarines. Four missile-firing submarines are now being built; five others have been authorized. A program realizing about 50 boats by 1966 is within construction capabilities and compatible with balanced funding. Polaris, which will be operational in 1960, will have a range of some 1,500 nautical miles. Although designed to permit launching from deeply submerged submarines, Polaris also could be employed by surface ships. More than half of the Polaris submarines could be kept constantly at sea around the Sino-Soviet perimeter, ready to attack from submerged positions unknown to the enemy.

FOURTEEN CARRIERS PROPOSED

The Navy also proposes a modern fleet of 14 large aircraft carriers in which 9 World War II ships are being replaced by the 6 new Saratoga-type carriers and eventually by atomic-powered carriers. The first atomic carrier will be commissioned in 1961. These big carriers, with a mobility ballistic missiles cannot solve, have long-range attack bombers which are equally effective for a variety of limited tactical operations or for delivering high-yield nuclear weapons. They afford, in short, ideal tools for limited war with an economical and significant bonus contribution to deterrence or the broken-back war.

We can anticipate that on March 1 the Congress will be asked to approve a defense budget of nearly \$41 billion for the 1960 fiscal year. Of this total the Air Force hopes to get \$18 billion, leaving less than \$24 billion to be divided among the Army, Navy, and Marines.

GOAL OF SAC

These figures conceal, however, the ambitions of the Strategic Air Command to begin construction of an imaginative, world-encircling readiness net: of aircraft and missile bases, radar screens (land, air, and

seaborne), and early warning and aircraft control systems. SAC has not divulged cost of this scheme, but has proposed a massive increase in manpower, which could only be obtained by denying support of a balanced and versatile concept. This denial of support is not bad in itself if justified; but such justification does not exist. The division represents indecision and inertia, a perpetuation of a trend to delegate real solution of our military problems to an almost paranoiac belief in the efficacy of massive retaliation—a trend whose faint basis in logic collapsed completely when atomic stalemate was reached.

America's strategic plans up to now have been a hodgepodge of compromise. Issues have not been clearly resolved but rather submerged and censored. We engage in an atomic arms race that lacks the logic of earlier ones; the atomic forces do not engage each other and relate to each other only in their ability to do significant damage. We can program atomic capability beyond requirements whenever we resolve contending concepts by compromise and fail to define the dimensions of deterrence.

PERIOD OF STALEMATE

Compromise has enveiled the United States to pass from a period where we alone were a nuclear power into a period of nuclear stalemate without a corresponding revision of our concept of the utility of atomic weapons as an instrument of national policy. We have not faced issues and have, in essence, supported a will-of-the-wisp promising security if we unquestioningly put our dollar on massive retaliation.

This sustained confusion in the Pentagon is partly responsible for the unwillingness of our European partners in the Atlantic Alliance to provide their shares in the common defense.

Britain's resultant dilemma over her own defense is described by the London weekly Observer, which says:

"Should we give the (nuclear) deterrent top priority and spend what is left on conventional forces? Or should we do exactly the opposite, concentrate on the conventional and put the remainder into nuclear development?"

WHITE PAPER CITED

"Some still accept the views (to concentrate on nuclear weapons) put forward in the 1957 white paper. Others believe that the deterrent theory is a dangerous myth and that if we continue with it we shall become perilously enfeebled. We shall have neither conventional forces nor nuclear weapons mighty enough to frighten off an aggressor."

On the other side of the coin, the Soviet Union is far advanced with a fourfold military program, viz: a fleet of 500 submarines which are likely, soon to include atomic-powered boats which could devastate the United States without warning by concerted missile attack from submerged positions around our coasts; a nuclear-equipped, highly mobile team of armies and tactical air forces in Europe, which holds an overwhelming superiority against anything the West could assemble today to defend either Europe or the Middle East; a diversified ballistic missile system, from short-range weapons already poised along the Iron Curtain to attack Britain and the great cities of Western Europe to intercontinental missiles intended for the United States, and a multiple screen of ground-to-air missiles and interceptor aircraft designed to prevent high altitude bomber (B-52) attacks on Russia's strategic targets.

SOVIET SMOKESCREEN

The Russians have developed this whole complex for modern war behind a propaganda smoke-screen that they were building a powerful fleet of long-range jet bombers for nuclear attack on America. Instead, they

were developing ballistic missiles, giving their armies a devastating punch, and assembling the greatest submarine menace in history. In short, we face a Soviet bloc capable and preparing for warfare of all sorts while we see larger and larger portions of our defense budget assigned to forces for the massive retaliation of the broken-back war.

A main reason why the mounting costs of our national defense threaten to bankrupt the Nation is because the American people have been bamboozled into spending too much of their money for costly weapons which are useful only for the nuclear holocaust.

This broken-back war is more likely to happen if we continue to concentrate our resources on an obsolete massive retaliation strategy, whose weapons would be useless against the limited wars and armed encroachments which the Soviet bloc is more likely to attempt throughout the world.

COLD WAR DEFEAT

The United States, consequently, is being defeated in the cold war because we have not acted decisively in determining what is required to (1) deter big war; (2) to deter little war; or (3) to fight little war. We have, for too long, accepted a policy of massive retaliation as a panacea for a threat of higher taxes, more rigorous draft provisions and reality, itself. We are today, inadequately prepared for limited warfare or to counter the Soviet's economic and psychological campaigns, as in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

A new brush fire war, therefore, might force the United States, largely in frustration, to use tactical atomic weapons to offset overwhelming strength of enemy forces. This could set off the holocaust.

Address by Alvin G. Waggoner, Executive Assistant to Director of Guided Missiles, During Commissioning Ceremonies of "Observation Island," Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., December 5, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, a new ship, the U.S.S. *Observation Island*, was commissioned at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth, which is in my district. This ship is designed as a test ship for the Polaris missile.

This new type ship represents a major milestone in the development of the Polaris weapon system which is so vital to our national deterrent posture. With this ship the Navy will be able to test its new Polaris missiles in a seaborne environment at an early date, thus advancing and accelerating the availability of this weapon system. The commissioning of this ship is of great significance because of the part it will play in the development of missiles, which may bring about a change in our concept of warfare. Mr. A. G. Waggoner, executive secretary of the Office of the Secretary of Defense Ballistic Missiles Committee, was the principal speaker on this

occasion. I am inserting Mr. Waggoner's address in the RECORD and commend its reading to the Members of Congress.

The commissioning of this fine ship today is, indeed, a memorable occasion for it is a most important step in giving our U.S. Navy a new capability, an intermediate range ballistic missile capability.

The mission of the U.S.S. *Observation Island* is to serve as a mobile test ship in the Polaris fleet ballistic missile program. She will be, however, the first ship in history configured to fire a weapon that will have a range of 1,500 miles. She is the first ship to mount weapons that can travel at speeds of 10,000 miles per hour. These facts make this a truly historic occasion.

For centuries, control of the seas meant control of the surface of those seas. History has seen the fleets of Carthage, of Rome, of Britain's Admiral Nelson, and of our own John Paul Jones, David Farragut, and George Dewey destroy enemy seapower by surface action. World War I introduced us to the menace of underwater warfare, the Navy's second medium or dimension of attack. Then came World War II with its decisive battles of Midway and of the Coral Sea in which enemies never even saw each others' fleets, but destruction was rained from the clouds through the medium of Naval Air Forces. That was the third dimension of naval weaponry.

Today we hoist the flag over the latest, and possibly the most amazing combination, the first ship to mount intermediate range ballistic missiles.

In wishing this fine ship, the U.S.S. *Observation Island*, a successful and fruitful existence of service to the Navy and the Nation, we must wish, quite paradoxically, that the Polaris system which she will assist may never have to be fired in anger.

Let's take a look at what this ship stands for and why she is being commissioned today.

About 3 years ago it became evident that a new instrument of delivery was being fashioned in our country and on the other side of the Iron Curtain to carry destructive warheads faster, more certainly, and farther than could be envisioned a few years ago. This instrument, of course, was the ballistic missile which could span oceans in minutes and reach out to targets hundreds and even thousands of miles distant.

Now, a ballistic missile is unique in that it is steered electronically or guided for only a very short part of its flight. Its guidance mechanisms place the missile on the exact path that will take it to its target and then say, in effect, "Now, Old Fellow, you're on your own." The last rocket stage and the guidance sections then detach themselves and drop back to earth, their tasks accomplished. This happens beyond the influences of the earth's atmosphere after the various rocket stages have built up to required speed in the first minute or so of flight.

From this point on the ballistic missile is merely a projectile winging its way to a distant target, out of reach of any control of any kind of either friend or foe. The only way to intercept it would be to knock it literally to bits by hitting it with another missile, and since the speed of ballistic missiles reaches 10,000 and even 15,000 miles per hour, to do this successfully promises to be quite a task.

We are assembled on the deck of a ship configured to test-fire the Polaris ballistic missile, the Navy's part in the overall longer range ballistic missile program about which you have read and heard so much.

Let me tell you a bit about Polaris. It will be an intermediate range ballistic missile with a range of some 1,500 miles. In speed attained and distance traveled Polaris will be exceeded only by the so-called intercontinental ballistic missiles, such as Atlas

and Titan. However, Polaris will have much in common with these long-range giants. First, it can be fired from our own soil—for every ship flying our flag is American soil—and hit targets far inland. The launching platforms of Polaris will be American ships using the great international highways of the open sea.

Polaris is the first, and only, ballistic missile designed to be launched from a moving, seagoing platform. Not only will this platform be located on a ship at sea, it will be located on a ship operating deep beneath the surface of the sea—a submerged submarine. This brings together in a new partnership two of the most revolutionary developments in military hardware since the close of World War II—a ballistic missile and the nuclear-powered submarine.

Now, what promise does this combination offer? First, distance covered by the missile. A Polaris missile will travel as far as from here to Denver in a single leap. Then, speed. This flight will take about 15 minutes. It will reach a speed of 10,000 miles per hour. In actual operation the missile flight will begin in the silent black ocean depths, sweep briefly through the atmosphere in which we have our being, proceed into the equally black silence of space, passing through our atmosphere again just before reaching its target.

Now, the performance of the nuclear submarine which will carry the Polaris weapon. Here is a ship that not only breaks, but shatters all previous submarine records. It can travel many times around the earth without refueling. It can travel submerged for weeks or even months at a time. It can cross major oceans at full speed without ever surfacing. It can travel faster than all but the fastest surface vessels. It might interest you to know that the crews in these submarines strap themselves into their seats, as in an airplane, so swift are the sub's motions in changing course at full speed. It can navigate under water for days at a time, even under thick arctic ice. These are not theories or prophecies. All of these submarine accomplishments are realities.

So here we have, combined in a single weapons system, the speed and ranges possible of an intermediate range ballistic missile and the vast potential of concealment offered by the millions of cubic miles of open ocean, the great watery blanket that covers some three quarters of our globe. With Polaris-armed submarines, our Navy can patrol the seas well within range of enemy targets for months at a stretch, silently, unseen, constantly on the move and ready to unleash its full striking power.

The *Observation Island*, the fine ship on whose decks this ceremony is taking place, will play a most important and even vital role carrying this daring concept of weaponry from the drawing boards of the technicians to operational reality. It will permit the Navy to make essential tests of the weapons system in virtually all its phases while the Polaris submarines are being built. It will permit a sensible step-by-step testing program to iron out all the "bugs", as we engineers call them of a wholly new mechanism. Since Polaris will contain some two hundred thousand separate parts, some of extreme complexity and exactness, quite an insect colony of such "bugs" may have to be explored and conquered.

We have all followed the tests of various missile projects at Cape Canaveral, cheered the successes and groaned at the failures, almost like spectators at a ball game. We know that in rocketry, as in the development stages of any technology, full accomplishment does not come in one step.

Though strictly a "test ship", the *Observation Island* will perform several most important missions. It will put together for the first time all elements of the Polaris fleet ballistic missile system in a seagoing

ship and then test them in the ocean environment. In so doing, it will perform a major service.

The second big job which this ship is designed to carry out is that of training crews for Polaris missile submarines. For, like flying an aircraft missile handling and launching is an art which cannot be learned overnight. It takes practice and patience. It means learning every step of the job, and doing it over and over again. That is where this ship will repay the investment of her conversion many times over.

Now, finally, where does Polaris fit into the overall scheme of the security of our country?

Fundamentally, we have two big military jobs. One is to take care of the crises, the brush fires, the threats to peace that seem to have become the milestones of the cold war age. Suez, Indochina, Lebanon, Quemoy, Berlin, wherever trouble spots develop, it is our job to see that they don't grow into major wars. Then there was Korea, that was the time the Communist leadership wanted to find out whether we would stand and defend ourselves. They found out.

The second job is to retain sufficient military power in being to swiftly render an aggressor impotent, no matter how completely he may try to wipe us out before we can strike back. That's where Polaris comes in as a major factor in impressing the Communist leadership that the terms "aggression" and "suicide" are synonymous.

The Polaris-armed submarine, lurking beneath the surface in a position unseen and unknown, can be assured of surviving an attack on this country and thus can be a deliberate instrument of policy rather than an automatic weapon of revenge. These submarines, strategically deployed, could destroy many major centers within minutes.

No one can "zero in" these submarines for destruction in advance.

Furthermore and importantly, this weapon will force a potential enemy to divide further his attention to our total retaliatory forces.

I sincerely and firmly believe that the Polaris program is a major force for peace. I believe that we can equally sincerely dedicate the fine ship on whose deck we are gathered to the mission of peace, not war. For in these times peace must be bolstered by the readiness and ability to apply force decisively. All of us wish it were otherwise, but merely wishing won't make it so.

The *Observation Island* begins its mission today. It is a mission of technological testing. It is a mission of training. It is a mission which will pave the way for achieving one of the most effective retaliatory instruments of destruction ever conceived. Finally, it is a mission of buying time until reason and statesmanship can become the dominant factor in keeping peace in the world.

Of one thing, however, we can be certain. If we are not ready, if we do not possess destructive weapons which can survive enemy attacks, we lay ourselves open to aggression, and to aggression just as soon as the opposing leadership can be sure that the price of such action is not their own national suicide.

The *Observation Island* has a job to do in bringing the fleet ballistic missile system to a stage of readiness that assists in deterring any potential aggressor, no matter how power crazed and reckless.

We wish the captain and his crew the best of luck in placing their ship in the service of peace. We wish the test crews, and later the crews in training, all success in their endeavors. Most of all, we wish that all Polaris missiles ever launched will be test missiles, and that never will one be sent on its way to destroy human life.

God bless the mission of the *Observation Island*. May it be a major factor in driving

the specter of war from our civilization; may it prove to be a milestone in our path to world peace.

Taking a Look at Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the following editorial from the Glendale News-Press to the attention of the membership. It is entitled "Taking a Look at Spending—Lawmakers Should Study Topic." I think all will find it of interest:

[From the Glendale News-Press, Jan. 19, 1959]

TAKING A LOOK AT SPENDING—LAWMAKERS SHOULD STUDY TOPIC

The first duty of lawmakers in Sacramento and Washington is to take a hard look at the extent and direction of government spending.

The first two-edged question that should be asked and answered in both capitals is what do we really need, and what can we prudently afford.

The key to sound and responsible fiscal practices lies in striking a balance between the reasonable needs and expectations of the people, and the financial ability of the State and national treasuries to pay for them without dipping further into red ink.

Until such a realistic appraisal is made and acted upon, talk of balanced budgets and an end to inflationary deficits is pure rhetoric.

There is a heartening indication that this approach will have influential backing in Sacramento.

Senator James J. McBride, Democrat of Ventura, the State's senior senator and head of the senate finance committee, says that California's budgetary problem should be approached, not merely from the standpoint of increasing taxes, but by a thorough study of all the State's spending programs and its revenue laws.

"I am not convinced," McBride said in commenting on Governor Brown's promise of higher taxes, "that the premise of funding existing programs is justified since all deficit estimates (\$195 million) are based on the same level and quality of service that is currently being provided by the State."

We recommend the same skepticism to our Washington lawmakers.

There is a point beyond which we cannot sanely go in providing bigger and bigger benefits to more and more people and projects without risking financial disaster.

Twenty-five years ago we had just one big Federal subsidy—\$250 million for highways.

Today, there are about 40 million people getting checks from the U.S. Treasury.

The States are beneficiaries of 62 programs of Federal grants totaling nearly \$5 billion yearly.

Individuals and businesses, including the housing industry, are indebted for Federal credit to the extent of \$80 billion.

All governments—Federal, State, and local—are in hock to the tune of nearly \$350 billion.

All private debts total \$850 billion.

All governments—Federal, State, and local—now spend \$145 billion a year.

All taxes now siphon off \$130 billion a year.

Ours is a wonderfully big and growing, rich and productive country.

But it is prudent to ask ourselves, and our lawmakers, where's the end of spending more money we don't have for many things we can do without.

The day of the political promise, the out-promise, and the superoutpromise has brought us to the question:

"How ridiculous can you get?"

The Boston University Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 8, 1959, Boston University's Sargent College, one of the oldest schools for physical education and physical therapy in the Nation, will hold opening exercises in its new building, gymnasium, and other facilities on the university's Charles River campus.

To commemorate this occasion, 11 members of the Sargent College faculty or staff, headed by Dean George K. Makechnie, have participated in a written symposium on the subject "Do Americans Have Sufficient Health and Energy in This Modern Era?"

Although it may be premature, I am enclosing one of the answers written by Elizabeth Wellman Gardner who has been on the faculty of the Sargent College since 1928. She was graduated from the Sargent School in 1926, received her B.S. in education and her Ed. M. from Boston University, and her M.A. and Ph. D. from Radcliffe College. She is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the New York Academy of Science, the Society for the Sigma Xi, and Delta Delta Delta.

Her answer follows:

Publications, both lay and professional, can have left little doubt in the public mind that the answer to our query is negative. How can this be true in a country whose standard of living, sanitation, and medical care are the best in the world, where one after another the major infectious diseases are being conquered, and where the average life expectancy is well over 60 years? For the same reason that our No. 1 killer is cardiovascular disease. Not only does the average American citizen fall short of optimal status in regard to circulatory health today, but he is likely to depart still further from desirable standards as the next decade proceeds. Why? Because the main cause of his circulatory inadequacy is lack of exercise—just plain lack of muscular exercise. And with industry bending ever greater efforts to develop more and more labor-saving devices, the situation can only worsen unless we do something about it.

Man, as an animal, is anatomically and physiologically designed for a life of vigorous physical activity. Had he been intended to live the sedentary life of automation (instead of animation) which he is increasingly adopting, he would never have developed an internal skeleton of linearly arranged bones with muscles whose attachments favor speed and range of movement. Nor would he have been equipped with specialized systems for

respiration, excretion, digestion, temperature regulation, and circulation to support the energy demands of activity. But these are a part of his biological inheritance. He is "stuck with them." They can only be maintained in optimal condition by constant use, by periodically and frequently being pushed beyond the meager limits of today's requirements. As their health falls, so does his. And of all these systems, the circulatory system is the most essential because the functions of the others rely upon it as their go-between. If it fails, all fail.

Man is, relatively speaking, one of the larger animals, but it is not his size which requires these specialized systems. The largest living things ever to exist on our planet are the giant redwood trees. Being incapable of movement, they need no digestive system to periodically process enough food to last till the next meal, nor respiratory system to make oxygen continually and quickly available to each cell in large amounts, nor excretory and temperature regulatory systems to eliminate the waste products of metabolism, nor a circulatory pump and muscular-walled vessels to maintain a pressure-flow circulation of blood. Yet, the same biochemical processes go on in the great tree as in man and animals, differing only in rate. It is muscle whose activity so increases the metabolic rate of animals; muscle whose imperative demands can suddenly multiply the energy needs of man's body by 20 to 40 times, or as suddenly drop it again to the resting level.

Man's circulatory system is marvelously designed to meet, from moment to moment, the large variations in metabolic requirements of the muscles. Delicately adjusted feedback mechanisms, the prototypes of modern engineering, maintain functional levels in such a dynamic equilibrium that they just meet the needs of the active muscles without wasteful overfunction. A marvelous interplay of acceleratory and inhibitory regulators, acting simultaneously, hold increases of heart rate, blood pressure and respiration down to a minimum appropriate to the needs of the moment.

Everyone knows that frequently repeated activity promotes strength and skill. The skeletal muscles and nervous system are not the only organs to profit from use, however. The heart muscle itself, the smooth muscles of the blood vessels, and the muscles of respiration are also strengthened so that they too can function with greater efficiency. In fact, it is only by daily vigorous use that these vital systems can be maintained in peak condition. Habits of inactivity result not only in atrophy of voluntary muscles, but in circulatory deterioration as well. The capacity of the heart to handle a sudden increase in blood volume diminishes insidiously until someday, under the stress of sudden exertion, the heart may fail, or a tiny blood vessel in the brain, its walls having lost their elasticity, may rupture and a man may lose his life or be condemned to a wheelchair.

Man must recognize his need for proper exercise as he has his need for proper nutrition. Exercise must be a part of each day's living. Specific provision must be deliberately made for it in the daily routine. It is hoped that doctors and educators will join physical educators in awakening the American public to an intelligent realization of the importance of daily exercise to our national health, and that governmental agencies will act to make adequate and easily accessible recreational facilities available to all. If, however, it should happen that physical activity, like vitamins, must be popularized by the propaganda of modern advertising, I hope that the manufacturers of sports equipment will outdo the producers of the lie-still-and-be-jiggled devices. In your exercise, I implore you, do it yourself.

Emancipation From Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post has pointed out that some insight into Cuba's present mood can be gained by glancing through the current issue of *Bohemia*, a respected Havana monthly, now on sale on some Washington newsstands.

Bohemia is printed in Spanish. It is regarded as a conservative magazine. I believe the following translation of *Bohemia's* lead editorial of January 11, 1959, does much to set the current Cuban situation in perspective.

The emerging democracy made possible by Fidel Castro and his followers has won the praise of the archbishop of Santiago. Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes' comments were carried in the *Catholic Standard* of January 23, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include both in the RECORD:

[From *Bohemia*, Jan. 11, 1959]

Bohemia's first word cannot be other than a word for the martyrs. Let us still for a moment our cries of joy, such justifiable joy. Let us not deliver ourselves entirely to the frenzy of our victory over the most repulsive and barbarous tyranny in the history of the Americas. We have a solemn debt toward the dead, and we must begin to pay it with a salute born of the heart that feels and the conscience that reflects. This is but the beginning of our tribute to the fallen.

We are tempted to affirm that it is necessary to go back to the living memory of the great collective sacrifice for independence carried on for 30 years by the Cuban people during the 19th century in order to find a parallel to the sinister period that has just ended. But on second thought we must correct ourselves and say that, notwithstanding the countless major calamities of that unforgettable historical period, the events of recent years are characterized by a blacker and more condemnable seal of cruelty.

In those days we fought against colonial despotism, against a regime controlled from Spain and defended by outsiders; this time native-born citizens fought against each other. In those days we were afflicted by a war during which Cuba's enemy often showed nobility and generosity; this time the defenders of the satrapy, though born in the same land and related by blood to the other people of the island, treated their fellow citizens as ferociously as the Nazi Gestapo and Hitler's army dealt with defeated nations.

The police of the tyrant Batista acted as an imported gendarme; Batista's army behaved as an occupation force in its own country. These monsters did not recognize human rights or feelings of brotherhood, did not have scruples over sex or age, did not respect prisoners. Defenseless civilian populations were subjected time and again to the most merciless bombing, as a punishment for their obvious sympathy for the rebel cause. The acts of genocide and the concentration camps were everyday facts in the horrendous strategy of Batista's militarism.

Crime ruled. The victims were a whole nation. The political leader, the professional, the heroic child, the priest and the

mason, the student, the housewife, the professor and the workman, the farmer and the urban dweller, contributed their bloody quota of martyrs to the holocaust. History was written in blood, justice was frighteningly subverted; Cain and Abel were multiplied to the infinite.

Now the 7 years of infamy and death unload their unspeakable burden on the new year—which auspiciously begins with emancipation from tyranny—Bohemia rises to remember our dead, our most sacred memory, and to pledge the best it can offer, the determination to carry out without yielding the mandate ensuing from their sacrifice.

[From Catholic Standard, Jan. 23, 1959]

CATHOLICS BACKING CASTRO SEE EXECUTIONS JUSTIFIED

SANTIAGO, CUBA.—The archbishop of Santiago has praised the revolutionary triumph of Fidel Castro and his followers and called upon the country's new government to improve the lives of the people.

Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes made 9 reform proposals in a 2,650-word letter read in all of the churches of Oriente Province, the birthplace of Mr. Castro's 26th of July movement.

He called the overthrow of the former government a triumph gained by the valiant followers of Mr. Castro. The leader himself was praised as a man of exceptional qualities.

Archbishop Perez Serantes listed the achievement of his nine points—which are mainly concerned with social justice and clean government—as the second stage of the revolution. The first stage, the overthrow itself and the installation of a new government, was "glorious, but is now closed," he said.

The social encyclicals of two Popes, Leo XIII and Pius XI, were cited in the archbishop's list of principles to be achieved by the new Cuban President, Manuel Urrutia, and his government.

The prelate recommended that the Government follow Leo XIII's "Immortal Dei"—on the Christian constitution of states—and "Rerum Novarum"—on the condition of the working classes. He also suggested that it follow Pius XI's "Quadragesimo Anno"—on social reconstruction—in providing Cuba with a new order.

"If Dr. Fidel Castro and Dr. Manuel Urrutia and the rest of the cooperators . . . inspire themselves with these principles . . . they will have deserved well from God and country," the archbishop said, adding:

"Should they not do this and should we revert [to the former type of government] then little will have been accomplished in spite of everything done by these new men, in whom the large majority of Cuban people have deposited their trust."

In Havana a Catholic publication said executions of ousted dictator Fulgencio Batista's agents were conducted in line with a military code providing strict guarantees of justice.

It added that the shooting of "a few hundred guilty persons" was "mild punishment" in view of all the "horrible things" that took place under the fallen dictator's 6-year regime.

The influential weekly La Quincena denied that the executions ordered by the military courts of revolutionary leader Fidel Castro constituted acts of political retaliation. The denial came from the magazine's own director, Franciscan Father Ignacio Blain.

NO CIVILIANS EXECUTED

The Catholic publication, noted during the years of the uprising for its condemnations of rebel terrorism and government reprisals alike, stated that all persons sentenced to death were convicted of common law crimes.

It said that no civilians had been executed, but only members of dictator Batista's

secret police and armed forces "who were clearly men stained with serious crimes."

Revolutionary leaders have been quoted as saying that under Batista's regime some 20,000 persons, including women and children, were tortured or killed by the fallen dictator's agents. Supporting this view, the magazine said:

"The chain of murders was so long and the men who committed them so well known that we can easily assert that the testimony of witnesses (at the trials) was backed by truth, devoid of a spirit of vengeance, and above all free of unjust accusations."

The magazine noted that the revolutionary courts established in Santiago and other cities were the same tribunals operated by the rebels during Castro's 2-year-long uprising.

It declared that "although summary" the trials of Batista agents were conducted in such a way as to insure that sentences were handed down "with strict justice." The magazine added:

"When the world will have become fully acquainted with all the horrible things that occurred in Cuba during the past 6 years the executions of a few hundred guilty persons will seem to be mild punishment."

Address by Hon. George H. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of last September, at the Union League Club in Philadelphia, a very striking and interesting ceremonial was performed in the formal presentation of a Scottish claymore—the long-time and most effective fighting weapon of the Highlanders—to the 11th Infantry, Pennsylvania National Guard. This was upon the 210th anniversary of the organization of the Black Watch, the widely famed military unit of the British Army, with Scottish background. Also, the occasion particularly commemorated the association of the Black Watch with the 11th Infantry on a battlefield in North America; that is to say, 195 years before, during the French and Indian wars. The 3d Battalion, the Black Watch of Canada, is allied with the parent Black Watch organization, which has more than two centuries of gallant military history behind it, and its allied units.

The presentation was made for all ranks of the Black Watch; and on behalf of the 11th Infantry—itself of a brilliant fighting record—the acceptance was made by our very popular Assistant Secretary of the Army, Hon. George H. Roderick, in a concise, able, and most interesting and informative address.

Pennsylvanians have every reason to be proud of their colonial history, and Secretary Roderick's reference thereto is especially appreciated.

Believing that the address is well worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave granted, I now include it as a part of these remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. RODERICK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, CEREMONIAL MESS, 111TH INFANTRY, UNION LEAGUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 13, 1958

I am honored to receive in behalf of the U.S. Army this Scottish claymore which is so beautifully inscribed, "Presented to the 11th Infantry on the occasion of its 210th anniversary by all ranks of the Black Watch."

I am happy that the presentation of this claymore, a weapon symbolic of the soldierly tradition of the Scots, can be made before members of the Black Watch of Canada. Indeed, it is to commemorate the association of your allied regiment in the British Army with the 11th Infantry on a North American battlefield 195 years ago that this presentation is made. We deeply appreciate this thoughtful gesture on the part of Her Majesty, the Queen Mother, Colonel in Chief of the Regiment, and all ranks of the Black Watch.

I should like to take this opportunity now to add my expression of welcome to the officers and wives of the Third Battalion, the Black Watch of Canada. I consider it a singular distinction that your battalion commander, Lt. Col. William Wood is one of only two men to occupy the chair which, for almost 200 years, has been reserved at this ceremonial mess for the regimental commander of the Black Watch or his designate. This honor accorded your commander is also a tribute to each of you in the organization.

The Black Watch of the British Army, whose commander you represent here tonight, Colonel Wood, is held in highest esteem by the many Americans who are familiar with its history. This is true because the regiment has participated with distinction in significant military campaigns in many parts of the world beginning in 1743 with the War of Austrian Succession. Units of the Black Watch have through the years perpetuated the great traditions of soldiering which characterized the ancient Scots. One has only to review the battle honors of the regiment to see how the valor of the brave men who have worn your traditional uniform have contributed to great victories that have often shaped the course of history. Waterloo, Sevastopol, the Marne, the Hindenburg Line, are some of the battles in which the Black Watch won honors. In World War II and Korea, the regiment continued its outstanding record of valor.

The Black Watch of Canada has carried on the fine traditions of its Allied regiment in Britain since its organization in 1862. Today, I understand, it is the oldest Highland regiment in any Dominion of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It too has won many battle honors, including such campaigns as South Africa (1899-1900), Ypres, Passchendaele, Hindenburg Line, France, and Flanders. The traditions of the Black Watch have been perpetuated by the splendid record of achievement of your regiment.

It is a significant fact—a fact which all of us here tonight should know—that one of the first campaigns fought by the Black Watch, and for which it won battle honors, was in North America during the French and Indian wars. In a series of actions at Fort Pitt and at Bushy Run in that year detachments of the Black Watch were joined by companies of rangers or provincials. Numbered among these provincials were the associators, an outgrowth of Franklin's Associators, organized by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia in 1747. It is to this organization founded by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia that the 11th Infantry Regiment traces its ancestry. It is also a significant fact that the action at Bushy Run in which the antecedents of the Black Watch and the 11th Infantry fought side by side resulted in a resounding victory.

I shall not attempt to review this evening the splendid chapter which the 111th Infantry has written in American history. The battle honors which have already been extolled here tonight are sufficient evidence of a magnificent record of achievement. But there is one aspect of this fine record which I would like to note. The 111th Infantry has maintained well the great American tradition of the citizen-soldier. From the earliest days of our history this Nation has maintained a small Regular Army and has relied upon its reserve of citizen-soldiers to form the bulk of our fighting forces in time of war. The record of the 111th Infantry with its many battle honors has exemplified the highest order of performance of the citizen-soldier in the defense of his country. America has always been proud of its citizens whose patriotism and love of country prompt them to take the time from their civilian occupations to maintain their military readiness to defend their country in time of war. I commend each of you this evening for your contribution to the defense of your country by your service in this great National Guard unit of the State of Pennsylvania. And, General Biddle, it is particularly pleasant for me to say to you, the adjutant general of Pennsylvania, distinguished soldier and statesman and admired personal friend, that the Department of the Army holds this service in highest terms of regard and pride.

The tradition of the citizen-soldier is likewise maintained in Canada by you gentlemen of the 3d Battalion. I understand that one of the outstanding features of your regiment in Canada has been the tremendous family spirit which has been present since its founding in 1862. Successive generations of officers and men from the same families have served both at home and abroad, in the same tradition that prompted the building of the parent unit in Scotland in 1739. We in America are very cognizant of the efforts which you are making to prepare yourselves as citizen-soldiers and appreciative of the importance of those efforts to the defense of your country and of the free world.

Knowing, then, the history of the Black Watch, it is with great pride that I accept this claymore in behalf of the United States and the U.S. Army. I accept it not only as a token of friendship and respect but also as a symbol of the fighting spirit and rugged character of the ancient Scot who used it as his primary weapon. It is this fighting spirit of the ancient Scot typified by his fierce loyalty to those he loved, his intense pride, his indomitable will, his determination never to yield to his enemies, that forms the basis of the Scottish tradition. In the U.S. Army we have always prided ourselves that our soldiers have been imbued with many of the characteristics of the great Scottish warriors. I hope that this Scottish claymore will serve to remind us again of the value in war of the individual soldier. For I say again, as many of the military leaders of the U.S. Army have said, that even in this age of the thermonuclear weapon a most essential prerequisite for victory on the battlefield is the fighting spirit of the individual soldier.

In this Scottish claymore I see an analogy. In its construction as a two-edged sword, the claymore can be said to be symbolic of the fighting forces of our two countries, the United States and Canada. Each force, like an edge of the sword, is capable of inflicting separate damage upon our enemies, but like the claymore, these fighting forces are welded together operationally by single direction. Thus we in the United States and Canada along with Great Britain and our other allies have joined forces in NATO and are, with unity of purpose, directing our efforts in a common cause, the defense of freedom.

With knowledge then of the great symbolism and tradition associated with the Scottish claymore and with awareness of the deep significance of the expression of friendship on behalf of all ranks of the Black Watch. I turn over this claymore to the commanding officer of the 111th Infantry. Colonel White, I charge you in behalf of the U.S. Army to maintain this symbol as a cherished possession. Let it continue through the years to remind you to preserve the great traditions for which it stands and which have been the guiding spirit of your great regiment for over 200 years. Let it also serve to remind all of us of the strength that comes when great nations such as ours are united in common purpose and motivated by a common tradition. With the strength which abounds from such friendship we can truly say in the words of the motto the Black Watch of Canada, "No one strikes me without fear."

Interest on the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an informative article written by Sylvia Porter, appearing in the Boston Herald of January 26, 1959, relating to the tremendous increase of interest and money paid on the national debt. Few persons seem to know of and appreciate that this large increase has taken place as a result of the policies of the present administration.

There is another aspect of this policy of high interest which could have been avoided and that is the effect upon the market value of Government bonds of prior issues with a smaller rate of interest, the sharp drop in the market value of such bonds.

TEN CENTS OF EVERY DOLLAR OF TAXES GOES FOR INTEREST

(By Sylvia Porter)

A full 10 cents of every dollar you and I and America's businessmen will pay in Federal taxes in the new year will go just to meet interest due during the 12 months to owners of U.S. Government securities.

This is a slice of the budget second only to that taken by the catchall "major national security." It dwarfs the 7 cents of every dollar going for all veterans' services and benefits, tops the 8 cents of every dollar going for all farm programs.

Of the billions we'll be pouring into the Federal Treasury in the year starting in mid-1959, more than \$8 billion will be automatically set aside for public debt interest.

This is a total which defies comprehension. It represents a new peak in the cost of carrying the debt, compares with an annual interest load of \$1 billion as recently as 1940.

When World War II ended and we toted up the cost of that global conflict in dollars, we found that war borrowing had pushed the national debt close to \$280 billion.

CRIES FOR EXPLAINING

The yearly payment made by the U.S. Treasury to holders of that massive amount of I.O.U.'s, was only around \$4.7 billion, though.

Today the national debt is around \$282.7 billion, not much higher than at the close of World War II.

But the yearly payment by the U.S. Treasury to holders of today's massive amount of I.O.U.'s, is over \$8 billion—an upsurge of more than 70 percent.

It's a tale that cries out for explaining, for while there will be countless headlines about the coming congressional debates on spending for farm supports, veterans' benefits, housing, foreign aid, etc., there will be little noise about this far bigger chunk of spending.

And the reason is that Congress cannot do a thing about this expense. Once the Treasury has pledged to pay a specified interest rate to a buyer of its obligations, it must pay that rate for the life of the obligation. It cannot cut the interest rate while the I.O.U. is outstanding. Of course, it can default on a note. When the President, in his budget message, estimated \$8.1 billion for debt interest alone in the 1959-60 fiscal year, he wasn't exaggerating one bit.

What has been happening? A key point about what has been happening is that it has not been an accidental swelling in spending. Rather, it has been the result of deliberate policies adopted at the highest policymaking levels in Washington.

First, the Federal Reserve System has been encouraging rising interest rates across the board through most of this decade. In simplest words, the theory has been: "Higher costs of borrowing money will restrict speculative activities by curbing marginal borrowing, and this will help restrain price rises. When business is swinging upward, the costs of borrowing money should properly go up too. Only when business is declining should we expect lower borrowing costs."

INCREASE IMPROVED

Second, under President Eisenhower, the heads of the Treasury have not fought the higher borrowing costs—as did the Treasury chiefs under President Roosevelt and President Truman. In simplest words, the position of the Treasury in this era has been: "The Treasury should not get special protection against a general rise in borrowing costs. The Treasury is just another borrower competing for available funds, and it should compete as others do—meaning the Treasury must pay the price (the interest rate) demanded by lenders for cash."

The result of these policies has been that as the Treasury has borrowed new cash in recent years and replaced maturing I.O.U.'s with new ones, it has paid higher and higher rates.

In World War II the going interest rate on long-term U.S. bonds was 2½ percent a year—and the Treasury borrowed billions from us at that level.

Today the going rate on long-term U.S. bonds is over 4 percent a year—and the Treasury can't get much cash even at that rate.

Sure, the United States can afford today's debt and interest load—but that doesn't make \$8 billion a year in interest alone any less staggering. What's more, the top of the debt or the interest cost is not yet in sight.

The President's Message on the Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I have examined carefully the President's message on the agricultural program and the

supporting memorandum of Secretary Benson, both of which were submitted to Congress today. The message and the memorandum reflect careful and thorough study by able and well-informed specialists. In my judgment the recommendations so presented are wise and constructive and I hope they will all be enacted into law promptly.

An Amendment Clarifying the Intent of the Outdoor Advertising Control Section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today an amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act to clarify the intent of Congress regarding the regulation of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. My amendment proposes to make it clear beyond any doubt that Congress intended to regulate—not prohibit—advertising along this great new network of roads.

Furthermore, my amendment insures that any such regulation must be fair and reasonable, and must not be prohibition in disguise.

What has made the introduction and the adoption of this amendment absolutely essential is the fact that the regulations, as they exist today, do constitute prohibition.

This unfortunate situation—posing a substantial threat to a large portion of our economy—was created by the Department of Commerce when it wrote the regulations. That agency completely misinterpreted the intent of Congress. Instead of regulation, the Commerce Department interpreted the act passed by the 85th Congress last year to mean prohibition and wrote a set of rules accordingly.

These rules are known as national standards for the display of outdoor advertising. Unless the proposed amendment is adopted, there is nothing to prevent the national standards issued last November 10 by former Secretary of Commerce Weeks from continuing in full force and effect.

Such an eventuality would work a great injustice upon the outdoor advertising business, which is a thoroughly legitimate and necessary business that helps promote our economy. We should not permit an administrative agency to flout the intent of Congress and injure such a business. It is therefore essential that prompt action be taken by this House to right the wrong that has been done.

For the benefit of the Members who are not familiar with this legislation, I will briefly review it. It has been customary every 2 years for Congress to pass a Federal Aid Highway Act, the most important provisions of which au-

thorize appropriations for road construction for the ensuing 2 years. The latest of such acts became the law on April 16, 1958—Public Law 85-381—and is known as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958. It included a section 122 entitled "Areas Adjacent to the Interstate System." Section 122 has been incorporated into the codification of the Federal Aid Highway Acts, title 23 of the Code, and is now known as section 131. I will refer to it as section 131.

This section declares it to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way of the Interstate System should be regulated. It further provides that the regulation must be consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. These standards are to include only four types of signs. After the adoption of the standards, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with the State highway departments to carry out the national policy. Any State that enters into such an agreement is entitled under this section to have its share of the Federal aid, payable on account of any project on the Interstate System, to be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost of the project. That, in brief, summarizes the pertinent provisions of section 131.

Section 131 uses the word "regulate." It does not use the word "prohibit." In fact, one of the earlier bills upon which section 131 was based did use the word "prohibit." This word was stricken from the compromise measure which formed the basis of section 131 as finally adopted.

Indeed, the sponsors of this legislation declared frequently during Senate debate last year that the purpose of the act was to regulate and not prohibit outdoor advertising.

For example, on last March 25, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator GORE said:

The bill does not provide for prohibition, either by States or by the Federal Government.

Senator NEUBERGER said on March 24 that—and I quote again from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

If State law authorizes the kinds of signs mentioned in the third and fourth classes of subsection (a), the standards promulgated by the Secretary may only contain reasonable regulation of them, not total prohibition.

Mr. Speaker, what could be clearer as to legislative intent? But did the Secretary of Commerce need this mandate? No; he went several steps beyond.

Allow me to cite some specific examples from the national standards. Take section 20.10 titled "State Regulations." This section reads:

A State may elect to prohibit signs permissible under the standards in this part without forfeiting its rights to any benefits provided for in the act.

I ask you, is this a standard of regulation? No. It is nothing more than a gratuitous invitation on the part of the

Secretary of Commerce for the States to prohibit advertising completely. Quite plainly this section tells the States that they may prohibit a legitimate business and still get their bonus. They will be paid for complete prohibition.

Only the most technical of interpretations of the wording of the act could justify the Secretary in making a payment for prohibition, or for that matter, to even invite prohibition.

Let us look at it this way. If Congress had intended to make the bonus payable for straight prohibition, then why did not Congress say so right in the law? Since this was not the intent of Congress, why then should it be allowed to stand as part of the national standards?

There are other—more direct provisions in the national standards leading to prohibition. Section 20.6 of the standards authorizes what it calls informational sites. Where one of these sites was constructed, all commercial signs would be prohibited for 12 miles in either direction.

This, too, is a gratuitous addition to the law. If you read section 131 of the Highway Code you will find no mention whatsoever of informational sites. Furthermore, at the time the act was being debated in Congress last year there was no mention or suggestion that informational sites should be established along interstate highways.

As a matter of fact, the first reference in Congress concerning these sites did not come until May 13 of last year, nearly a month after the law was enacted. On that day Senator NEUBERGER put forth the idea. The Commerce Department promptly grabbed it as an easy way to make it appear as though outdoor advertising were being permitted, when in actual practice informational sites would prohibit it.

The Commerce Department envisions these sites as being pull-offs from the highway where a number of small commercial signs are displayed on big boards, like a directory. Motorists would even have to get out of their cars to read them.

Now the purpose of outdoor advertising is to convey a message to persons as they move about from one place to another—walking, driving a car, riding a train, et cetera. This is the historical, commonly understood, and generally accepted concept of the meaning and purpose of outdoor advertising.

If one took a classified telephone directory and hung it on a post out of doors, we would not have outdoor advertising. By the same token, informational sites are not outdoor advertising. Because they would no more fulfill the true function of outdoor advertising than a telephone directory hanging from a post along the highway.

I might point out that there is no such thing as an informational site in existence in this country today.

Certainly, if there were any utilitarian advantage to such a device, some State would have constructed one by now.

Another provision of the national standards which leads to the virtual prohibition of outdoor advertising is the one contained in subparagraph (b) of

section 20.7. This prohibits signs within 2 miles in advance of an interchange. The latest figure that I have been able to obtain from the Bureau of Roads indicates that interchanges on the Interstate System will be on the average about 3½ miles apart. While it can be said with accuracy, that this regulation does not absolutely prohibit all signs, it also can be said with equal accuracy that it prohibits so many signs that it will act as a practical prohibition.

Furthermore, there is practical prohibition in the size limitation set by the Secretary on the few signs which are permissible. He has decreed that the maximum size shall be 150 square feet, which would allow for a 10- by 15-foot sign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this restriction would exclude one whole segment of the outdoor advertising business, the segment known as the standardized outdoor advertising industry.

This advertising medium, as it is called, many years ago standardized its signs at 300 square feet, a fact, I daresay, that is well known by the Secretary. Yet, he wrote the standards so that standardized outdoor advertising would be prohibited.

I ask you, Is this reasonable regulation to make a raw discrimination against an established industry which has earned its niche in the economy? No. It is prohibition by regulation, just as the other facts and figures show that I have presented.

Prohibition of alcohol was tried once in this country. It was a failure. Prohibition is not the way of a democracy. It is an exercise of tyranny. Let us live up to the spirit of democracy and not be tyrants. Once the door is open to prohibition of legitimate business for purely esthetic reasons, where will it be stopped? Perhaps other groups will criticize and then try to abolish other types of structures for esthetic reasons. Certainly there is room for great differences of opinion. What is a pleasing attractive structure to one, may be completely unattractive and unpleasing to others. Are we to turn over to an administrative agency the power to prohibit a legitimate business on such unstable grounds? Shall we permit a precedent that may leave the door wide open for the prohibition of other legitimate businesses in the future according to the whims of an articulate minority?

In conclusion, section 131 authorizes the appropriation of several hundreds of millions of dollars to be paid to the States for the regulation of outdoor advertising. The Secretary of Commerce, through his promulgation of the national standards, has authorized the pouring out of these millions for a very different purpose, that is, as a bonus to those States which completely prohibit outdoor advertising or which adopt the national standards which require a virtual prohibition of outdoor advertising. In my opinion, no bill that called for paying these millions for a complete prohibition could have passed Congress. The national standards go far beyond the intent of Congress. The only way to carry out the intent of Congress is to

pass the proposed bill, which will make it clear beyond all shadow of doubt that it is a regulatory, not a prohibitory, bill, and which will require new national standards that are not confiscatory, but fair and reasonable, and permit the continuation of a legitimate business which benefits this economy.

The Education of Our Children Is of National Concern, and if They Are Not Educated Properly, It Is a National Calamity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower said at his White House press conference on July 31, 1957, that:

The education of our children is of national concern and if they are not educated properly it is a national calamity.

Fred M. Hechinger, a past president of the Education Writers Association, wrote an article which he titled the "Five Basic Problems of Education" and which appeared as the lead article in the New York Times magazine of January 25, 1959. The New York Times is to be congratulated for its generosity in giving so much space to a discussion of this vital subject by a former education editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

It must be said of Mr. Hechinger's article, I think, that it almost entirely ignores the vital point that inadequate pay is the fundamental reason why better people do not become teachers and why so many competent people leave the profession. This view was expressed repeatedly by the many distinguished witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress.

Similarly, the Rockefeller report on education (p. 25) declares that:

The root problem of the teaching profession remains financial . . . until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profession to attract its full share of the available range of talents. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially.

Since Mr. Hechinger's article is in all other respects such a timely and incisive discussion of American education, I include it for the information of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced three major bills designed to assist in solving the basic problems of education. H.R. 284 would amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for 20,000 national defense scholarships and for other purposes.

President Eisenhower called for 10,000 scholarships during the 85th Congress. The House provided these but they were dropped by the Senate.

A preference for science and mathematics written into the National Defense Education Act would be modified by H.R. 284 to give equal weight to the other disciplines including the humanities.

Repeal of the loyalty oath is provided in the H.R. 284, however the measure also calls for an affirmative oath of allegiance. Many educational leaders believe the present requirement of a loyalty oath, applying as it does to a large number of young people and teachers, is thoroughly harmful since it singles out people in education as objects of suspicion. Further, the present act tragically stifles the free exchange of ideas in the classroom and leads to complete stultification of the educational process.

My second bill, H.R. 965, provides financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries.

Federal grants to the States would be on the basis of each State's school-age population and would amount to \$25 per child during the first year, \$50 the second, \$75 the third, and \$100 for the fourth and succeeding years. Written into the bill is the assurance that no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration of any school or school system. To make sure that the States and local school districts do not slacken their own efforts, the bill provides for a reduction of the grants if a State's educational program is below the national average. The effective date of this reduction provision would be delayed for 3 years to give State legislatures two sessions to work on their programs.

Federal officials have estimated that we are short 140,000 classrooms and 135,000 teachers. It is a shocking thing to realize that only one-half cent of every Federal tax dollar goes to support public schools. This must be compared with the 43 cents out of every local tax dollar and the 31 cents out of every State tax dollar which goes to public education. Our schoolchildren must have the support of the one level of government which to date has been resting on its oars where education is concerned—the Federal Government. It is time that we began putting first things first. A nation which does not put a top priority on education will not remain a first-class power very long. At the present time we have launched a multi-billion-dollar Federal roadbuilding program; we spend \$40 billion plus on defense, and several million dollars apiece for our missiles. Our citizens spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year on liquor, tobacco, advertising, automobiles, and other luxuries. Our materialistic culture can and it must find funds for education which is essential to our survival as a free nation.

My third bill, H.R. 2440, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private

giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

The following letter explains the purposes of H.R. 2440 in detail:

JANUARY 23, 1959.

Mr. EDMUND J. GLEAZER,
Executive Director, American Association of
Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. GLEAZER: I have your letter expressing interest in my bill, H.R. 2440, to provide increased incentives for private giving to colleges and universities, and asking for a statement regarding it.

This measure follows the recommendations of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the resolution adopted by the Association of American Colleges at its convention in Miami, Fla., last year. Many other organizations have called for increased private giving including the Council for Financial Aid to Education, the National Planning Association, and the recently established Independent College Funds of America consisting of 40 State and regional organizations representing 467 colleges and universities. Most corporations and individuals conspicuously fail to contribute the sums permitted under the present tax laws. In fact, it is the failure of the present tax laws to realize the sums necessary which has led to H.R. 2440 and the other bills in the Congress to increase private and public funds for educational purposes.

H.R. 2440 would allow a taxpayer a credit against income tax for charitable contributions made to institutions of higher education. In the case of an individual taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be the same as the present limit on the deduction for charitable contributions. H.R. 2440 would not give him a tax benefit with respect to more contributions than he may now include for deduction purposes alone; he may elect to treat a charitable contribution (if it is to an educational institution) as a credit rather than as a deduction, but the total of credit plus deduction is no greater than the present allowable total of deductions.

In the case of a corporate taxpayer, the limit on this credit would be increased from 5 percent to 10 percent of taxable income (where the percentage-of-taxable-income method of computing the limit is used), and this credit would be in addition to the deduction presently allowed for charitable contributions generally; a corporation may elect to treat charitable contributions to educational institutions as credits rather than as deductions (up to 10 percent) without cutting into the amount of such contributions (along with other types of charitable contributions) which may be allowed as deductions. Of course, the same contribution cannot be counted as a credit and a deduction.

Under H.R. 2440 the taxpayer would be allowed a 2-year carryover on the credit just as he is presently allowed a 2-year carryover for deduction purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to prescribe regulations governing the time and manner of making the election to treat a contribution as a credit rather than a deduction and imposing conditions to ensure the effective correlation of the new credit section with the existing deduction provisions.

I am sending along two copies of H.R. 2440 for your use.

Cordially yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

FIVE BASIC PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Ever since the cold war moved into outer space, the American people have been concerned about education. No longer is the sky the limit; even the moon is only a

whistlestop. And in the futuristic contest, the classrooms are the launching platform.

Hardly a week passes without several television programs peering behind the scenes of education. Not long ago, a broadcaster cornered a few high school students, and their deplorable ignorance set off a national storm of criticism. The Rockefeller report on education got top billing on the front pages of even small-town dailies. Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, received a sympathetic public ear when he proclaimed that, if the money for education could not be found in the Federal budget, the defense appropriation should be cut.

President Eisenhower appointed a special Committee on Education Beyond High School. The Ford Foundation made the largest gift in the history of private philanthropy for the increase of professors' salaries. James Bryant Conant, Harvard's former president, has devoted the past 2 years to an attempt to find out what is wrong with American high school education. In fact, the Conant report, which is set for publication next Wednesday, has already stirred up more excitement than many Government white papers.

Everybody is concerned about education; but education is an elusive, amorphous thing. Before it can be understood and improved, some of the crucial problems must be singled out and defined. As an observer of the educational scene, I have visited classrooms, talked with teachers, listened to parents, sat through speeches and conventions, scanned the statistics and studied the reports.

Let me set down what seem the five most immediate problems; then let us see what the experts recommend.

THE PROBLEM

1. How can American standards of education be raised, and what, especially, can be done to meet the challenge of the exceptionally gifted child?

American democracy promises every child a full elementary and secondary education, but the unanswered question has always been how to do this without surrendering to the lowest common denominator. Our educational *laissez-faire*, which permits even able students to pick elective snap courses, has allowed standards to slip.

The raising of educational standards for the great mass of students would mean a spectacular improvement in the country's total reservoir of skills. But what about the small number of exceptionally gifted children—the top 2 percent? The talents of these, if lost, are irreplaceable. In terms of the country's progress and of competitive coexistence in a cold war period, they may well hold the key.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

There is almost unanimous agreement that the search for quality in a system of quantity rates first attention. To cope with the problem of a curriculum which has been loaded down with an almost unlimited variety of subjects from driver education to citizenship training, the Rockefeller report, entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence," demands that "we reach some agreement on priorities in subject matter." Educators are asked to make up their minds which of the many elective courses are most important.

The Conant report will go a step further. It will clearly demand that all high school students complete 4 years of English, 3 to 4 years of history and related social studies, 1 year of mathematics and 1 year of science. Students in the top 20 percent would take 3 additional years of science, 3 more years of mathematics and at least 3 years of 1 foreign language.

For all students there must be improved guidance. Dr. Conant asks for 1 guidance

counselor for every 250 to 300 high school students. And, in order to assure adequate programs and facilities, he asks for elimination, through consolidation, of all high schools with graduating classes of fewer than 100 students.

All proposals for the improvement of education demand a greater sense of continuity of subjects and a greater scope of understanding. Study of a foreign language for less than 3 years, says Dr. Conant, is like drilling for oil and then stopping before striking it. In the study of history, too, efforts are largely wasted unless there is a sense of the natural sequence of events.

For the 2 percent of gifted pupils, even more of a concession to the difference in human talent must be made. "A school system that insists on the same instruction for the talented, average and below average child," said Rear Admiral Rickover, "may prevent as many children from growing intellectually as would a system that excludes children because of the social, political or economic status of their parents. Neither system is democratic."

The experts agree. "Any educational system is, among other things, a great sorting-out process," says the Rockefeller report. But while the European sorting out is achieved almost entirely by impersonal examinations, the American experts call for a variety of tests, some scoring native talent, others the actual achievement of the student, with personal observation and guidance. Once the gifted students are recognized, the experts want them to be given advanced work, without separating them from their classmates.

Toward the end of high school the extra work would be increased. Thus, juniors and seniors would be offered college-level instruction in some subjects, as they now are under the advanced placement program sponsored by the college-entrance examination board. Another program for early admission to college, initiated by the Fund for the Advancement of Education and hailed by all the experts, has sent more than 1,000 gifted students to college during the past 5 years without completion of the last year or two of high school.

THE PROBLEM

2. How can we get better teachers?

There is no way to improve the quality of American education without an adequate supply of good teachers. Already a serious shortage of highly educated manpower exists. This shortage will become increasingly critical unless we find enough of what the Ford Foundation calls the seed corn—teachers who, through their superior efforts, help to raise new generations of educated brains.

Perhaps even worse, the standards set for the teachers are often pitifully low. For example, at a convention in Bowling Green, Ohio, recently, an education spokesman demanded that chemistry teachers be given at least 32 hours of college study in that subject. A Russian student in a college-preparatory high school, by comparison, gets more than 340 hours of chemistry before graduation.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

"No educational system can be better than its teachers," warns the Rockefeller report. It estimates that the number of new teachers needed in the next decade is somewhere between one-third and one-half of all college graduates in that period. The present ratio of college graduates entering the teaching profession is only one out of every four or five. And yet, even today, the report warns, the problem of quality is critical. As of 1956, 33 percent of all elementary teachers did not hold an A.B. degree, while more than 21 percent of all public school teachers had less than 4 years of college.

Since the training of all teachers depends on the quality of the training of

college teachers, there is special significance in a report by the National Education Association that "since 1953-54, holders of the doctor's degree among newly employed, full-time [college] teachers have decreased 25.2 percent." And the manpower pressures of the immediate future may make this situation even worse.

The Rockefeller report calls for an improvement in the courses and training procedures given teachers. "If the programs for the preparation of teachers are rigid, formalistic and shallow, they will drive away minds as fast as they are recruited," it warns. "Unhappily, preparation for precollege teaching has come all too close to that condition."

The report warns against the practice of handling teachers as "interchangeable units in an educational assembly line." At present, "the best teacher and the poorest in a school may teach the same grade and subject, use the same textbook, handle the same number of students, get paid the same salaries, and rise in salary at the same speed to the same ceiling." The ironic result is that school administration—and the end of active teaching—often becomes the only refuge for able teachers who want to advance their careers.

The problem of getting a sufficient number of teachers is primarily one of recruiting and of offering an attractive career. "But even with aggressive recruitment there appears to be little or no likelihood that we can bring into teaching at any level anything approaching the number of qualified and gifted teachers we need," says the Rockefeller report. "We must therefore utilize our superior teachers more effectively."

All the experts agree that, in the words of the Rockefeller report, "one way to make better use of the ablest teachers is to eliminate many of the petty tasks which occupy a teacher's time. Less highly trained classroom assistants may accomplish much in the lightening of this burden." The Fund for the Advancement of Education, putting this theory to the test in Bay City, Mich., found it successful, and it has spread from there to many communities across the country. A bonus, it was found, came when many of the aides, seeing teaching at its best, became so interested that they went back to college to get their teacher training.

Other experiments have been sparked by the success of the first one. The use of teams of teachers, made up of 1 master teacher, 1 regular teacher, and 1 untrained assistant has made it possible to increase the class size for some subjects to 3 times a normal classroom quota, while, at other times, permitting 1 teacher to work with only 8 to 12 pupils. The use of television has also made it possible to get more of the best teachers into contact with more students.

THE PROBLEM

3. Should we emphasize science as against the liberal arts?

However we respond to the challenge of Sputnik or speculate about the importance of moon shoots, one fact is inescapable—science and technology are intimately linked with modern man's destiny.

Traditionally, there used to be a clear dividing line between the liberal arts and the sciences. The high school student who thought he had no interest in a career of science frequently was allowed to get by with a minimum of mathematics and science instruction. Reports about the Russian schools, which go to the opposite extreme of requiring a stiff dose of science and mathematics for all high school students, have intensified the problem of just how much science training should be required of every high school graduate.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

The experts agree on two fundamental points: (1) that, despite the panic headlines, science must not crowd out the humanities; (2) that it is vital for all students, not just the scientifically inclined, to have a thorough measure of basic mathematics and science.

On the first point, the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School says that the country "would be inexcusably blind if it failed to see that the challenge of the next 20 years will require leaders not only in science and engineering and in business and industry, but in government and politics, in foreign affairs and diplomacy, in education and civic affairs."

On the second point, Dr. I. I. Rabi, Nobel Prize physicist and chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, says: "We must teach science as an intellectual pursuit rather than as a body of tricks." And he adds: "As yet, if a man has no feeling for art he is considered narrow-minded, but if he has no feeling for science, he is considered quite normal. This is a fundamental weakness."

Probably the greatest waste of scientific talent stems from social clichés which discourage girls from studying science and mathematics as "unladylike." Dr. Conant found that, even in the best high schools, fewer than half of the gifted girls elect 4 years of mathematics.

The experts agree that it is not a question of "either-or" between science and the liberal arts. The Rockefeller report warns as much against the narrowly trained scientist as against the educated man who is illiterate in science.

THE PROBLEM

4. Who should go to college?

Already more than 3 million young Americans are enrolled in college—a total of one-third of the eligible age group. Is universal college the next step, following the universal high school? Some State universities have, in practice, accepted this principle; they consider a high school diploma an automatic admission ticket. Other college spokesmen warn against the danger of indiscriminate admission policies as an invitation to lowered standards. They are, however, more concerned that rising costs will price the colleges out of the market for many able students.

One fact is clear: Even if the present policy of selection is continued, most colleges would have to double or triple in size by 1975 in order to accommodate the same percentage of students who go to college today.

No expert wants to restrict college admission, but all would like to see standards raised so that the restrictions could be built into the procedure of selection. They applaud current trends in that direction. They cite the announcement by the University of Illinois that by September 1960 its freshmen will no longer be nursed along in remedial English courses. They point with approval to more than a dozen colleges which have revived foreign-language requirements for admission.

The problem is not so much whom to keep out of college, but rather how to make sure that those who should go to college do so.

The two roadblocks, the experts agree, are motivation and finances. To remove the first, they say that young people with talent will have to be shown more effectively that there is real value and excitement in higher education. To remove the second, they suggest more scholarships.

The President's committee called for 10 times the present total amount of scholarship money, estimated at about \$60 million. It wants about 200,000 of the ablest and neediest high school graduates annually to

be assured of a college education by having the financial burden removed from them.

In addition, it calls for between 25,000 and 50,000 subsidized campus jobs so that another large group will be able to support itself with work-study programs. In order to build higher education firmly into the American way of life, the President's committee also suggests that the tax laws be revised so that students and their parents would be assured of credits or deductions.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

All the experts agree that there should be a greater number of 2-year colleges for those who are unwilling or unable to commit themselves to 4 years of higher education.

Finally, the Conant report will urgently demand another reform plan which would eliminate those students who feel that they are inadequately prepared to make a living when they leave high school, and who go to college for vocational training rather than for education. The Conant plan would expect the high schools to offer vocational training of highest caliber to these students.

Considering the importance of the problem of who should go to college, it is disappointing to find the experts vague and hedging in their replies. The reason is simple: they are torn between rational planning and the commitment to an ideal. The first calls for toughness in setting up restrictions so that the colleges and universities can be made into institutions of excellence; the second dreams about the removal of all limitations from a child's educational horizon. At present, the American genius for compromise is in search of a formula that will be democratic without destroying the standards of scholarship and education.

THE PROBLEM

5. How do you pay for all this?

If mass and class in education are to be combined, perhaps for the first time in history, then the cost will be high. What compounds the difficulty is the almost pathological fear of Government control through Government financing. Yet, from the problem of the loss of potentially able teachers to higher paying jobs to the fact that local spending is not even beginning to catch up with school construction needs, every sign points to an inescapable truth: the present sources of money are insufficient to pay for a first-class mass education system.

Many schools are overcrowded, understaffed and ill-equipped. There is an estimated shortage of 142,000 classrooms and an excess of almost 2 million pupils. And within 10 years the high schools will have arrived at a point where they will face 50 to 70 percent more pupils than they can now accommodate.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

None of the experts has tackled the money problem with complete candor. The fear of an all-out fight over the principle of Federal aid has led to a flood of cautious statements and even more cautious legislation. Yet between the lines the implication is clear: Federal aid will have to be a permanent part of the picture.

What are the real needs? Our total expenditure for education, from elementary school through the universities, today is approximately \$14 billion annually. This is 3.6 percent of the gross national product. The experts estimate that, in order to attain the goals of quality in a system of quantity, the Nation will have to spend \$30 billion annually 10 years from now, with those \$30 billion measured in terms of today's purchasing power. This would mean, according to the best economists' predictions, about 5 percent of the gross national product.

The Rockefeller report points out that local and State tax systems are in some respects archaic. School expenditures are charged almost entirely to the revenue raised through

property tax—and this is also the tax which meets with the most solidly organized and most vocal opposition. It is no coincidence that the rejection of school bond issues in New York State reached an all-time high last year—despite Sputnik.

"It is this weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education," says the Rockefeller report. "For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services, there seems to be only one alternative: a thorough, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems."

Almost certainly this is not going to happen, and definitely not in time to bolster a weakened edifice of education.

The only public acknowledgment of these unpleasant facts was made by the White House Conference on Education, late in 1955, which voted better than 2 to 1 in favor of Federal aid to education, to be devoted specifically to school construction.

Congress omitted all Federal aid to school construction, however, after the administration's Federal aid proposals in 1958 completely dropped the demand for money for buildings.

Congress and the public had their eyes on scholarships, which they considered the chief ingredient of a crash program to compete with the Soviet Union. When it came to a vote and a series of compromises, the less than \$1 billion aid bill offered mainly student loans (not scholarships); some graduate fellowships, plus special financial lures in the form of partly written-off loans to draw students into the teaching profession; and special funds for the improvement of guidance, language, and science teaching, vocational education, and research. The largest single amount—\$300 million—was earmarked to buy science equipment for school systems in the various States. The most critically needed items, funds for buildings and for teachers' salaries, were overlooked.

Thus, the real Federal aid problem as a key to the financing of the schools remains an issue, with the fear of Federal control still the major roadblock to more sweeping appropriations. The Rockefeller report points out some safeguards that could be built into Federal aid to prevent it from leading to Federal control:

1. Federal funds would be one source of support among many.
2. State, local, and private sources of funds should continue to be the major factor in the support of education.
3. Federal funds should be used only to balance the serious gaps in the total educational system, and should be given in such a manner as to encourage State and local governments to use their own resources.

Whatever the sources may be, the experts have no doubt whatsoever that, financially, we have already face a real emergency. "It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money," says the Rockefeller report. "The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is the fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face. At stake is nothing less than our national greatness and our aspirations for the dignity of the individual. If the public is not prepared for this, then responsible educators, business leaders, political leaders, unions, and civic organizations must join in a national campaign to prepare them."

Blind Lawyer Accepts Post in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that one of my constituents and a good friend, Attorney John F. Nagle, of Springfield, Mass., has joined the National Federation of the Blind here in Washington as its national legal representative. Mr. Nagle is blind himself, having lost his sight at age 12 when a seventh grade student in school. Despite this handicap, he demonstrated courage and initiative and completed his education at the famous Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Mass., the American International College in Springfield, and Northeastern University Law School, also in Springfield.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a news story from the Springfield Union of November 24, 1958, concerning Attorney Nagle.

BLIND LAWYER ACCEPTS POST IN WASHINGTON—J. F. NAGLE TO REPRESENT NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR SIGHTLESS

John F. Nagle, blind lawyer, Sunday announced acceptance of an executive position with the National Federation of the Blind in Washington, D.C. He is leaving Springfield immediately and will begin his new duties December 15.

As national legal representative of the blind association, Nagle will promote the interests of the blind before Congress and various Government agencies, will help with drafting legislation, will appear as counsel for blind persons in social-security and civil-service cases, and will travel widely in the eastern part of the United States to help State blind associations with problems of organization and legislation.

The National Federation of the Blind has a membership of 40,000 blind members. It promotes and initiates legislation at Federal and State levels, conducts surveys of blind services in various States at the request of the State authorities and wages a ceaseless battle against discrimination against blind people in terms of job opportunities.

Nagle, who currently makes his home at 34 Myrtle Street has a law office at 782 State Street. He travels unaided, with a cane, between these two points twice daily. Until recently he had a seeing-eye dog, a Labrador retriever named "Cap."

Work with the organized blind is not a new thing for Nagle. He has long been active in this work. He is currently president of the Associated Blind of Massachusetts and chairman of its executive committee, and was general chairman of the national organization's last convention, held in Boston last July. He is also a member of the advisory board of the Massachusetts Division of the Blind, to which he was appointed in February 1958 by Gov. Foster Furcolo.

His other community activities are numerous. He is a member of the Springfield Lions Club and chairman of its sight conservation and blind committee. He is active in the United World Federalists, holding posts as member of the board of directors, chairman of the speakers' bureau, chairman of the study group committee, and legal counsel for the New England branch of the organizations, as well as being much in demand as a speaker on world federalism.

In the local Unitarian Church he is a member of the standing committee charged with running local church affairs and a teacher in the church school, as well as being active in other committees. For 6 years he was legal adviser for the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

MEMBER OF BAR

He is also a member of the Blind Profession Association of America, the Civil Liberties Union, the Adult Educational Council, the Hampden County Bar Association, and the American Bar Association.

Nagle lost his sight at age 12, when he was in the seventh grade in a local school. Thereafter he attended the Perkins School for the Blind, Boston University, American International College, and Northeastern University Law School, Springfield division. He holds two college degrees, one in law, and has been admitted to practice at the Massachusetts bar, the Federal bar, and the Department of Justice, Bureau of Naturalization and Immigration. While at Boston University he was a member of the varsity debating team.

During World War II he took special training in assembling and machine operation at Springfield Trade School. He was employed on the night shift at the U.S. armory and practiced law in the daytime.

In May of this year he married Miss Virginia Clarke of Worcester, also totally blind, and at that time president of the Associated Blind of Worcester.

A Bill To Expand the Veterans' Administration Direct Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED WAMPLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 27, 1959, I introduced the bill, H.R. 3513, which would expand the veterans' direct loan program by \$150 million thereby permitting the Veterans' Administration possibly to make in the neighborhood of an additional 15,000 loans. I understand that this increment in direct loan authority would make it possible for veterans' home loan applications to be processed on a current basis.

My bill is similar to other measures currently before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I feel that finding a solution to the veterans' home loan financing problem, particularly in the rural areas where private money

is not readily available, is of signal importance.

Had it not been for the Veterans' Administration's direct loan program, the Nation's veterans, and those veterans in the Sixth District of Indiana, which I have the honor to represent, would have received fewer loans than they have. And, although I find that in the State of Indiana the Veterans' Administration has made approximately 400 direct home loans in a period of less than 9 months, there are, at present, 1,312 Indiana veterans waiting for such a loan; and, unless they get a direct loan, they will be unable to buy a home.

The fact that these 1,000-plus veterans in the State of Indiana have not been able to find private financing has prompted me to introduce the measure, Mr. Speaker, and to urge that it be favorably considered by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am genuinely interested in doing everything possible to allow these Indiana veterans, living predominantly in rural areas, small cities and towns, to take advantage of their veterans' benefits, bestowed upon them by law for their service to our Nation.

For example, I am informed that in Warren County, Ind., where there is a veteran population of 790, no guaranteed loans have been made and absolutely no direct loans. I might add that the entire county is eligible for Veterans' Administration direct loan financing.

Surely, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives will want to act to ease, if not totally correct, the home-purchase inequity placed upon the veterans of this country's rural areas.

God and Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a letter to the editor which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I wish to say at the outset that I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by Rev. John P. Gorsuch. This Nation's policy toward Red China is wholly unrealistic, and I said so publicly last fall in a press conference. I advised the people of my congressional district that the question of recognition and of admission to the United Nations was a foregone conclusion. The only question to be determined is, when. The vote in the United Nations last fall on the question of admitting Red China to the U.N. was a clear signal to Mr. Dulles and his advisers that it should not be delayed much longer. If we are to entertain any serious hope for peace, it is not by denying the very existence of a nation of over 600 million souls.

In closing I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the writer of this communication is the son of one of my closest personal friends. This young man's father and I were classmates at the University of Denver Law School. It gives me a great personal pleasure to insert this letter in the RECORD:

GOD AND MR. DULLES

In a recent story in the Washington Post reference was made to the fact that a high percentage of Protestant clergy were opposed to either the recognition of Red China or to its admission to the United Nations. Apparently the Committee of One Million which made this estimate felt this refuted the Cleveland resolution adopted by the National Council of Churches in November which proposed that diplomatic recognition should be given.

I for one wasn't polled. Nor, I suspect, were a number of other clergy. I simply want to bear witness to the fact that there are a good many of us, as there are a good many Americans in other professions, who feel the Cleveland resolution makes some real sense. It represents a flexible and open-minded approach that is sorely needed.

Our State Department has too frequently been pietistic and doctrinaire. And, tragically, one sometimes gets the impression that the churches feel that God and Mr. Dulles are on intimate terms.

What the churches need to make clear, and this is what the Cleveland report seeks to spell out in reference to a concrete issue, is that it is not so-called abstract moral principles which ought to guide us nearly as much as it should be response to the concrete workings of God in the complicated web of events we call history.

The present administration is always talking about operating from the basis of moral principles. But principles and God aren't the same thing. God's will can only be understood in specific situations, not by starting with abstractions and trying to paste them to real life.

The question of whether to recognize Red China is a good case in point. To be sure, it is hardly a moral nation in many respects. But the real point is, do we truly want world peace or don't we? And if we do, recognition seems to be a step in the right direction because it ought to mean new friends in the rest of Asia and a chance to drive a wedge between Red China and the U.S.S.R. so that we could deal more easily with each.

In other words, there are many of us who feel that if God's will is now to be realized and the goal of peace is to be furthered, self-righteous moralism, and hysterical anti-communism ought to be put aside in favor of a policy that is definitely realistic.

JOHN P. GORSUCH,

Assistant Rector, St. Alban's Episcopal Church.
WASHINGTON.

"That's America to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 1959

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following poem by Mrs. Bettie A. LaVeck of Dearborn, Mich.:

THAT'S AMERICA TO ME

My country is a symbol of each living thing
I see,
The blooming of a rosebud, the rustle of a
bee.
The sun rising in the morning, the people
that I see,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's
America to me.

Friends in the factories work side by side
each day,
Makes our lives enriched more than words
could say.
Friendships in all walks of life, the price of
this is free;
Just living here on God's rich soil that's
America to me.

Our home whether a mansion or old and
broken down,
If filled with love can be the happiest in
your hometown.
A friend who offers assistance to a needy
one I see
Just living here on God's rich soil that's
America to me.

The joys we give each other make our lives
complete,
It gives us courage for the burdens we all
have to meet.
A kiss, a hug, a baby, a thief, a king I see,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's
America to me.

The church in which we worship is crowded
to the door
With a hundred shining faces I've never seen
before.
A problem leaves the face of an unknown
man today, even I feel relieved as I
pray my God to thee,
Just living here on God's rich soil that's
America to me.

Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, January 29 of each year marks the anniversary of the birth of Albert Gallatin, brilliant U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under Thomas Jefferson. Gallatin was born on January 29, 1761, in Geneva, Switzerland, the descendant of a family of watchmakers. Already then, as today, Switzerland was the center of a great watch industry which in our own day plays such an important part in United States-Swiss trade relations.

Gallatin came to America in 1780 and threw in his lot with the American patriots. After the establishment of the new U.S. Republic he embarked on a political career in which he served successively as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senator, Secretary of the Treasury and finally as U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain and later to France.

He devoted his life and work to many worthwhile enterprises, the most important of which were his advocacy of a system of free universal education, reform of Federal tax and budgetary policies, and the promotion of sound trade

relations with other nations. He also advocated liberalization of the immigration and naturalization laws.

As we offer our tribute today to Albert Gallatin, we pay our respects to the memory of a great American who laid the basic framework for policies which have helped to bring the United States to a position of preeminence in the market-places of the world. The ruling principle of his life was friendly commerce with other nations as an enduring promise of America's peaceful growth, and that principle is still a powerful factor in our continued growth and our leadership of the free world. The expansion of trade and commerce among the free nations is as vital today as it was in Gallatin's day.

Unfortunately, the present administration has shown a strong tendency to yield to the protectionists and those who seek to erect new barriers in our trade relations with the world. Such policy is against the liberal trade traditions of Gallatin. I trust that we shall return to the sound policies advocated by Albert Gallatin.

C. O. Wanvig, Milwaukee Civic Leader

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known and most widely respected leaders in Milwaukee and Wisconsin is Chester Odin Wanvig, chairman of the board of Globe-Union, Inc.

Mr. Wanvig is not only an industrialist, but a civic and community leader, farmer, and philanthropist. Throughout his life he has placed great emphasis on the spiritual values which have traditionally been a vital part of America's resources—a source of inner strength for us as individuals and as a nation.

Under Mr. Wanvig's leadership, Globe-Union has contributed to the reaffirmation of our spiritual values by broadcasting, over radio stations in the 17 communities where its 22 plants are located, inspiring prayers delivered by Chaplains of the House and Senate. One is the Pearl Harbor anniversary prayer given in the House on December 7, 1943, by Chaplain James Shera Montgomery:

Almighty God, on the anniversary of the grimmest hour in American history, give ear to Thy words and consider our mediation; grant that our fellow countrymen may harken unto Thy voice: "Fret not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity." Through the dreary desert of suffering and sin, we pray for a highway for the march of all emancipated peoples. "Commit thy way unto the Lord and He shall bring it to pass."

Heavenly Father, universal is the hand of justice that holds the eternal scale. As we meet the challenge of today, grant that we may keep enthroned within, the spirit of humanity which is the merciful endowment of our Master. Allow us not to relax the

divinity of our immortal souls nor treasure up wrath against any nation which forgets God. O let us labor for the advancement and the release of man from the chains of tyranny, and the promise of future days will assume for us fresh meaning and power in all the vicissitudes of this world. Inspire all to bring to this Chamber tithes of time, of energy, and of understanding. O come and reign above all treaties that the Christian precepts may be augmented in all lands and thus they will be brought into closer relationship with Thee and become the garden of our Lord. In the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace and the Son of Man. Amen.

Two others are Christmas prayers given by the late Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall, and by Senate Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris:

We thank Thee, O God, for the return of the wondrous spell of this Christmas season that brings its own sweet joy into our jaded and troubled hearts.

Forbid it, Lord, that we should celebrate without understanding what we celebrate, or, like our counterparts so long ago, fail to see the star or to hear the song of glorious promise.

As our hearts yield to the spirit of Christmas, may we discover that it is Thy holy spirit who comes—not a sentiment, but a power—to remind us of the only way by which there may be peace on the earth and good will among men.

May we not spend Christmas, but keep it, that we may be kept in its hope, through Him who emptied Himself in coming to us that we might be filled with peace and joy in returning to God. Amen.

Our Father God, amid all the bitterness and ill will of these days, we thank Thee for the gentle, balmy climate of the Christmas-tide. May the cynicism which has tarnished our faith be dissolved by the confident assurance that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth.

We would bow anew at the shrine of that One who didst come to a violent world and who is now remembered and adored, while the ruthless dictators are forgotten. In a world that is a neighborhood and must be made a brotherhood or we perish, join us to that saving minority that across the boundaries of prejudice, intolerance, and hatred extends the dominion of understanding and good will. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

The presentation of these prayers serves to emphasize Mr. Wanvig's firm belief that the greatness of America is based on individualism which comes from religious faith—faith in the free man under God.

To give further insight into the philosophy of Mr. Wanvig, let me quote his own words:

Our economy thrives on competition. We continually strive to make better products—we continually strive to reduce costs. That in turn creates the typically American respect for the other fellow's work and ideas.

The quality . . . of all the products we manufacture walks into our plant every morning on two legs. Machinery and modern testing devices are necessary to insure quality, but the human element—in worker, engineer, and management—is still the controlling factor.

Attitude—how we think and how we feel about our work—determines the quality of our product. Quality can't be inspected into products. It can't be put on the surface. It must be built in. We make products by the millions—but they are used one by one.

We believe in the dignity of man, and the well-being of our employees has always been

one of our major considerations. Years ago, long before we paid dividends to stockholders, we recognized our employees' contributions to our progress and shared with them the profits of successful years.

We believe in the Golden Rule and have unceasingly tried to practice it.

Despite the many demands on his time in the business world, Mr. Wanvig has given much effort in the service of his State and community. He has been a member of the University of Wisconsin board of regents, a trustee of Milwaukee-Downer College, and president of Milwaukee Country Day School. He is a member of the board of governors of Marquette University and the President's Advisory Committee at Marquette. He was one of the organizers of the Greater Milwaukee Committee, and is generally recognized as the founder of Junior Achievement in the Milwaukee area.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by C. O. Wanvig to his community, State, and Nation—and to his fellow men everywhere—are numberless. We need more men like him.

In Memory of Representative George H. Christopher

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE CHRISTOPHER came from a town that is close to the center of our Nation. It is not far from the spot where the trails fanned out, over which the pioneers ventured to open up the West.

He loved the land and he cared for it tenderly, and he was proud of the fulfillment that came at harvest time. And the rhythm of the seasons brought the harmony of nature's art and poetry and music to his heart.

GEORGE was a Missouri farmer, and a good one.

He was blessed with the native wisdom, and wit, and independent spirit that is so true to the American character.

Quiet, but plain spoken, he had the faculty of stripping away all sham and artifice to get at the root of an issue.

As I am a city Democrat, representing an industrial district, I liked to talk with GEORGE and learn the viewpoint of the agricultural Midwest, which is the "seed-bed" of so much that is individual and self-reliant in our country's personality.

He was conscientious in representing his constituents, and in going beyond that to serve the Nation's interests. Since coming to Washington as a Member of the 81st Congress, he had served on the House Administration Committee, the Committee on Agriculture, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

When Congress adjourned, he went back home to the farm of 975 acres where he and the late Mrs. Christopher lived so many happy and work-filled years building the homestead that made

its wholesome contributions to the progress of the Nation.

There he replenished himself in the company of friends and neighbors who, beholden only to themselves and to God, looked themselves straight in the eye, and then made up their minds as free-men.

When GEORGE returned to Washington he spoke for them, and we, his colleagues were the beneficiaries of his practical knowledge and his homespun counsel.

Missouri has lost a distinguished son who served his people and his Nation well.

We, his fellow legislators in the U.S. House of Representatives, mourn his passing.

To his sons and daughters we send our sincere sympathy.

We pray that the memories of his kindness to them, and his devotion to our Nation, will comfort them in their bereavement, and inspire them throughout the years ahead.

Treatment Plant Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll of the Nation's 52 State and territorial health officers shows that by an overwhelming majority—82 percent—they believe the current Federal sewage treatment plant construction grant program has resulted in stimulation of sewage plant construction. Their views are backed up by the facts which show that construction of sewage treatment works—the Nation's worst public works problem—has risen steadily during the course of the construction grants program.

Contract awards in 1957 rose to \$351 million and are expected to reach at least \$390 million in 1958. The 1952-56 average was \$222 million. Total construction of treatment plants reached an all-time national high in 1958 with over one-third of the projects constructed in that year receiving Federal grants. Moreover, at least 35 States experienced their highest treatment plant construction levels in 1957 or 1958.

The results of this poll of the Nation's health officials shows that three-fourths of them favor doubling the authorization of construction grant allocations. These same officials, it must be remembered, opposed the adoption of this grant program when it was first proposed in 1956. But in overwhelming numbers they now favor the program and what is more recommend additional Federal participation. On this, too, they are well supported by the facts.

A recent survey of State and Territorial sanitary engineers indicates the estimated sewage treatment construction program of 40 States for the next 3 years could utilize approximately twice the

Federal grant money authorized for the next 3 years under Public Law 660. According to this survey, the estimated cost of sewage treatment plant construction requirements for the next 3 years is approximately \$540 million per year. The average annual Federal contribution to maintain this level of construction is estimated in the survey to be approximately \$100 million per year, or twice the current authorized Federal level of participation.

Despite the success of the treatment plant construction program and its endorsement by State health officials the President has recommended that it be repealed. According to the President's budget message his administration supports programs necessary to stimulate greater State and local effort in areas of critical national concern but has consistently endeavored to strengthen our system of government by encouraging State and local governments to assume responsibility for many public needs which they can provide well without relying on Federal aid at all. To further this worthy objective the President would discontinue Federal grants for waste treatment works construction and adjust Federal revenue laws as recommended by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee so the States can assume full responsibility for these programs starting in fiscal year 1961.

What the President has done is pick what has been termed "the Nation's worst public works problem" by Fortune magazine and single it out for the budget ax on the pretext of strengthening Federal-State relations. He has picked a program that was enacted in the first place because it was needed to stimulate greater State and local effort in an area of critical national concern, namely, pollution control, and which has proved to be such a successful stimulant that over 80 percent of the Nation's health officers who 2½ years ago opposed it today agree that it has resulted in stimulation of sewage plant construction within their jurisdiction. The President's own adviser for public works, Gen. J. S. Bragdon, has stated that:

To meet our needs for water, conservation is the order of the day. We cannot manufacture this necessity of life. We must store it and use it more efficiently, learn to convert saline waters and find ways to improve the distribution of it. Most important of all, our rivers will have to be cleaned, and adequate treatment facilities installed to prevent upstream pollution. To accomplish this job, we need almost 8,000 municipal plants alone, and in all, some 17,000 facilities, public and private, to insure that all of the potential sources of pollution are adequately controlled.

Obviously, here is an area of critical national concern where State and local efforts have lagged the past 20 years making necessary the program now in operation to stimulate greater State and local effort. No wonder 48 out of 50 State health officers have come out in opposition to the President's recommendation to repeal the existing program. No wonder the President's own Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, in an almost unheard-of action, unanimously refused to endorse his recommendations.

Who agrees with the President on this issue? The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers were his sole supporters when hearings were held on the subject last year by the Public Works Committee. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I have never been able to fully understand the position taken by the chamber and the NAM on this issue. Water is essential to industry. By 1975 industry will be using 215 billion gallons a day, 62 percent of the Nation's water used will be in industry. To make a ton of steel alone requires 65,000 gallons of water. Industry has more at stake here than any other element of our economy and yet their national organizations oppose measures designed to assure that the quality of our water supply will be adequate for industrial as well as other uses. To encourage industry to join with others in combating pollution, I have introduced legislation today providing fast tax writeoffs for industrial waste treatment facilities which may be constructed in the future.

At the same time I have introduced a bill to increase the Federal grant program under Public Law 660 in order to further stimulate local effort to increase the level of treatment plant construction so that it more closely meets the proven needs of the country.

My bill would amend section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by authorizing:

First. Grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or \$500,000, whichever is the smaller. Under existing law the maximum grant is 30 percent of the cost or \$250,000, whichever is the smaller. Experience has shown that there has been less stimulation of construction in the larger communities subject to the \$250,000 limitation than in those eligible for the full 30 percent grant. Because of this limitation, there is insufficient incentive to larger communities which are at the same time often major contributors to pollution. Increasing the maximum grant limit to \$500,000 should tend to stimulate more projects from the larger communities, thus giving State pollution control authorities an opportunity to bring their programs into better balance by accelerating construction in the larger as well as in the smaller communities.

Second. Municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project. Under existing law each project is limited to the maximum grant of \$250,000 or 30 percent of the cost, whichever is the smaller. Experience indicates that if communities which join together could receive a larger grant the program would have a greater stimulatory effect on such communities. Often the construction of such joint facilities is the most economical and efficient method of providing adequate sewage treatment and is generally encouraged by consulting engineers and the States. This amendment would give the States greater latitude in determining the use of funds within their States and author-

izes an allocation to each municipality involved in a joint project its share of the estimated reasonable cost rather than limiting the project, as under present law, to a single maximum grant.

Third. Reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds. Experience under the present act indicates that a number of jurisdictions have not been able to use their funds because of lack of eligible projects. On the other hand, many States have backlogs of projects considerably in excess of their Federal allotments. This amendment would permit a reallocation of funds from jurisdictions which cannot use them to jurisdictions having projects for which grants are not made because of lack of funds. This will stimulate additional construction in the States having the greatest demonstrated need.

Fourth. One hundred million dollars for construction grants each year for 10 years. Present law provides for \$50 million a year for 10 years for Federal construction grants. Even this amount has resulted in tremendous plant construction stimulation, but it is not enough. The level of construction is reaching the \$400 million mark, but our yearly needs are nearer \$600 million. In order to stimulate construction up to this level it is necessary to restore the Federal construction program to amount I originally proposed in 1956 and which was cut in half. I said then that we were creating a program with one leg amputated before it had even learned to walk. On one leg the program is walking well but we need to restore the other leg so it can run the pollution problem right into the ground.

My bill also provides for the establishment of an Office of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the present time the Federal water pollution control program is administered by the Water Supply and Water Pollution Control Program Section of the Division of Sanitary Engineering Services of the Bureau of the State Services of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These men are doing a superb, dedicated job but the morass of the administrative framework within which they work cannot help but stifle and restrict their activities. The Committee on Public Works has stated explicitly that:

It intends to watch carefully the progress and development of the national water-pollution control program and particularly the supporting role of the Federal Government.

In a committee report in 1956 it was stated:

The committee believes that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should place a high priority on the objectives of the program authorized by the bill (Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956) and will diligently carry out its role in this Federal-State cooperative activity by providing a constructive program within an appropriate administrative framework.

Mr. Speaker, that appropriate administrative framework has not as yet been

established by administrative action. Legislation is therefore needed. Control of pollution is part and parcel of the overall water resources problem. Waste carrying is an essential use of water. Pollution simply means that waste has built up beyond the water's capacity to carry it. Therefore, one of water's essential uses is curtailed and what is more its availability for other uses reduced at the same time. This affects industry, agriculture, fish and wildlife, and our health as well. The control of pollution is no longer concerned merely with the correction of sanitary nuisances but rather with the conservation of a great and precious resource—water.

The existing administrative framework within which the pollution control program operates must, therefore, be broadened and expanded so that the proper emphasis can be placed on all aspects of the problem—engineering, legal, research, construction, economic, and health. At the urging and by request of the Nation's great conservation organizations, women's clubs, and many others, and in the interests of good government, I recommend the establishment of an Office of Water Pollution Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare so that an all-out attack, at all levels of government can begin against the pollution problem which threatens our health, reduces available water supplies and restricts economic growth and expansion.

The Plight of the Small Businessman in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the small businessman is well expressed in the following letter which I have received this day from a constituent of mine.

The first day of this session I introduced House Resolution 30 to investigate the cost of living. This letter points out the need for such an investigation. It can be surmised that when small businesses are gone, big business will price with little regard to supply or to cost.

The letter follows:

I am a veteran of World War II, with a wife and two children. Nine months ago, I took out a second mortgage on my home and borrowed over my head to buy a little supermarket. Today, I'm on the verge of bankruptcy. I'd place the major portion of the blame on the A. & P. Tea Co. In the early part of November, they opened a store not too far from me. The other major chains; namely, Food Fair, Kroger, and Wrigley in order to keep their share of the business started a price war which makes it impossible for me and any small businessman to compete. As an example, A. & P. is advertising 50 pounds potatoes for \$1.29. I paid \$1.65 for the same package this week

at the Produce Terminal. They're selling Land O' Lakes butter for 67 cents when it costs me 69 cents per pound. Large grade A eggs are advertised at 45 cents per dozen and they've been costing me 47 cents all week. Their meat prices are beyond comprehension for any type business operation to make a reasonable profit. I'm not asking for any special considerations for myself; but is there any way through legislation or investigation where this "monster" big business can be controlled? I'm writing this letter as a last resort. I've done everything possible attempting to make my business show a semblance of profit. If you as a representative of the small businessman cannot help me, I foresee in the not too distant future a society of big business and a working class. Recent mergers in every field of business and industry offer justification of my statement. Thank you for your attention.

National Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1958, the Washington Post and Times Herald published on its front page a story bearing this headline: "Ike Warned on Lack of Trained Men." The story began thus:

President Eisenhower was told yesterday the United States is in danger of running low on trained manpower while the Soviet Union is driving for technical supremacy. The President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers said it is convinced the Nation faces a "grave problem in highly trained manpower during the coming decade."

It expressed doubt that "present public agitation reflected a real understanding of our long-term need for scientists, engineers, and technicians."

Thus, nearly 16 months after Soviet Russia launched its sputnik and despite our own scientific achievements of the past year, we are still being warned by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers that we are facing a "grave problem in highly trained manpower" and that the American public still lacks "a real understanding of our long-term need" for scientists.

A year ago this month, on the opening day of the 1958 session of Congress, I introduced a bill for the establishment of a U.S. science academy. Its purpose was to help remedy the very shortage of trained scientists, engineers, and technicians about which we now hear and will continue to hear in the future, unless we take the necessary action now. What was true a year ago is even more true today, except that we have lost a whole year of time. This matter is therefore not only timely, but most urgent. I fear the problem may grow greater and graver by the month.

I have now revised my bill and brought it up-to-date. Today, I am reintroducing it and I am happy to report that our colleague from New York, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, has informed me that she will be pleased to be a cosponsor of the measure.

The bill provides for the establishment of a National Science Academy under the jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation, rather than under the Defense Department. The Academy is visualized as an educational institution emphasizing scientific knowledge and research, rather than as a military academy along the lines of West Point or Annapolis.

The purpose of the National Science Academy, as defined in the bill, shall be "to train selected men and women, to be known as science trainees, in the field of science or engineering for service as officers or employees of the United States." Specifically, this institution is to prepare young men and young women for scientific careers devoted primarily to the security of our Nation.

Highlights of the bill may be stated as follows:

Young men and young women, between the ages of 17 and 25, may be nominated as candidates for appointment to the National Science Academy by the President or by Members of Congress. Final admission to the Academy will be determined on the basis of qualifying examinations as prescribed and supervised by the National Science Foundation. Those who are admitted will receive a 4-year course of study, at Government expense, in which they will be trained in science, engineering, mathematics, and related fields.

Upon completion of the course of studies, the science trainees will be required to serve at least 5 years as science officers or employees of the U.S. Government, either with the Armed Forces or as civilian scientists and technicians in Government agencies. A limited number of foreign students from friendly countries may be admitted to the Academy, provided they pass a proper security check. The foreign students, however, will not be required to serve the United States as in the case of our own graduates. All those enrolled at the National Science Academy, including foreign science trainees, will receive a free education, housing, medical care, and other emoluments, and will be subject to established regulations of discipline, attendance, and so forth.

As far as location of the National Science Academy is concerned, no specific site is prescribed in the bill. It is merely recommended that the Director of the National Science Foundation shall establish a commission of five members to advise on the selection of a site. In the event there is no unanimity on the part of the commission, it shall submit to the director three sites, from which he is to choose one as a permanent location. Until this is done, however, the bill advocates the use of temporary facilities for the academy so that it may begin its operations as soon as possible.

In connection with a permanent location, I merely wish to express this view: I would prefer to see a site selected in an area which provides ample space for buildings, laboratories, and other needed grounds and facilities for an institution of this kind. Perhaps the most logical choice would be in an area which is not too close to any large urban center, an area which has not yet been built up and around which could be established

in time a science city with major research facilities, equipment, and housing accommodations for the students, faculty, scholars, research people, and those serving their needs. In other words, to do what we have already done at our atomic research centers.

There is no way to estimate at this time the cost of establishing a National Science Academy, but Congress can appropriate certain sums for the acquisition of land, construction of buildings and laboratories, and other needs until the institution is ready to begin functioning, and thereafter a set sum can be designated each year on the basis of needs. Unquestionably this will require many millions of dollars, but it will be a worthwhile investment for the benefit of our country and it should not be any more expensive than providing funds for existing colleges to expand their present facilities.

As for the admission of students from friendly countries, this proposal is designed to help cement stronger ties with our allies, encourage them to develop the best scientific brains, and provide them with the opportunity of giving some of their students a thorough scientific background which should prove of mutual benefit.

Obviously, an institution of this sort must be established only under Government auspices for reasons of security, national needs, financing, attracting the best qualified students, and achieving the desired results. It must be provided with the finest scientific laboratories, and the top scientists in the country should be invited to teach at the National Science Academy. An educational institution of this kind would undoubtedly arouse considerable interest among high school students throughout the country and would serve to inspire many among them to pursue a career in science or engineering.

As to the question how a National Science Academy could be more helpful than existing colleges and universities, I should like to point out the following:

First. It would assure our Armed Forces and the U.S. Government with a constant and dependable flow of highly trained manpower, with scientists, engineers, and technicians, to undertake specific tasks and duties in any emergency. These people would be required to remain in Government service, in a military or civilian capacity, for at least 5 years. In this way the Nation would benefit from their services for having provided them with a free education and a career. Graduates from existing schools and colleges are under no compulsion to render such service to the Nation.

Second. It would create a great advantage for the United States by the fact that the scientists, engineers, and technicians trained at the National Science Academy would be geared toward problems of national security, scientific research for defense, and related problems.

Third. It would provide a great incentive for American youth to strive for a career in science or engineering and the development of scientific talent. This should serve as an excellent stimulus for the growth of scientific education. Many young people, who otherwise

could not afford a higher education, would now have such opportunity on the basis of merit and scientific ability.

Fourth. It would strengthen the field of scientific education by training more people skilled in the art of communicating interest in science and increasing the prestige of science teachers.

Fifth. It would prepare scientifically trained and competent people with a broad knowledge of the humanities for participation in governmental functions of a civilian nature.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have been constantly reminded that Russia is outstripping us in the training of scientists and engineers and that she may be gradually attaining technical supremacy. Now this fact has been verified by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers. There is no need to stress the importance of accelerating and expanding our science education. By now this fact is clear to all.

The establishment of a National Science Academy, such as advocated in my bill, would help relieve the existing shortage of trained manpower in this vital field, it would encourage more profound respect for science and science teachers, it would stimulate young people to pursue a career in science to a greater degree than ever before, and it would have a beneficial impact on the welfare and the security of our country.

There is a great need for such an educational institution in the country today. The urgency of the times in which we live requires it. I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert at this point the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 31, 1958, as referred to above:

LIKE WARNED ON LACK OF TRAINED MEN—COMMITTEE FEARS NATION IS FACING A GRAVE PROBLEM

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

President Eisenhower was told yesterday the United States is in danger of running low on trained manpower while the Soviet Union is driving for technical supremacy.

The President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers said it is convinced the Nation faces a grave problem in highly trained manpower during the coming decade.

Among other things, it mentioned a drop in 1958 enrollments at engineering schools. It also spoke of the prospect of a smaller group of men in the most productive age bracket in 1965, attributing this to a dip in the birth rate during the depression of the 1930's and World War II.

In its final report to Mr. Eisenhower, the committee of educators, scientists, labor union, business and Government representatives urged the White House to take responsibility for coordinating and stimulating efforts by public and private groups to meet the problem.

This was the kind of work—in the non-Federal field—assigned to the committee when it was set up in 1956, about 19 months before Russia sent aloft its first sputnik.

The Committee said the sputnik launching had sparked greater public awareness of the American scientific manpower problem. But it expressed doubt that "present public agitation reflected a real understanding of our long-term need for scientists, engineers and technicians."

"A sudden swing of the pendulum of public opinion, such as has occurred during the past year, invites a countering when the initial momentum is spent," the report said.

Termed disturbing was a 13 percent decrease in freshman enrollment in engineering courses this year and a 4-percent decline in total undergraduate engineering enrollment.

"At the same time," the report added, "the Soviet Union is reaffirming its intention to surpass the United States in the fields of science and technology within the next decade."

Another factor bothering the Committee, it said, was that in 1965 the "lean generation" resulting from lower birth rates in the depression and war periods will provide the country's labor force with fewer men in the 25-34 age group.

This smaller group, the report went on, will have to help support (1) an over-all population growing at the rate of almost 3 million persons a year, (2) a standard of living depending ever more on technological advances, and (3) a cold war "which does not appear to be abating."

Committee Chairman Howard L. Bevis, president emeritus of Ohio State University, said in a letter transmitting the report that certain Federal actions are "welcome evidence of the Government's practical concern and its readiness to act."

In this connection, Bevis mentioned the new National Defense Education Act, aimed at spurring scientific-technical education, and expanding programs of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation.

"The watchword now is 'follow through,'" Bevis said.

Last weekend Mr. Eisenhower announced he is creating a new Federal Council for Science and Technology. This group is intended to achieve better planning of scientific programs supported by various Government Departments, and to reduce duplication in such programs.

In doing so, Mr. Eisenhower followed a recommendation by another advisory committee made up of scientists.

Heading the list of proposals by the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers was the recommendation for White House coordination of efforts to develop and utilize trained manpower.

The report also called for continuation of programs launched by the Committee during its 33-month existence. They are:

Sponsorship of manpower utilization clinics with participation by industry, universities, and professional societies of scientists and engineers.

Organization of State and local groups to work toward the long-range improvement of elementary and secondary school education, with main stress on science and mathematics.

Development of adequate statistical data on the supply of scientists and engineers.

Development of guidance and counseling materials concerning science and engineering careers for high school students.

Fostering wider public understanding of the need for highly qualified scientists, engineers and supporting technicians.

Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, good television is one of the rare and occasional free gifts of our free enterprise system. Last evening on the Columbia Network

"Show of the Month" the television production "What Every Woman Knows," sponsored by Du Pont and starring Siobhan McKenna, was a superb 90-minute show with temperate advertising inserts. This was followed by a splendid bit of TV journalism in a production entitled "Castro's Revolution."

Shows of this type would dispel any interest in pay TV.

Priority for Starving Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the development of our national affairs through the activities of the Congress occasionally produces such a great contrast between the issues under discussion and the immediate requirements of some sections of our population that it becomes necessary to pause and take notice of a paradox of our own creation. In recent days the United States has greeted two important visitors—Mr. Mikoyan, the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union and Mr. Arturo Frondizi, President of Argentina. I recognize the need for our country to treat important foreign visitors with courtesy and good manners and to assist our friends in foreign lands to the maximum of our capabilities. The contrast between the discussions in these chambers at the time our famous visitors were at hand, and the things I have seen with my own eyes, in my own district, within the past few days, is so great, however, that it is necessary in defense of the principles of democracy and fair play on which this Nation was founded for me to bring certain matters to the attention of this House.

During the visit of Mr. Mikoyan we were advised through press reports that he was greeted with mixed emotions in several of our major cities and in five of them his party was showered with eggs. When Mr. Frondizi spoke before this House he paid us many compliments as a nation and told us a great deal about the misery of his native land, and about our share in the responsibility for the correction of that misery.

He said:

We cannot ignore the fact that millions of human beings in Latin America suffer from misery and backwardness. A stagnant and impoverished country cannot uphold democratic institutions. On the contrary, it is a fertile soil for anarchy and dictatorship.

Following the visits of these two men I took a trip myself, back to my own congressional district. The trip was planned as a result of numerous communications which I had received from businessmen, labor leaders and public officials describing in detail the economic disasters which had fallen upon the people who I was elected to represent. I visited the coal fields of the southern

Appalachian area, much of which lies within my congressional district.

In the coal fields of my district there are over 30,000 unemployed receiving unemployment compensation and 40,000 who have long exhausted their unemployment benefits, and who have not been employed in a productive manner for 2 years or more. They and their families are subject to the degradation of living on the combination of charity and surplus agricultural commodities.

They have seen the number of employed miners in West Virginia decline from 125,000 in 1948, to 47,000 today, and they have no illusions about the future.

Their children exist on a skid-row diet of corn meal, rice and whatever else the surplus commodities warehouse has available. These children never have any meat, and have seldom seen a fresh egg during the past 2 years. They envy the children who are so amply blessed with good food that they can afford to throw eggs at foreign visitors. The parents told me that even today they only receive enough food for 3 weeks out of the month under all of the existing aid programs—that their diet contains only one-third of the calories and proteins needed to sustain life. So the children weaken a little, and their parents are condemned to watch these future citizens shrink in vitality and hope, day by day.

They cannot afford to worry over the race to control outer space, the competition for the minds and loyalties of men, or the role of American leadership in the free world.

As for their children; can you develop a nuclear physicist out of a child who had no shoes and was forced to quit school in the fourth grade? Will you draw tomorrow's space pilots from among these who have had no orange juice or milk or eggs for over a year?

These are not the people of India or the masses of Chinese I am talking about; these are Americans—strong and self-reliant and skillful in their trade. They are disciplined to work in teams, and are renowned for their courage in a realm of industrial activity which is very dangerous under the best conditions. When they have work to do, they arise in the morning and enter the mouth of a coal pit to spend the day underground, beset by the dangers of gas and cave-ins more hazardous than fire and flood—dangers which few people, including myself, would care to face as a daily ration.

Their situation is not new, it has been growing cumulatively for several years. What have we done about it? We have done nothing of any practical benefit. These miners are the victims of several circumstances—for one, a trade policy that whittles away their livelihood in exchange for doubtful gains in foreign popularity. For another, they are the victims of technological advances which replace the miner with the machine. There is no disposition here to argue against automation or mechanization in the coal fields. We cannot stop progress, and those of us with business experience know that mechanization is necessary for competitive reasons.

But the miners have been displaced through the operations of American industrial ingenuity to create a more competitive end product and a more attractive price for the consumer. In other words, mechanization has been in the general public interest, but the miner and his family are being destroyed. So, they have given up everything, either for theoretical advances in international good will on the one hand, or a public benefit through lower cost to the consumer on the other.

In return they have received nothing but the right to starve and to see their children die before their eyes. This is a situation which cannot be permitted to continue, and I say it is the responsibility of this Congress to return to them an opportunity to live like American citizens, to lend a hand in their economic reconstruction, to see that this Nation does not take away everything and return nothing from any body of its citizens. If we do not take care of our own in circumstances as dire as these, how can we expect to earn respect in foreign lands? If these conditions are permitted to continue in this area of industrial operation, what confidence will our own people in other areas have in us and our way of life? Automation and mechanization will sooner or later enter all types of industrial activity. The coal miner has been struck first and struck hardest, but he will not be the last to be driven to his knees by the random progress of science. Industrial progress has created among the miners a permanent disaster. This is not a natural disaster of storm or flood, but it is a disaster nonetheless, and cries out for disaster relief.

I realize that this is not the first time this matter has been brought to the attention of the House, but the situation grows worse every day, and there is no sign of strong interest or concerted activity on behalf of those affected. What is necessary to stir us to action? Is it necessary to fill the gallery with half-starved men and women? Is it necessary to have a repetition of some dreadful enterprise like the depression bonus march on Washington? Will we not take forthright action until the pot boils over and the starving thousands descend upon us to parade the coldheartedness of their Government before the leaders of the world? There have been bills introduced before this House—thousands of bills—covering a great variety of subjects, but no pending measure merits consideration ahead of the lives and hopes of those who have given up everything in the advancement of the public interest.

We have before us for consideration measures to aid distressed areas, to increase the flow of surplus agricultural commodities, to institute a program of coal research, and other proposals which will give both immediate and lasting relief to the people of the coalfields. They must get priority. A distressed-areas bill was passed by the last Congress and vetoed by the President. This time it must be passed with an overwhelming majority, sufficient to defy the veto threat implied in the President's

message. If I could assemble the membership of this House in a single vehicle, and take you with me through the coalfields of my district, and allow you to spend a day looking at the sum total of human misery which has resulted from prevailing conditions, I doubt that there would be a single opposing vote for any measure which would better the situation.

The subject is not one for debate. There is nothing to debate. The last and best hope for these people rests in the power and authority of this Congress. They have seen Development Loan Funds established to assist the backward people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, with authority to spend \$825 million for that purpose during the current fiscal year. At the same time they remember that a measure costing half as much, which would have given them hope and sustenance, failed of passage over a veto, and they were left with nothing.

The gaunt figure of the starving miner who stands idle is a mockery of the image of America as the land of abundance. If there is to be a showdown then, let it come quickly. Every day of delay means another day on which a 100,000 children face the morning on a breakfast of cornmeal and water, or with no breakfast at all.

I urge a quick consideration of the measures that will afford relief. I appeal to your generosity and sympathy. I challenge your native pride in the country we are all sworn to protect and defend.

The conditions that exist, left unattended, will brew the devil's broth of disloyalty and furnish fertile grounds for the disease of disbelief in our way of life.

It may be said that these are hard words, but this is a condition which defies words. Its solution rests solely in the source of all laws—the Congress of the United States. I appeal to you to make it your primary concern, even as it is mine.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1959

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Forty-one years ago the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence for the first time after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. Unfortunately, their freedom was short lived, and for that reason we commemorate this date with sadness and sympathy for the plight of these courageous people, today the victims of Communist expansion and aggression.

This anniversary should serve as a reminder of the fateful enslavement of 40 million Ukrainians by Soviet communism, and we should pledge anew our

efforts and hopes for the day when once again there will be a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley, at the Luncheon Meeting of the Adcraft Club of Detroit, Statler Hilton Hotel, January 9, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address given by the Honorable James A. Farley at the luncheon meeting of the Adcraft Club of Detroit on January 9, 1959. Mr. Farley's remarks will be of particular interest to members of the advertising profession:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE ADCRAFT CLUB OF DETROIT, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, JANUARY 9, 1959

I am speaking to you today as a businessman, and I am speaking to you as fellow businessmen. There are no sharp divisions among our businesses. Advertising depends upon production. Production depends upon advertising. One without the other would shrivel away. Living standards would drop to those of a century ago. And, unemployment would spread over the land.

As businessmen we deal with something called economics. And, the people who deal with economics are called economists; that is, some of them do. So, a businessman is an economist, too, although he may not have a Harvard degree.

Now I want to be understood to say that I have the greatest respect for professional economists. They can, and most of them do, help us who are on the practical end of things with the many problems which we must meet. Every sizable company employs them and profits by their advice.

But, there are a few economists who are not content to advise business and Government and then let the responsible managers make the decisions. They want to make the decisions themselves. Above all they want to tell the President and Congress what to do with and to business.

I have met a good many of these economists, not only in business but in Government, for I was, for nearly 8 years, doing my bit in Government myself. And, in the Post Office Department I had a pretty big business to direct. I met a good many of the economists who were in Washington in those years. Most of them I respected. I liked almost all of them. But, the thing that struck me was not only their lack of practical knowledge of the problems of business but the fact that they never were able to agree with each other. Some of us had to make the practical decisions and when we got to that we had to brush away all of the technical language and the four-, five-, and six-syllable words and apply that commonsense that experience had provided for us in our years in business before we ever went into Government.

Of course I was also in politics. And, in a way politics is a business, too. The only thing about politics as a business that is distinctive is that if you are honest there is not monetary profit in it. But, in business

honesty is not just the best policy but the only real policy. In politics the profit is not in material things but in the satisfaction of serving your country and your fellow man so that he will have a better way of life.

We hear a good deal of talk these days about the need for advertising censorship and regulation. I know of no field that needs regulation less or that has disciplined itself more. There is no governmental body whose wisdom could be as great or whose discipline could be as harsh as that of the open competitive market. If we stop to think about it, competition functions in much the same way as his majesty's loyal opposition or as a minority party. State an untruth, be it ever so small, and your competitor is quick to point it out and to force you to correct it. Here and there a fly-by-night may publish an exaggeration and before competition and the public have time to catch up with him he will be gone. But the permanent manufacturer who represents 98 percent of the products we live by has long since learned that truth and honesty in advertising are the only policy that enable him permanently to live with his public.

Politics and advertising have this in common, that they thrive best in a free society where both are subjected to the continual harsh light of publicity, claim and counterclaim, criticism and opposition. About the only difference I see between the two is that a politician is a little bit like a banker. A banker draws up a statement at the end of his fiscal year—a politician subjects himself to the approval of the public every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. But with a piece of merchandise and with advertising every day is election day, and every product and every advertisement is continually and completely subject to the verdict of public opinion. In both cases it is truth and character that stand out.

If we look over the field of famous trade names, the ones that are permanent are the ones that have been truthful and honest, that year in and year out have given full value for the dollar. If you stop to think of the amount of faith the average buyer puts in the merchandise he buys in the American market today it is the finest possible tribute to the veracity of the American printed advertising word. If you look at the politicians the world remembers, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Cleveland down to our own day, it is not the clever and expedient whom we remember but those who were known in their day for their stubborn addiction to the truth.

I do not know what your concept of a politician is. Perhaps it is as erroneous as my own idea of an advertising man used to be. I used to think that advertising men were long-haired artists who dreamed up ideas. Perhaps you think a politician is an adroit character who spends his time glad handing in a smoke-filled room. But just as in advertising the harsh reality of sales results weeds out the opportunist in favor of the statesman who renders a public service.

Let me give you a definition of politics that I have carried with me for a quarter of a century, written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago. It goes like this: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is no other in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm. There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul, nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all its temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

With the change of a few words that would be an equally good definition of advertising.

To carry the parallel still further, let me give you a list of 10 rules for the making of a successful politician, which I have set down for my own guidance. A politician must have a good personality. He must have what we call character. He must be a substantial human being. He must work hard. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him. He must have native ability and must be able to see and use ability in others. He must be aggressive but not to the point of being offensive. He must have a feeling for what people want. He must be able to make decisions. He must understand the meaning of the practical compromise without loss of principle. Above all, he must be truthful. The man or the advertisement that does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. The dog of untrammelled ambition is usually pursued by the rabbit of conscience.

In short, I find little difference in the rules for success—whether in advertising or politics or any other field.

To return to the economists who have been in government in past years, some of whom are still around, they are still writing books and articles. And, they still cannot agree among themselves. I am thinking now of several examples.

One of these has written a book which has had a lot of attention. In it he concludes that the American people are much too well off. They have not only all that they need but all that they want. And, also that they have a lot of things that they not only don't need but that they should not really want at all. They are just too darned prosperous.

Of course this is a long, long cry from the days when they were saying that one third of the people were ill clothed, ill fed and ill housed. But a lot of water has gone over the dam since then. And a lot of economists have gone over the dam too. But some of them still survive. One of them goes on to say, and this is not without importance here in Detroit, that the people are buying too many nice big automobiles while the Government is not building enough roadways and highways to accommodate them.

Well, we do have our traffic problems, we must admit. But, it is also true that we are spending, through Government, billions of dollars a year to solve these problems. And, that volume of construction, along with the big Federal program passed by Congress a few years ago, is going about as fast as it is humanly possible to go. But, you cannot build highways with money alone. It takes engineering and planning and the mobilization of workers and machinery. And, above all, it takes time.

But this economist is in a hurry, and so he would slow down the building of cars in two ways. He would take the money away from consumers by heavier taxes. The economists' term for taking the other fellow's money is "drain it off."

Then, he would have workers and producers work fewer days in the year and fewer hours in the week, and also have them work with less energy while they are working. He is not talking about fewer cars alone. He would have fewer refrigerators, and cosmetics, and baby food, and television sets and telephones.

He doesn't mention Coca-Cola but I imagine he thinks we consume too much of that, too. Probably he believes that the refreshment people get from Coca-Cola makes them work harder. And, in his book that is bad, very bad indeed.

For most of this overconsumption and overproduction he blames advertising. He sees in advertising a sinister plot to make people want more than they need. And, in his catechism it is a sin to want more than you need.

We have heard a lot from people who call advertising waste. There are some who would have government tell every businessman how much he should spend and not spend on advertising. These people would have a government bureau determine in every individual case what percentage of its gross receipts should be spent for advertising. Thus they would have an army of bureaucrats going over your books and making your business judgments. Of course, this would take more Government money—and employ many people who would otherwise be making things people could use.

But, I have seen enough of government to know that there is waste in government, too. I have served with two Hoover Commissions and I have participated in many reports of those Commissions—reports which point out specifically where those wastes are and how they can be eliminated.

We are not stingy with Government services. As a nation we are spending very considerably more than \$100 billion a year at the Federal, State, and local levels. This is a very big part of our national production. It is, I believe, big enough. What we need is to get our money's worth for what we are giving in taxes.

But, I am at a loss to know a simple fact. How does this economist expect to get the taxes to pay for more and more public spending if at the same time we are producing less and spending less and working fewer days and hours? Sometimes the expert misses the simple point of commonsense. In his theories he forgets his arithmetic.

But, to come back to advertising what are we getting for our money spent in the newspapers, magazines, television, and radio?

To begin with, are advertising budgets too large in proportion with our receipts from what we produce? I do not think so and I speak with some authority. To achieve their advertising objectives, the bottlers of Coca-Cola and the Coca-Cola Co. together have probably invested more money in advertising Coca-Cola than is invested in advertising any other product in commercial history.

The determination of the proportion of receipts which should go into advertising is a matter of business judgment. For there are stockholders to be considered and wages and other matters with which such a decision must be measured. No successful business has as its mission in life to make the advertising profession happy. It uses advertising just as it uses engineers and research and new designs and faster and more efficient methods of production. It uses advertising because it helps toward the ever-expanding service which it gives to the public.

From the standpoint of advertising, the employment in that business of brains, manpower, and creative effort means more money spent, more consumption of goods and more taxes for public services.

There is also the maintenance of real services under private auspices such as the dissemination of information, news, entertainment, by the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. This means the enrichment of life for all.

We have just completed a 19-day newspaper strike in New York City. This should have been a great satisfaction for the economist I have been talking about. For, without any direction from the daily press Christmas customers had to wander blindly among the stores for what they wanted to buy. This meant extra expense, wasted time, and general demoralization. It also meant from \$50 to \$100 million in loss to the people affected by the strike. If this is the sort of thing that some of our reformers want they are lacking not only in commonsense but they are lacking in the ordinary decent consideration that one human being owes to another.

But, behind all this sort of talk of economic reform is another and more serious consideration. If we are to cut the pie between what is spent by private individuals and what is spent by government, who is to do the cutting? Who is to decide what the individual shall have and spend and what government is to have and spend? That, these reformers answer very simply. They are to have national planning. I may say that there were plenty of these around when I first entered government service in 1933. They are the "papa knows best" boys.

The millions of decisions made in a free economy by the citizens would no longer be the main factor in the movements of the economy. That decisionmaking would be in a small aristocracy in the government. And, in general, those people would have never met a payroll—not met the practical facts of life in business, or the professions, or as manual workers.

That sort of planning was tried in England and it failed. And, if it could not succeed in a small country like that how could it succeed in a vast country like ours.

For myself, and I am confident for you, the old rule of freedom of choice is best. Freedom for businesses to make their own business judgments with, of course, reasonable regulation to see that competition is kept wide open. And, freedom for the individual to make his own choice. That is economic liberty practically applied.

That has made us what we are as a nation. We are not perfect. We never should be. But, this system of ours has produced more for all, more of what makes for happiness, and culture, and peace, and order than any nation has seen in all history.

This is liberty, the last best value given to men on earth.

Anniversary of Birth of Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 198th anniversary of a great American of Swiss birth, Albert Gallatin.

Albert Gallatin, brilliant U.S. Secretary of the Treasury under Jefferson, was born on January 29, 1761. He was descended from a family of watchmakers, and born in Geneva, ancient capital of the modern watch industry which today contributes so importantly to United States-Swiss trade. Sensing that a greater future would be found in the new Nation struggling for its independence, he landed in America in 1780 and threw in his lot with the American patriots. After the Revolution he entered a political career in which he was successfully Pennsylvania State Legislator, Congressman, Senator, Secretary of the Treasury, and Ambassador to Great Britain and France.

I wish particularly to remind my colleagues that Albert Gallatin, while a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives was the founder of the great Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am proud to be a member.

His life was devoted to many enterprises, most important of which were

the system of free universal education, reform of Federal tax and budgetary policies, and the promotion of sound commercial relations with foreign nations throughout the world. He said:

It is commerce which unites the nations of the civilized world. It is principally to commerce that we are indebted for modern civilization.

We all recognize that America's ties with the entire free world are now challenged by the powerful, divisive force of Soviet collectivism. To cope with this challenge we must revive Gallatin's principles on trade as a guide to our future action. We must renew and strengthen our commercial ties to what Gallatin called the nations of the civilized world. We can accomplish this vital task, only if Members of the House can approach their job in the spirit of the founder of the House Ways and Means Committee—the great Albert Gallatin.

Soviet Psychopolitics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the final two articles by George Todt on the practice of psychopolitics by the Communist conspiracy. These articles were originally published by the North Hollywood, Calif., Valley Times. I wish to thank Mr. Todt and the Valley Times for permission to reprint this series:

AS BERIA PUT IT TO AMERICANS, V—AN ADDRESS BY BERIA TO AMERICAN QUISLINGS AT LENIN UNIVERSITY, 1936

"American students at the Lenin University, I welcome your attendance at these classes on psychopolitics.

"Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of Geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of 'mental healing'.

"By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our first, most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression and scientific turmoil. At last, a weary populace can seek peace only in our proffered Communist state. At last, only Communism can resolve the problems of the masses.

"A psychopolitician must work hard to produce the maximum chaos in the fields of mental healing. He must labor to increase the personnel and facilities of 'mental healing' until at last the entire field of mental science is entirely dominated by Communist principles and desires.

"To achieve these goals, the psychopolitician must crush every homegrown variety of mental healing in America. Actual teachings of Freud, James, Eddy, and others among your misguided peoples must be swept away. They must be discredited, defamed, arrested, stamped upon even by their own Government until there is no credit in them and only Communist-oriented healing remains. You must work until every teacher of psychology unknowingly or knowingly

teaches only Communist doctrine under the guise of psychology. You must labor until every doctor and psychiatrist is either a psychopolitician or an unwitting assistant to our aims.

"You must labor until we have dominion over the minds and bodies of every important person in your Nation. You must achieve such disrepute for the state of insanity and such authority over its pronouncement that not one statesman so labeled could again be given credence by the people. You must work until suicide arising from mental imbalance is common and calls forth no general investigation or remark.

"With the institutions for the insane you have in your country prisons which can hold a million persons, and can hold them without civil rights or any hope of freedom. And upon these people can be practiced shock and surgery so that never again will they draw a sane breath. You must make these treatments common and accepted. And you must sweep aside any treatment or any group of persons seeking to treat by effective means.

"You must dominate as respected men the fields of psychiatry and psychology. You must dominate the hospitals and universities. You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse amongst you the high incidence of foreign birth and training. If and when we seize Vienna, you shall then have a common ground of meeting and can come and take your instructions as worshippers of Freud along with other psychiatrists.

"Psychopolitics is a solemn charge. With it you can erase our enemies as insects. You can cripple the efficiency of leaders by striking insanity into their families through the use of drugs. You can wipe out the outcries away with testimony as to their insanity. By our technologies you can even bring about insanity itself when they seem too resistive.

"You can change their loyalties by psychopolitics. Given a short time with a psychopolitician, you can alter forever the loyalty of a soldier in our hands, or a statesman, or a leader in his own country, or you can destroy his mind.

"However, you labor under certain dangers. It may happen that remedies for our treatments may be discovered. It may occur that a public hue and cry may arise against mental healing. It may thus occur that all mental healing might be placed in the hands of ministers and be taken out of the hands of our psychologists and psychiatrists.

"But the capitalistic thirst for control, capitalistic inhumanity and a general public terror of insanity can be brought to guard against these things. But should they occur, should independent researchers actually discover means to undo psychopolitical procedures, you must not rest, you must not eat or sleep, you must not stint one tiniest bit of available money to campaign against it, discredit it, strike it down and render it void. For by an effective means all our actions and researches could be undone.

"In a capitalistic state, you are aided on all sides by the corruption of the philosophy of Man and the times. You will discover that everything will aid you in your campaign to seize, control, and use all mental healing to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their own borders.

"Use the courts, use the judges, use the constitution of the country, use its medical societies and its laws to further our ends. Do not stint in your labor in this direction. And when you have succeeded you will discover that you can now effect your own legislation at will. And you can, by careful organization of healing societies, by constant campaign about the terrors of society, by pretense as to your effectiveness make your Capitalist himself, by his own appro-

priations, finance a large portion of the quiet conquest of the nation.

"By psychopolitics, create chaos. Kill our enemies and bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known."

Some fun, eh keed?

ONE ASPECT OF MENTAL HEALTH WORK, VI

Have members of the Communist conspiracy infiltrated themselves into the vast mental health program going on in the United States today?

That is a question which millions of Americans have been asking themselves over a long period of time.

One California State legislator, Senator Hugh P. Donnelly, Democrat of Turlock, made the forthright accusation in Los Angeles last July that mental health programs in our country are part and parcel of a long-range Marxist scheme to seize control—through cunning, treachery, and stealth—of the minds of our people. This in order to aid and abet the Soviet Union in its drive to a Red world government.

In saying this, I am sure we can all be certain that Senator Donnelly did not mean to impugn the motives or cast unpatriotic reflections upon the large number of dedicated American citizens who are helping to carry the water in their commendable struggle to alleviate the dread ravages of mental disease. I count myself in this category. I have nothing except admiration and respect for the 95 percent, or better, of those volunteers and professionals in mental health work who are motivated by pure humanitarianism and are Good Samaritans.

These are not the kind of persons to whom Senator Donnelly was referring in his blast at a conspiratorial few—hidden masterminds who may pull the strings unseen as they work behind the scenes—at Los Angeles last August. In fact, no responsible person wishes to do less than help the bona fide Good Samaritans achieve their worthy goals.

But nothing is more detrimental to their efforts than the considerable body of fear which has been built up in the United States by this time concerning the Kremlin's potential Trojan Horse technique in this field now and in the future. Is there anything to it?

Frankly, I do not know—at least, I am not sure. Let's put it that way. But I do know that there is a great amount of doubt about this engaging and controversial matter from one end of the country to the other.

Now, I submit that this subject of mental health is too important to remain obscured and hidden from the public's gaze for long. It may be time to put it on the table for public inspection.

In past columns, I have quoted at length from the official Russian textbook on psychopolitics and the infamous address of Beria, former head of the Russian secret police, to American quislings at Lenin University in 1936.

The odious implications are pretty obvious on the face of it all. And if they are true—then we have been laying back too long in our attempts to go to the bottom of the mystery. For Beria, although liquidated by his erstwhile pals in the Kremlin as of now, certainly spoke with the voice of Russian officialdom 20 years ago.

It is no question of a Hollywood film "whodunnit" to imagine that we have become the number one target of international spies and saboteurs on a grand scale by this time in our history. Such has been the fate of every nation which wore the imperial purple of world leadership in the past. And this will continue to be the case in the future.

Our very wealth and power attract the vermin who come here to undermine our Nation—at the behest of our most deadly opponent on the world stage. This isn't

looking under the bed. Happens to be the facts of life. What should we do about it?

Back in August I suggested that the time is ripe in the forthcoming Congress to ask for this matter of mental health programs to come under the closest scrutiny—a first-class investigation.

In addition to this, I also think the Federal Bureau of Investigation ought to be brought into the case. The FBI's astute director, J. Edgar Hoover, has enough stature that he could perhaps do more than any other man, outside of the President and the Vice President, to keep this kind of ship on an even keel.

It would go a long way to restoring public confidence in the mental health programs if the President might request a bipartisan committee to shed light on this problem. And let the chips fall where they may.

As a former chapter president of the Sons of the American Revolution, I think all patriotic societies and citizens everywhere should join with one voice to make such requests of the White House and the Congress in the forthcoming year.

The aim shouldn't be that of looking for trouble—but to get the record straight for all concerned. Not the least of whom are the good Samaritans who are working their hearts out to bring assistance to those who have fallen. And to assist the latter by combing out the deadwood in the present programs.

The honest in heart would have nothing to fear from such an investigation. For the honest have nothing to hide.

Actually, none would suffer except the guilty—if such were to be found. Why not take a look and see for ourselves?

And while we are at it, why not ask this question, too: How is it that, in such a spiritual matter as mental illness may very well be, the church has indeed been so shut out of ministering to these sick and needy ones? Why have the men of God been kept at arm's length here? In any affliction of the spirit who may be more sorely needed by the patient than they?

State Senate Honors Korkosz Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts State Senate has adopted a resolution congratulating John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, of Chicopee, Mass., who designed and built the projector apparatus for the new Hayden Planetarium of the Museum of Science in Boston. Recently, I included with my remarks on the Korkosz brothers some newspaper articles commending them for their achievement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Springfield Daily News of January 19, 1959, concerning the State senate resolution:

STATE SENATE HONORS KORKOSZ BROTHERS

BOSTON.—The State senate this afternoon is expected to adopt resolutions congratulating John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, of Chicopee, for their outstanding scientific achievements.

The resolutions were sponsored by Senator Maurice A. Donahue, Democrat, of Holyoke. The text follows:

"Whereas John J. and Frank D. Korkosz, brothers, of Chicopee, have designed and

built the new projectors for the New Hayden Planetarium at the Museum of Science in Boston, and for the planetarium at the Springfield Museum of Natural History; and

"Whereas our solar system and its complexities have been made dramatically visible by the ingenuity of the Korkosz brothers for the benefit of all people who wish to view their creations; and

"Whereas the scientific research and contributions of these brothers have been hailed by scientists and astronomers the world over; and

"Whereas the Korkosz brothers projects have been utilized by the U.S. Air Force as a training aid in celestial navigation, and invaluable contribution to the safety and perpetuation of our great Nation; and

"Whereas Korkosz Day in Chicopee was officially proclaimed recently by the Honorable Walter M. Grocki, mayor of Chicopee, commemorating their services to science and their country: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate extends its congratulations to the Korkosz brothers for their outstanding accomplishments in the astronomical field; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the clerk of the senate to Frank D. and John J. Korkosz, of Chicopee."

Inaugural Address by the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, January 14, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to commend to the attention of my colleagues the inaugural address of the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, the 59th elected Governor of Maryland.

Governor Tawes as Comptroller of the State of Maryland for the past 16 years has acquired a thorough and intimate knowledge of our State's financial structure. The people of Maryland are, indeed, fortunate to have as their pilot our most experienced State administrator who can be depended upon to chart the correct course for our State in the complex times that lie ahead.

His address follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF J. MILLARD TAWES, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, AT ANNAPOLIS, MD., JANUARY 14, 1959

I have just taken the oath of office as Governor of the State of Maryland.

This solemn ceremony has left me with a feeling of both pride and humility—pride in the consciousness that I now am a part of that succession of men who have been chosen to govern this State, and humble as men are likely to be when faced with a grave task and heavy responsibilities.

In taking office today, I have become the 59th elected Governor. And thus I take my place in a long line of Governors that goes back more than 180 years—to Thomas Johnson, who was sworn in as the first elected chief executive in 1777.

The responsibilities which now rest upon me I feel most deeply, and in all humility, I implore the support and the prayers of the citizens of Maryland who have given me the opportunity to serve them in this high office.

It is my own fervent wish that I may be able to discharge these obligations with courage, dignity and wisdom.

Each Governor, during his administration, confronts the peculiar problems of his day and era. Glancing back over the recent history of the State, we recall that Governor O'Connor's responsibility was to make certain that Maryland rendered the maximum contribution toward winning a global war. Governor Lane's big task was to restore State services and rebuild State facilities, which, through necessity, had been deferred during the war years. My immediate predecessor, Governor McKeldin, had the burden of guiding our State through a period of intensified growth in population and economic activity.

Now, with this inauguration, we are moving into a new era—an era which will produce new problems and new challenges and a period in which the people of Maryland will be called upon to make decisions of great consequence.

Firm courage in the face of these challenges must become the touchstone for the conduct of the Governor, the legislature, and all public servants.

The task of the legislature is not made any easier because of the overwhelming dominance of one political party. On the contrary the legislature must exercise unusual diligence to see that all shades of opinion are obtained and all points of view explored.

As I begin my task, I find comfort in the fact that Maryland is blessed with a devoted group of career public servants. Quietly and efficiently, they perform their duties. Many of them have served the State for long periods of time, and their intimate knowledge and experience will be utilized by my administration to the advantage of the public. These conscientious and loyal State employees deserve our appreciation; without their devotion to duty, no State policy can succeed.

I possess no special gifts of prophecy, but I predict, nevertheless, that during the next 4 years we will witness an expansion of industrial and business activity such as never before has been seen in this State. Every report indicates that our population will continue to grow, and at an even faster rate. At the same time, we may expect the demand for services provided by the State to attain new peaks. Pressures will pile up for more highways, for more schools, for better hospitals and better prisons, for an improved welfare program.

I have no misgivings at all about our capacity to meet the demands as they arise. It is sobering, nonetheless, to realize that within the last year our State approached a revenue crisis—a crisis in which we observed the demands for services overtake our ability to pay for them with established revenues.

In common with many other States, Maryland has reached a stage of development where great strides forward must be taken if we are to keep up with the times.

I conceive it to be the principal task of my administration to achieve these new standards and at the same time to preserve the financial integrity of the State.

I say quite frankly that there may be times when we find it impossible to reconcile requests for services with our ability to pay. In such an instance, clearly our alternative is to forego the service or to provide the additional revenues. As for my part, I am resolved to face the difficult choice with forthrightness and determination.

As I see it, this is neither the time nor place to discuss in detail the means of approaching our fiscal problems. That I intend to do later this month in my message to the general assembly.

I will confine myself today, therefore, to what I consider fundamental concepts—

the basic philosophy from which I shall seek guidance during the next 4 years.

I offer you four fundamental principles which I believe to be essential to the conduct of a vigorous, progressive, and intelligent administration. I think of them as the four cornerstones of the structure I shall try to build.

The first is to look ahead. Matters of State no longer can be handled in a day-to-day manner, without plan or program. Gone, indeed, are the days when it was possible to think on a year-to-year basis. We must project our designs many years in advance to achieve the best results.

I think it is regrettable that in the past State planning to often has been no more than a pious hope, an expression of good intentions, ignored in practice after being paid dutiful lipservice.

The State of Maryland cannot afford the luxury of casual planning. I shall offer no program during my administration the end of which cannot be foreseen. It is my intention never to propose a course of action without a cautious exploration of all its aspects and all its possible consequences.

We must remain constantly aware that every move we make will have its impact upon our tax structure, upon the relationship of departments, upon the daily lives of the men, women, and children of Maryland.

The effects of our action fan out and expand as the years pass by. I conceive it to be the responsibility of this administration to weigh these effects and project them into the future as far as possible.

Likewise, it is our duty to determine the needs of the State 2, 3 or 4 years from now. This is a continuing responsibility and one that cannot be fulfilled by sporadic, independent surveys.

For all these reasons, I am placing "looking ahead"—that is to say, intelligent foresight—at the top of my list of fundamental principles.

A second precept I will call: "keep the public informed." In a democratic State, no program can be successful unless it is supported by the people, and the people cannot participate in a program effectively unless they understand it.

One of the great virtues of planning is that it gives the public the opportunity to examine measures well in advance of their initiation.

The State is confronted at every turn with demands for services which result inevitably in greater costs to the public. I consider it my duty, and the duty of every public official of the State, to do everything possible to remove any area of doubt or misunderstanding that may exist as to the effect of a proposed policy or program.

This administration and the people of Maryland will be called upon to make many difficult choices during the next 4 years. There is no magic formula to give us the things we want without cost or obligation.

When difficult decisions are being made, it becomes imperative that the Government keep the public fully and frankly informed.

I believe that the ultimate success of my administration will depend to a great extent upon the degree to which it takes the public into its confidence.

For this reason, it is my purpose and my aim during the next 4 years to heighten the public awareness of all the functions of State government, and by so doing, to create an atmosphere in which the Government assumes the role of a partner and coworker with its citizens.

The greater the interest and understanding of the people in the administration of their government, the better that administration will be.

A third principle upon which my administration will stand I like to call the principle of open mindedness. The era we are approaching will be one of rapid change.

We see signs of this everywhere. Seventy percent of our citizens now live in urban communities, and this ratio will increase. New metropolitan areas will be created and existing ones will expand. New systems of mass transportation are being devised.

Traditional approaches to such things as education, public welfare, prison management, and many other State activities are being reexamined. Moreover, many State functions—because of our growing population—have outgrown old methods and techniques of organization and administration. New forms and new formulas must be devised.

It is my belief that in the interest of efficiency and economy—in the interest of good government in general—the State has a duty to make a continuous reappraisal of its traditional administrative processes and to remain constantly on the alert for new, better, and faster ways of getting the job done.

The quality of being alert to these new approaches and developments is what I mean by the term "openmindedness." An administration which is openminded will not hesitate to change or to do things differently from the way they were done last year or the year before.

As Governor, I will encourage—indeed, I will require—a reexamination by department heads of all their activities. I am going to count heavily upon this spirit of openmindedness to provide the formula for the solution of many of the problems ahead.

The final principle upon which I shall base this administration is confidence and faith. The day after election I made a statement in which I named as the three greatest assets of Maryland its bountiful land, its alert and vigorous population, and its unequalled heritage of freedom and tolerance.

We Marylanders are fortunate in the rich endowments of our State. As Governor, this knowledge will strengthen me in facing the tasks ahead. The opportunities for growth and development which lie before us are unlimited.

With faith and confidence in our State and its people, and with the help of Almighty God, we can look forward to an ever more bountiful and prosperous life for all our people.

Thank you.

The High Cost of Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods in Pennsylvania again point up the seriousness of the situation in many parts of our great State.

Particularly at this time, the grave concern of all of us is the unreasonable amount of delay in the construction of the Kinzua Dam. The loss of personal property to the residents of this area is far greater than any benefits real or otherwise that might be derived from nonconstruction of this needed public work.

The attached editorial from the Pittsburgh Press gives damaging evidence of the need for this improvement. It is time Congress demands the immediate construction of the dam which was authorized 21 years ago.

The present Governor of Pennsylvania, David L. Lawrence, has worked for years for the construction of this project. As the longtime mayor of Pittsburgh, he pointed out time after time the seriousness of the situation. It is a sad commentary to have to spell out how right he was in the millions of dollars of damages caused by a negligent and inexcusable delay in carrying out the mandates of Congress.

Congressman KEARNS, who represents this district, informed me that he has again introduced legislation for the needed appropriations.

The editorial follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Jan. 25, 1959]

THE HIGH COST OF FLOODS

What is the cost of the recurrent floods in western Pennsylvania's river valleys?

You can get a variety of estimates and educated guesses. Perhaps the best guide is contained in a report given Representative L. H. GAVIN, Oil City Republican, by Col. H. E. Sprague, then district engineer for the U.S. Army at Pittsburgh. It cited a flood survey made by his office some years ago.

"At the time of that report the average annual direct flood damages for the four major damage districts involved (Wheeling, Pittsburgh, New Kensington, and Kittanning) based on recurrence of natural flood stages of record and conditions and values as of June 1948, amounted to \$10,034,000," Colonel Sprague said. "At present day price levels (1956) such direct damages would amount to approximately \$15,600,000."

(The reader should note that this is an average every-year cost, and includes only direct damages, excluding such tangible values as loss of wages, business, and profits.)

The granddaddy of all floods, of course, was the devastating St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936. From Warren, Pa., on the Allegheny and from Braddock on the Monongahela to Moundsville, W. Va., this inundation did damages estimated by the Army engineers at \$728 million (1956 prices).

Which brings up the next question, which is: How much damage would have been prevented if the proposed Allegheny River (Kinzua) dam had been in existence?

Colonel Sprague estimated 2 years ago that the total average annual benefits of that dam would be (January 1957, prices) \$4,971,000, of which \$4,093,000 would be in flood control, the balance in other stream control benefits.

He added that the dam would have prevented more than \$4,500,000 in damages from the single flood of March 1956 in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys. It may be assumed that the dam would have been at least equally effective in last week's flood.

The Kinzua Dam was first authorized by Congress back in 1938—21 years ago. It was deferred, delayed, and postponed for various reasons, some financial, some because of priorities assigned to other flood-control projects, and some because of the vigorous opposition of certain groups who just didn't want the dam to be built.

Had the Kinzua Dam been built in 1938, the cost would have been well below the more than \$100 million now estimated, and at \$4 million a year in flood benefits, the project would have paid for itself by this time.

There are other real benefits to be derived from flood protection besides those dollars-and-cents figures of the engineers. The additional safeguard given lives and properties is worth an inestimable sum.

More, the completion of this key and largest unit of the plan for western Pennsylvania's flood protection would constitute a

major improvement for the Allegheny Valley from Warren to Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley to Moundsville, W. Va. It would open the way to the long-delayed industrial development of the Allegheny Valley—a development which is bound to come some time and which would be hastened by flood protection.

By any account, the Kinzua Dam is an investment that would pay big dividends, in lives, properties, and prosperity. Congress should order construction started as soon as possible.

When Congress Looked Away, How the Speculators Did Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles written by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Although Mr. Slevin's articles bear datelines of September 1958, they are most timely.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 1, 1958]

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS LOST BY U.S. BOND SPECULATORS SINCE JUNE—EFFECTS TO BE FELT FOR MONTHS YET

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—The Treasury Department sold \$7,388 million of new bonds last June and the dust hasn't settled yet. It was the worst debacle in the history of U.S. Government borrowing. The bonds have been declining in value since the day the subscription books closed and they still were edging lower last week.

Individuals bought the bonds. So did banks, corporations, brokers, dealers, and insurance companies. Some bought the bonds as permanent investments. But an astonishingly large number bought the bonds for speculation. The real and paper losses of the buyers totaled almost \$400 million when the Labor Day weekend began.

The loss is the largest that ever has been suffered by the buyers of a new issue of securities in so short a time. Every fresh decline in the bond market adds to its size.

SOME LOSE MILLIONS

The real dollars-and-cents losses are being borne by the speculators who bought the bonds to make a quick profit and, instead, have been selling them out at strapping losses. There are some individuals and syndicates who now count their losses in the millions.

The paper losses are on the books of the investors who bought the bonds for the 2½ percent interest that they pay, still have them, and plan to redeem them for 100 cents on the dollar when they mature on February 15, 1965. They will be hurt only if they are forced to sell at depressed prices before the bonds come due.

No one is wise enough to say how much of the drop was caused by the speculators overbuying the 2½s and then hastily dumping them when the market broke. The bond market was ready to turn down, and the skid in the new bonds has been accompanied by a steep slide in the prices of other Government securities. But there is general agreement among financial experts that the entire United States Government securities market has plummet-

ed far more swiftly than it would have if the speculators had not moved in.

The magnitude of the speculative activity was staggering. The best guess now is that speculators bought more than \$3 billion of Government bonds during the June refunding. That represents the difference between the \$7,388 million total issue and an advance Treasury estimate that the true investor demand for the new 2½s would total between \$3 billion and \$4 billion.

"These guys must have thought they were playing with marbles," a leading investment banker said recently. Guys who had never found that they had signed up to take millions of dollars of Government bonds."

WILL BE FELT FOR MONTHS

The impact of the June fiasco will be felt for many months to come. It is a matter of profound national concern.

The market for United States Government securities has been disrupted and it has become measurably more difficult for the Treasury to finance the Government debt in a sound and orderly fashion.

The Federal Reserve System, which is charged with regulating the national money and credit supply, found its activities limited this summer by a need to be solicitous of the weakened Government securities market.

The persistent decline in bond prices has scared off the big Government bond houses that are supposed to make a market by buying, selling, and owning Government securities. They are reluctant buyers for they fear that further price declines—and further losses—are ahead. The new bonds plunged from a peak price of just over 100 13/32 on June 5 to a low of 93 28/32 last Friday—a drop of \$6.54 in the value of every \$100 bond.

Separate investigations of the June break are being made by the Federal Reserve and the New York Stock Exchange. Whether they can or will find solutions that will make it more difficult for the speculators to come into the Government bond market in the future remains to be seen.

There is a widespread conviction that it must not be allowed to happen again.

The damage to the market, to credit policy, to investors, and to the financial integrity of the country has been too great.

The full story of what happened has not been told and perhaps it never will be. But the major pieces now can be fitted together.

It is easier to single out those who played a part in the events leading to the collapse than it is to parcel out responsibility. Many people were involved. Many forces were at work. Some of the biggest corporations and banks in the country did things they intend never to go again.

But there is no one scapegoat.

The responsibility must be shared among:

Individual, corporate, bank, and broker-dealer speculators who unsuccessfully tried to make a killing in the Government bond market;

More than 100 leading corporations that supplied hundreds of millions of dollars to the speculators to finance their bond purchases;

Dozens of substantial banks that financed security purchases at little or no cost to the speculators;

A money broker who financed more than \$500 million of the bond purchases by acting as go-between for the corporations and the banks on the one side, and brokerage houses and individual speculators on the other;

Brokerage houses, including stock exchange firms, that speculated in Government bonds for their own account and encouraged their customers to do the same;

Government bond houses and banks that sold securities to stock exchange firms on terms that permitted the buyer to delay payment until a date in the future;

The Federal Reserve System, which made money so cheap in pursuit of its anti-recession policy that the speculative deals became tempting to corporations and banks that were in search of income;

The Treasury Department, which shared the general blindness about the events that were taking place and thus arranged the refunding on terms that tempted the speculators to make their play.

A minority caused the trouble—a minority of the corporations, a minority of the stock exchange houses, a minority of the investors.

The speculative fever burned its hottest in Wall Street, but it fanned out across the country and blinded the speculators and the lenders to the risks that they were taking.

It was a classic speculative surge. Hardened professionals and naive clerks all reached the same happy conclusion: the Government bond market could go only one way—"up"—and there was money to be made for the asking.

But they were wrong.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 2, 1958]

BIG PROFITS MADE IN FEBRUARY PURCHASES LURED PLUNGERS INTO JUNE DEBACLE

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 2.—Wall Street now holds the "Gay Nineties" partly responsible for last June's big speculative purchases of the Government's new 2½ percent bonds.

The financial center is not talking about the colorful decade that ended the 19th century. Instead, it is pointing directly at a \$1,727,000,000 issue of 3½ percent bonds—due in 1990—that the Treasury sold in mid-February.

These were the "Gay Nineties." They soared to a peak price of 107 10/32s during the weeks after they were issued. Speculators had been heavy buyers at the offering price of 100 and the big paper profits whetted their appetites for more when they looked ahead to the \$9,550,000,000 refunding that the Treasury would have to carry out in June.

BUT ONE EPISODE

The "Gay Nineties" were but one glittering episode in a story of huge speculative profits that began when the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. The shift to an antirecession, easy-money policy and the impact of the business downturn on market expectations led to the sharpest drop in interest rates—and the steepest rise in bond prices—in history.

That was when the professionals began to make big money.

They reaped enormous profits by buying outstanding Government bonds and holding them while prices rose. They made millions more by buying 3½ percent, 17-year bonds that the Treasury sold in December and 3 percent, 6-year bonds that it sold with the 32-year "Gay 90's" in February.

It was against this background of a pell-mell price rise and confident expectations of further increases to come that the speculators began to build their positions for the June refunding. It seemed certain that the recession would continue for many more months and that bond prices would continue to climb as interest rates fell. It didn't look like a gamble. The word went out: There's no risk. It's a sure thing. It's a free ride. Get on board.

Bond prices customarily are pushed to higher levels when business activity declines. The supply of money grows while the demand for funds weakens. People bid against one another to buy the available supply of bonds.

The biggest plungers—and the heaviest losers—are believed to have been a Miami, Fla., family group. They are known to have

had close to \$90 million of new bonds and there are some indications that their purchases were substantially larger. They held on to their bonds after the market broke in June, kept hoping that a fresh rise would get underway, and didn't begin unloading in earnest until August.

They sold many millions out at 96 cents on the dollar and sold millions more at 95. Their losses have been estimated at almost \$5 million—and just last Thursday a dealer found evidence that they still were selling.

The Miami crowd, as they now are known in Wall Street, and other giant speculators could operate on a magnificent scale because a money broker arranged to give the speculators access to the idle cash of some of the country's biggest corporations. The speculators paid no interest, usually did not put up any money of their own, and gave the corporations temporary title to the bonds to protect the loans.

They called the deals repurchased agreements. Sometimes they did them with banks and called them buybacks.

A Boston broker arranged \$73 million of loans for his customers through the money broker. A prominent oil industry official came to the money broker. So did the head of a Midwest brewery, the lawyer for a big mutual fund, a top officer of a big defense company, and many, many others.

Bank officers got caught up in the rush and in at least two instances they approached Government bond dealers for special credit arrangements. The big foreign agency banks in Wall Street helped to finance the speculators, and substantial foreign interests, including Greek shipowner money, joined the profit-hungry throng.

The speculative excitement spread during May from the big Government bond operators to brokerage houses and through them to thousands of little people who had never bought a marketable Government bond in their lives. The stock market showed signs of weakening and brokers talked up the rising Government bond market as a smart hedge against the threat of a stock market break.

Where \$100,000 deals always have been looked on as small potatoes in the Government bond market, some brokerage houses pushed the bonds in \$5,000 and \$10,000 blocs.

Some asked margin. Others didn't. One novice speculator bought \$1 million of the new bonds by putting up only \$1,500—a margin payment of exactly three-twentieths of 1 percent. He sold out at a profit of \$180 before the market broke. If he had waited just a little longer he would have lost \$7,000.

The public had missed out on the gay 90's and the big profits of the winter and early spring. The public came in during the last days of May and the first days of June—in time for the crash landing.

Toward the end of June, about 10 days after the market broke, a preoccupied trader for one of the leading Government bond houses stopped at a cigar stand and absent-mindedly asked for "a pack of 2½'s."

"How are they doing?" the clerk asked. "I've got a hundred of them myself."

Another major dealer received a call at about the same time from a man who asked the price of the 2½'s. When the dealer said they were selling at 99½, the caller said he would like to sell some.

The big bond houses trade with other dealers, banks, and brokerage houses but don't usually trade with individuals.

"What's your name and how many do you have?" the dealer asked. "Five million," replied the caller and gave a name that the dealer didn't recognize.

"Who are you?" the puzzled dealer inquired.

"A used car dealer in Jersey City," the man replied.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 3, 1958]

PLUNGERS WAITED IN VAIN FOR RALLY

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—Professional speculators, commercial banks, big corporations, bond dealers and stockbrokers got caught with the dress manufacturers, real estate salesmen, storekeepers, stenographers, and ribbon clerks when the Government's new 2½-percent bonds broke par June 19.

Some people got out in time, but most didn't. A few Government bond dealers had sensed that a change was coming and had been quietly reducing their inventories for some days before the market broke. But many spectators wouldn't believe that the turn had come and hung on to their bonds—hoping that the slump would be brief, hoping that a rally would carry the bonds back above par and at least let them get even.

The rally never appeared.

The 2½'s were in weak hands. Too many 6-year 8-month bonds were owned by individuals and corporations who didn't want to own marketable governmental bonds, had no business owning them—and couldn't wait to get rid of them.

They were speculators. They were not investors. They had bought the bonds in the hope of a quick profit. Now that the bonds were going down instead of up, they wanted out.

Price changes in the Government bond market customarily are small and the speculators signed up for huge quantities of the 2½'s in their attempt to make a profit. They had to buy in on little or no margin to get the leverage they needed.

A composite case in point would be a speculator of modest means who bought \$1,000,000 of bonds on credit, made no down payment, and was startled to realize that he had, in effect, signed a pay-on-demand note for \$1 million.

A speculator who dealt with one of the New York Stock Exchange firms that lived up to the N.Y.S.E. rules by charging the full 5 percent margin that the exchange requires would have had to put up \$5,000 on a \$100,000 deal.

He still had powerful leverage. A 1-point rise would have returned a \$1,000 profit. That figures out to a 20-percent return on a \$5,000 investment within a few short weeks.

It was a different story when the market broke. Every point decline meant a \$1,000 loss to the small speculator who had \$100,000 of bonds. It meant a \$10,000 loss to the speculator who had \$1 million of bonds.

SPECULATORS SELL

The speculators had no stomach for that kind of pounding. They didn't plan to keep the bonds for 6 years 8 months and couldn't have paid for them if they had wanted to. One after another, the speculators began to sell out.

Some of the largest corporations of the country contributed to the debacle by speculating heavily in the 2½'s. Corporations normally invest their funds in short-term securities that mature in a year or less. They know they will need the money within a short time for taxes, dividend payments or equipment purchases and choose temporary investments that can be liquidated quickly.

But the 6-year-8-month bonds were too tempting. The corporate treasurers knew about the big profits that had been made in the Government's February issue of "Gay 90's" and they thought that bond prices still were rising.

Treasurer after treasurer threw caution to the winds and decided that he would buy the 2½'s, hold them until they rose to a premium of 101, 102, or perhaps even 103, then kick them out at a profit and switch to the 1-year-and-under securities that he should have bought in the first place.

The 2½s didn't go up. Some corporations sold out at a loss and added to the pressures that depressed the bond market. Others still are carrying the 2½s on their books in red ink. It's a safe guess that many red-faced corporate treasurers have spent uncomfortable hours explaining their June gambling enthusiasm to company presidents and boards of directors.

The startling fact is that corporations directly and indirectly financed more than \$1 billion of the speculative purchases of the 2½s. A Treasury survey shows that corporations—which had been expected to buy only a handful of the bonds—actually took \$1,045 million worth.

The corporations didn't buy the entire \$1,045 million of bonds for their own speculative operations. A sizable share—certainly many hundreds of millions—represents bonds that the corporations took for the individual speculators that they were financing through the repurchase agreements.

Corporations were tempted to speculate in the 2½s partly because they were unenthusiastic about a 1½ percent interest rate that the Treasury attached to a 1-year certificate that it issued at the same time as the 2½s. The corporations normally would have gravitated toward the 1-year security to meet their short-term investment needs, but the Treasury survey reveals that they bought a relatively meager \$570 million of the certificates while taking the incredible \$1,045 million of intermediate bonds.

Commercial banks speculated heavily, too. They were expected to be substantial buyers of the 2½s since a 6-year 8-month bond is an attractive investment for many commercial banks. But the banks bought many more than they needed for their own portfolios.

The Treasury breakdown shows that commercial banks took \$4,031 million of the 2½s. The bank takings alone thus exceeded an advance Treasury estimate that total subscriptions to the 2½s by all comers would total somewhere between \$3 billion and \$4 billion, and played a significant role in boosting the total bond issue to \$7,388 million. Where the Treasury had expected to sell \$5 billion to \$6 billion of the 1-year certificates, it received orders for only \$1,817 million.

The bank figures undoubtedly exaggerated the volume of direct bank speculation just as the corporate figures exaggerate the amount of direct corporate speculation. The bank total includes the 2½s that the banks bought for speculators who had arranged direct loans and for speculators who had arranged "buybacks."

Ironically, commercial banks from one end of the country to the other were steadily—and injudiciously—buying the 2½s during the delicately balanced mid-June weeks when the Government bond dealers were cautiously liquidating their own holdings.

The bank purchases helped give the Government bond market a deceptive appearance of stability in mid-June just as heavy speculative buying in May had made the market look stronger than it really was.

The commercial bank speculation didn't end directly to the downward pressures after the market broke because the banks kept their 2½s in preference to selling them out at a loss. Normally, though, the banks would have bought up some of the 2½s as they were released by the speculators. But the banks were overstuffed and wanted none of them. An important cushion was missing when the speculators began to unload.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 4, 1958]

MONEY BROKERS TAP IDLE RESERVES OF FIRMS, BANKS TO PLAY MARKET
(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 4.—One day in late February a New York investment bank-

ing house called a prominent money broker and asked him to arrange a \$30 million loan for an unidentified individual. The money broker quickly complied. It was the first of many such loans that ultimately led the money broker to set up the financing for more than \$500 million of speculation in the Treasury's June issue of 2½-percent bonds.

The initial deal was arranged for tax rather than for speculative purposes. So were a number of the other transactions that the money broker negotiated during the following months. But the method that he used was peculiarly well adapted to financing speculation in Government bonds.

The word spread rapidly and the demand for the loans mounted. The money broker arranged some deals for big individual speculators including the Miami crowd that bought about \$90 million of bonds. Most of his deals were negotiated for members of the New York Stock Exchange and for other brokers who wanted financing for themselves or for their customers.

He wasn't the only money broker who participated in financing the June speculation, but he was the most active. He showed speculators how they could tap the huge reserves of idle corporate and bank money to play the Government securities market.

The money broker called his deals repurchase agreements when he made them with corporations and buybacks when he made them with banks.

Speculators liked the deals because they obtained millions of dollars of Government bonds without paying any interest and without putting up any money of their own.

Corporations and banks liked the deals because they held Government obligations as security and collected more interest than they could have obtained through conventional financing techniques.

The first \$30 million deal set the broad pattern that the others followed. Here is how a typical repurchase agreement worked:

Acting on the instructions of the money broker, a big corporation with idle cash bought \$30 million of 2½-percent Government bonds that were scheduled to mature June 15. The money broker agreed to buy the bonds from the corporation by the maturity date and contracted in turn to sell them to an individual or a brokerage house that had placed the original order.

POCKETS INTEREST

The corporation pocketed all or most of the 2½ percent interest that the bonds paid. Frequently it agreed in advance to accept only 2 or 2½ or 2¼ percent and the money broker kept the rest.

It was an attractive deal because the corporation received about twice the income it would have obtained by the traditional device of investing its funds in short-term Treasury bills. The bills yielded about 1 percent during most of the spring.

The money broker collected one thirty-second of 1 percent commission on the bond transaction.

The speculator was assured delivery of the bonds on the date that he wanted, at the price the corporation had paid, and at a cost of only the one third-second commission that he would in any event have had to pay a broker for buying the bonds.

Banks found the buy-backs even more lucrative than the corporations did. The interest they received from the 2½s contrasted sharply with the one-eighth to one-fourth of 1 percent that they could have obtained by lending their surplus "Federal funds" to other banks during the period in late May when the speculative fever was at its peak.

The wide spread in the interest rate structure was responsible for the strong appeal that the speculative loans had for both the corporations and the banks. The spread had developed in large part because of the aggressive manner in which the Federal Re-

serve System had been pursuing its anti-recession easy-money policy.

BIGGEST IS \$84 MILLION

The biggest repurchase agreement that the money broker arranged totaled \$84 million. It was negotiated with a mutual fund.

One corporation made \$70 million available. Another provided \$60 million. More than 100 other corporations and some 2 dozen banks provided substantial but lesser amounts.

The speculators used the money to have the corporations and banks buy "rights" to the new securities that the Treasury would issue in its \$9,550 million June refunding. "Rights" are maturing obligations that the Treasury encourages investors to exchange for new Government securities. Some speculators chose the 2½ percent bonds that matured June 15 while others bought the 2½ percent notes that came due the same day.

Most of the wealthy individuals who originally came to the money broker for tax reasons stayed to gamble. They got caught up in the speculative excitement of late spring and failed to sell out in time to achieve their tax objectives.

One affluent citizen bought \$22,825,000 worth of rights for tax purposes through a repurchase agreement. He acted on the advice of a prominent New York accountant who told him that \$22,825,000 was the exact amount that he needed. He bought the rights at a premium and gave orders that they were to be exchanged for the 2½s, which then were to be sold out immediately.

But he heard that the 2½s were going up canceled the sell order, and finally sold at a heavy loss after the 2½s broke par.

DIDN'T SELL IN TIME

Another individual bought \$25 million of the rights, then became more interested in speculation than in taxes and bought and additional \$36 million—a total repurchase deal of \$61 million. He didn't sell in time, suffered a substantial loss, and is mad as a wet hen at the money broker that he dealt with.

The tax plan was only for people in the upper brackets and only for people who had substantial losses on other investments.

Take the hypothetical case of a man in the 70 percent income-tax bracket who bought about \$30 million of rights and paid 100¢ for each bond. The premium payments of ½¢ totaled \$75,000. A taxpayer is permitted to deduct premium payments from ordinary income. This means the taxpayer could subtract the \$75,000 from his taxable income. The saving for a man in the 70 percent bracket amounted to \$52,000.

He still had to take two more steps. He had to convert the rights into the new Treasury securities and had to sell out the new securities immediately to get his money back.

The market was rising. The taxpayer assumed that he would be able to get back his \$75,000 of premium money by collecting at least as big a premium on the new June security as he had paid on the rights.

But he would lose his tax saving if he had to pay a 70 percent tax on the premium that he collected. The scheme therefore provided for writing off the premium income against carryover losses that the taxpayer had suffered from unfavorable investments in previous years.

The market remained strong for a brief period after the tax operators converted their rights into the 2½s. But most waited too long to sell.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 6, 1958]

MONEY BROKER TRADED ON NAME TO BACK HALF-BILLION IN DEALS
(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 6.—The Wall Street money broker who arranged the

financing for more than \$500 million of speculation in the Treasury's June refunding didn't invent the techniques that he used but he polished them up and put them to work on a scale that had never been seen before.

Individual speculators and brokerage houses, who could not have swung the deals on their own, obtained interest-free, no-downpayment access to huge quantities of corporate and bank credit for speculating in the U.S. Government securities market.

BROKER'S GOOD NAME

The money broker got them the money by putting his own name instead of theirs on the repurchase agreements and buybacks that he negotiated with corporations and banks. He traded on his high reputation and solid credit standing to make deals that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers would not have made with his clients.

At the peak of his operations, he had commitments to buy more than \$500 million of Government bonds from corporations and banks. Individuals and brokerage houses in turn had promised to buy the bonds from the money broker.

But people up and down Wall Street shudder today to think of what might have happened if the Government bond market break had been sharper than it was—and if a number of the speculators had reneged on their contracts with the money broker.

He lost a large sum of money but he met all of his commitments and disappointed some Wall Street bankers who had been confidently predicting that he would go under.

The New York Stock Exchange has been auditing the money broker's books and is conducting a wide-ranging investigation of his operations in an attempt to find out whether any of its rules have been violated. It began looking into the situation after the 2½% came on the market June 15. In early July it ordered him to liquidate \$376 million of repurchase agreements and buybacks that he still had in force.

WALL STREET PLAN

The methods that the money broker used had been developed in the last few years by the big Government bond houses to finance their portfolios of Government securities at lower interest rates than they would have had to pay the Wall Street banks.

The bond dealers tapped corporations and banks all around the country, and one result was that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers felt at home in negotiating "repurchase agreements" with the money broker. They were working with a type of transaction they had come to know well.

The money broker, for his part, had been using the same devices on a smaller scale to finance tax-savings deals and elaborate arbitrage transactions for his clients. He had established a special place for himself as a clearing house for banks that wanted to buy and sell "Federal funds." On his biggest day his transactions fell just \$30 million short of an even \$1 billion.

Bank lending officers in large- and medium-sized communities all around the country knew him. Borrowers came to him, for he could obtain money much more cheaply than they could get it for themselves. Because of his dealings in "Federal funds," he always knew which banks had extra money they were anxious to lend.

It only gradually dawned upon the banks and the corporations that the deals they had made with the money broker were riskier than their customary transactions with the Government bond houses. Some lenders were less knowledgeable than they might have been. Others had been lulled by eager talk of a rising bond market and riskless transactions.

Those who came in at the beginning started out with one type of commitment

and ended with another. But even so, they probably would not have become nervous if the bond market had not weakened.

JUNE REDEMPTIONS

The original "repurchase agreements" and "buy backs" covered the 2½-percent "rights" that matured June 15. Banks didn't fret about entering into deals secured by a Government bond that could be redeemed at par in mid-June. Neither did the corporations.

But when the speculators told the lenders to exchange the "rights" for the new 2½s, the character of the deal changed profoundly. Instead of holding riskless securities, the banks and corporations now had title to Government bonds that would not mature until February 15, 1965, and that would fluctuate in price.

The lenders had not thought to obtain a promise of collateral from the money broker to protect them against a decline in price. He in turn had not obtained margin from his clients for he did not consider them brokerage customers who would be subject to the stock exchange requirement of a five-point margin payment.

Bank examination officials maintain they are not disturbed by the buybacks since they know of no bank that suffered a substantial loss. Many bankers vigorously disagree. They consider it unsound banking to lend money on a 6-year, 8-month bond without at least 5 percent margin.

As the 2½s rapidly lost their premium value before breaking par on June 19, the lending officers of the big New York banks received call after call from the worried treasurers of big corporate depositors. Some had loans they could call on short notice. Others were committed for fixed periods such as 30 days. One corporation had agreed to hold \$5 million of bonds until August 15 and \$5 million more until September 15.

NEEDED COLLATERAL

The bank lending officers shook their heads and advised the corporations to demand collateral to cover the decline in the price of the bonds. The margin calls mounted. The money broker had to get collateral to cover his contracts. Banks and brokerage houses demanded more margin from their customers. Each day brought additional liquidation of the 2½s. Each day saw more speculators shaken out.

The heavy volume of corporate financing and the insistent margin calls were ominously reminiscent of the 1929 stock market crash. Billions of dollars of speculation had been financed by corporate call loans in 1929. When the market broke, the corporations demanded their money and touched off a torrent of distressed liquidation.

The dimensions of this summer's break were not comparable to the 1929 crash.

But the country has had a blunt reminder that it is dangerous to finance speculation through bank and corporate call loans that are protected by little or no margin.

[From the New York Herald-Tribune, Sept. 7, 1958]

"NO DOWNPAYMENT" SAID WALL STREET IN FINANCING OF TREASURY OFFERING

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Some of the big Wall Street banks and large Government bond dealers helped finance speculation in the Treasury's \$9,550 million June refunding by carrying securities for their customers without a downpayment and without an interest charge. The chief beneficiaries were leading New York Stock Exchange firms. But other brokerage houses and some individuals obtained the 100 percent "loans" too.

The "free carries" were a departure from the normal operating practices of the few dealers and banks who made the generous credits available. They acted under pressure from good customers and because they had

a chance to earn a comfortable return on a riskless transaction.

"It wasn't something we went after," a bank official said recently. "We only did it for the substantial houses. We were careful which stock exchange firms we did it with. They came to us."

What the banks and the dealers did was to grant their customers "delayed delivery" in selling them the 2½ percent and 2½ percent "rights" that matured June 15. A stock exchange house that bought, say, \$5 million of the 2½s on May 15, didn't have to put any money up until it took delivery of its securities in June. Normal government bond market practice would have called for payment either the next day or on the second day following the sale.

Most of the delayed delivery contracts were made as the speculative excitement mounted from mid-May on. They called for delivery in early June for that was when the Treasury was expected to open its refunding books. A speculator who planned to exchange his "rights" for new Government obligations would have to act at that time.

\$2 MILLION TO \$5 MILLION BLOCKS

A substantial number of the delayed delivery sales of rights to the stock exchange firms were in blocks of \$2 million to \$5 million. A few were larger. One well-known member firm took more than \$50 million of the rights from a bank under a delayed delivery contract.

The stock exchange houses eagerly sought the delayed delivery contracts for the same reason that they embraced the "repurchase agreements" and "buy-backs" that they arranged for themselves or through a money broker. Delayed delivery was one more way in which they could obtain "rights" without an interest charge and without a downpayment.

The banks and the dealers found the delayed deliveries tempting because they were able to sell the 2½s at the premium prices of mid-May while they continued to collect the 2½ percent interest until their customers took delivery in June. It was a shade less profitable for the dealers than for the banks since the dealers had to borrow money at about 1 percent to carry the rights.

Many dealers refused to make delayed deliveries. The refusal often meant a lost sale because the stock exchange firm then shopped around until it found a dealer or a bank that would give it the free credit it wanted.

"We said: 'No thanks,'" a prominent Government bond dealer recalled. "We're not in the moneylending business."

The loan officer of one of the big financial district commercial banks said flatly: "We're clean. We didn't finance any of the rights. We had the answer from the beginning: 'No.'"

The delayed deliveries like the buy-backs seemed sound from a banking standpoint. The collateral was the best. The 2½s came due on June 15. If the buyer reneged, the bank could exercise the rights itself or turn in the maturing securities for cash. It could lose no more than the premium it would have collected if the deal had not fallen through.

NOT GOOD FOR UNITED STATES

But the easy credit deals contributed to the excessive speculation in the government bond market. What may have been good for the banks was not good for the country.

The Treasury closed its subscription books on June 6 and the people who had bought the 2½s on delayed delivery contracts elected overwhelmingly to exchange their securities for the new 2½ percent, 6-year, 8-month bonds. The dealers demanded payment but the banks extended the free carries for 10 days until June 16—the day when the rights were to be replaced by the

new bonds. June 16 was the exchange date because June 15 fell on a Sunday.

The additional 10-day delay pushed further into the future the moment when the speculators would have to arrange loans and put up margin to finance their bonds. At least one bank carried the new bonds for insistent customers to July 1—without interest and without a margin payment.

Brokers pressed banks for liberal credit terms and many banks and brokers carried the speculators with little or no margin partly because they were convinced that the market was rising and there was no risk—and partly because they were in competition with one another.

A broker who meticulously observed the stock exchange's 5 percent margin requirement was aware that he might lose a customer to another broker or to a bank that charged no margin. Money was easy. The borrowers held the whip hand.

Many banks financed the speculators through standard security loans but granted more liberal terms than they normally would have provided. Where one Wall Street bank, for example, held fast to its regular 3½ percent interest charge for street accounts, another planned to ask 2½ percent but trimmed its fee to 2 percent because that was the rate a big competitor charged.

ZERO TO 5 PERCENT MARGINS

Margin requirements in New York ranged from zero to 3 percent on the rights and from 2½ percent to 5 percent on the 2½s.

The Wall Street division of one major bank had a larger volume of loans on its books after the 2½s were issued than at any other time in its history. Significantly, the bulk of the loans were to stock exchange firms that had never been active in the Government securities market before. Like many others, the stock houses found themselves doing something new—and took a licking.

A large number of banks outside of New York financed speculators on as little as 1 or 2 percent margin. They usually made the loans through money brokers directly to individual speculators.

They loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to people they didn't know and they had some frantic moments trying to get hold of speculators in New York and other cities to raise additional margin as the market went down.

One worried out-of-town banker came to New York in late June carrying a three-page, single-spaced list of unknown New Yorkers to whom he had casually loaned an average of about \$200,000 each on the new 2½s. Along with other bankers throughout the country he had thought the bond market would remain strong and his loans would rest quietly until they were paid off. To their dismay, the bankers discovered that they had acquired thinly protected, highly active Wall Street accounts.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
Sept. 8, 1958]

TREASURY AND WALL STREET DIDN'T KNOW THAT BREAK IN MARKET WAS AT HAND (By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The mid-June break in the Government bond market and the steepness of the decline took Wall Street and Washington by surprise. They had known that trouble was brewing but they hadn't suspected that the situation was as grave as it proved to be. Top Government financial officials and some of the keenest bond dealers in New York only gradually abandoned hope that the drop could be held within narrow limits.

The ironical fact is that Government bond prices had hit their peak in April but the speculators didn't know it. They streamed into the market during May and early June

to bet on a further rise in a market that had already started to drift lower.

The Treasury Department didn't know the turn was at hand. Neither did its expert advisory committees of top commercial and investment bankers. They came to Washington in the last week of May to advise the Treasury on the terms of its \$9,550,000,000 June refunding and all of the discussions began and ended with an assumption that the market would remain strong.

KNEW OF SPECULATION

The bankers and bond dealers knew that people were speculating in the "rights" that matured June 15. But they had no notion that the speculation was as widespread as it was. Neither did the Treasury or the Federal Reserve System.

The advisory committees warned the Treasury that speculative demands would make it dangerous to include a long-term bond with the securities that it would offer in exchange for the "rights." But they stopped there. The Treasury accepted the committees' general recommendations and announced on May 29 that it would sell about \$1 billion of 3½ percent, 27-year bonds for cash and would give the holders of the "rights" a choice between 2½ percent, 6-year, 8-month bonds and 1½ percent, 11-month certificates.

Speculators never had gambled by buying 6-year, 8-month bonds before. No one thought that they would now.

But the danger signs multiplied in the days that followed. The premium on the "rights" went up after the Treasury announcement. It had been expected to decline for it had been thought that the speculators would dump their "rights" once they found that the refunding package would not include a potentially lucrative long-term bond. Instead, they held tight. The rise in the price of the "rights" was a tipoff that the ranks of the plungers were growing.

THE ALARM RINGS

The subscription books closed on June 6 and on Tuesday, June 10, an alarm bell clanged loudly. The Treasury made public a preliminary finding that investors had taken about \$7,250,000,000 of the new 2½s instead of the \$3,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 it had anticipated.

But commercial banks were buying in the market and the price of the 2½s edged up 1/32 the next day. The dealers and the Treasury agreed that it would take several months but the market could absorb the extra \$3,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 of bonds. The consensus was that the job was manageable.

Disquieting rumors circulated during the rest of that week. The speculators had to take delivery of the 2½s on Monday, June 16 and the market heard that a money broker had some commitments that he was finding it difficult to finance. On Friday, June 13 there were reports that he had asked that some deliveries be postponed beyond the Monday deadline.

The market became jittery. The 2½s slipped from a peak of 100½s on June 5 to 100½s on Friday, June 13. They dipped to 100½s on Monday.

People who had had "free carries" had to obtain bank loans and had to put up margin when they took delivery of the 2½s. Some sold out instead.

The money broker delivered \$126,000,000 of the new bonds to his clients. Many corporations had taken repurchase agreements on the understanding that they would get their money on June 16 in time to pay their quarterly tax installments. A number of speculators had mistakenly believed their interest-free, no-downpayment corporate credit arrangements would continue. Some reluctantly placed their bonds in bank loans. Others wouldn't or couldn't put up the mar-

gin that the banks were asking and they, too, sold out.

The 2½s slipped to 100½s on Tuesday and to par on Wednesday. The next morning the New York Herald Tribune reported from Washington that the Federal Reserve System has reached a major turning point in its antirecession drive and is slowing the pace at which it has been pressing toward easy money. The speculators leaped to the twin conclusions that the central bank soon would be shifting toward tight money and that a decline in bond prices was imminent.

The 2½s broke par. The general decline in the Government bond market was underway.

The Herald Tribune story triggered the decline. It had the impact that it did because it hit a nervous, speculative market at a time when business activity was beginning to improve and market expectations were shifting.

The recession was ending sooner than the plungers had anticipated. Speculative buying had helped bring about a record-breaking rise in bond prices after the Federal Reserve shifted to easy money last fall. Now the speculators started to dump their holdings and bond prices plummeted during the following weeks.

The market broke because business activity unexpectedly began to rise. It broke as dramatically as it did because it was shot through with speculation.

Each fresh report of an improvement in business activity made it seem more certain that higher interest rates and lower bond prices were ahead. Each new sell order from an individual or a corporate plunger aggravated the downward pressures.

When the New York Stock Exchange in early July ordered the money broker to liquidate \$376 million of repurchase agreements and buy-backs that still were in force, it added to depressing influences that led the Treasury to buy up \$589,500,000 of the 2½s from June 18 to July 9 in a vain attempt to stem the decline in bond prices.

Hindsight makes it plain that the Treasury should not have made an unlimited offering of 6-year, 8-month bonds to holders of \$9,550,000,000 of maturing Government securities. It feared speculation in the 27-year bonds that it simultaneously sold for cash and it imposed stiff downpayment and allotment limits that kept most of the speculators out of the long bonds.

The \$9,550,000,000 refunding would have been far harder to control since every holder of a maturing security had a right to one of the new Government obligations. But there were steps that the Treasury could have taken if it had known that the speculators were lying in wait. It could have offered only short-term securities for example, or it could have restricted the offering of 2½s to an amount that it was sure the market could digest.

But its suspicions were not aroused and it walked in with its guard down and its chin out. Even so, there is widespread agreement among market experts that the Treasury still would have come through unscathed if the speculators had not chosen to make their big play just at the time when people were becoming aware that the recession had ended.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 9, 1958]

PLUNGERS CAN BE A PROBLEM AGAIN IF ACCESS TO EASY CREDIT IS LEFT OPEN (By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Speculators raised hob with the bond market this year and they can do it again unless corrective steps are taken.

The plungers turned the Treasury's \$9,550 million June refunding into the worst fiasco in Government financial history. The bond

market is wide open for another foray any time they care to get it started.

Speculative activity has become a major problem because the character of the Government bond market has changed profoundly in the past 10 months. It has become a market where prices swing widely and dramatically enough to attract mass speculation. It no longer is a market where all price changes are small.

Government bond prices rose at a record pace after the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. They dropped almost as violently this summer when it became apparent that the recession was coming to an end. Professional operators aggravated the upswing by buying bonds and professionals and amateurs alike aggravated the downturn by dumping them.

PSYCHOLOGY CHANGED

Market psychology has changed. Investors now expect drastic price movements. When the market broke in June, investors stopped buying and withdrew to the sidelines to wait for prices to stabilize at new and sharply lower levels.

The odds are against another speculative binge in the near future. The speculators were badly burned when the market broke and all except the toughest professionals will be nursing their wounds for a long time to come.

Market conditions at the moment are unfavorable for mass speculation. Business activity is rising and the dominant pressures on bond prices during the coming months are expected to be in a downward direction—not in the upward direction that attracts the speculators.

A shakeout as violent as the one that took place this summer temporarily provides its own correctives. Corporate treasurers who have large amounts of cash locked up in 2½ percent bonds that are below par won't soon again gamble with short-term money by using it to buy bonds. Corporations and banks that financed the speculators through "repurchase agreements" and "buy-backs" will be more careful about the people they do business with—for a while anyway.

But even the most painful memories eventually fade. The plungers will become a problem again the next time a recession develops and a sharp rise in bond prices seems to be a prospect. Now that the speculators have found the way, they will come back.

Easy credit made their operations possible. If they are to be stopped, it will have to be made more difficult for them to obtain funds to finance their purchases of Government bonds.

SAME PRESSURE LIKELY

The opportunity for big profits would not have arisen if the Federal Reserve System had not made money so easy that corporations and banks were hungrily looking for loans. And the opportunity would not have arisen if easy money had not driven short-term interest rates down so far that the lenders were searching for a more attractive return than they could obtain from normal short-term investments such as 91-day Treasury bills.

The Federal Reserve made money cheap in aggressively pursuing an antirecession, easy-money policy. It was trying to restore liquidity to the country's financial structure and thus to prepare the way for a business recovery. It will be under pressure to follow the same course in another recession. Even if it decides to move more cautiously, money may still become cheap enough to support a heavy volume of speculation.

A more direct approach to the problem of controlling speculation would seem to be in order.

The most commonly heard proposal is that Federal margin requirements be imposed on

purchases of Government bonds. Along with State and local government obligations, Government bonds now are exempt by statute from the downpayment and other credit regulations that the Federal Reserve Board maintains on stocks.

Margin requirements would not have deterred the corporate and bank speculators who used their own money last spring and paid for their bonds in full. But the need to post a downpayment doubtless would have deterred many of the individual speculators and brokerage houses that put up little or no margin to carry huge quantities of the "rights" that matured on June 15 and of the 2½ percent bonds that were issued in exchange.

LESS EAGER TO GAMBLE

An individual who had a "free carry" on \$1 million of "rights" might have been less eager to gamble if he had been faced with a 10 percent margin requirement and had had to put up \$100,000—or with a 25 percent margin requirement and had had to put up \$250,000.

The downpayment requirements on stock were set at 50 percent in June and now are pegged at 70 percent.

Banks could not have made "buy-backs" without margin if Government bonds had been subject to the existing regulations. Corporate money perhaps could have flooded in through repurchase agreements under the present rules but the margin laws would give the board power to control the "repurchase agreements" if the exemption were repealed.

An across-the-board imposition of margin regulations on Government bond transactions would create difficult problems for the big Government bond houses. They have to carry large inventories of securities and would be severely hampered by a regulation that required brokers and dealers to put up margin when they borrow against Government bonds.

New York Stock Exchange specialists and odd-lot dealers are exempt from the present stock margin requirements. It has been suggested that the Government dealers could be treated similarly.

An exemption could be granted only if standards were adopted to distinguish the 10 to 16 houses that make a market in Government bonds from the dozens of other brokers who call themselves Government dealers but actually do no more than execute buy-and-sell orders for customers.

It has been proposed that the Federal Reserve Board be authorized to establish the criteria. Alternately, it has been suggested that the dealers be given authority to set up a self-regulating association that would lay down rules as the stock exchange defines and supervises its specialists and odd-lot dealers.

Other margin recommendations have been made that stop short of new legislation. One is that the stock exchange increase its present 5 percent rule to a higher figure—and see to it that it is enforced. One objection that brokers voice to this, as to many proposals for stiffening the exchange rules, is that it might drive customers into the arms of more lenient banks and nonmember brokers.

It has been urged, too, that the exchange make Government bonds subject to its net capital requirements and there are some indications that it may take this step. Two Government bond houses are members of the exchange and presumably would insist upon special treatment that would enable them to continue to finance their inventories of Government securities.

The exchange has steadily broadened its net capital rules as abuses have developed. It made commodity futures subject to net capital requirements in 1946 and it brought in tax-exempt State and local government obligations in 1953.

Brokers could not have made some of the deals that they made in June if governments had been subject to the net capital rules.

The exchange says that a firm must have a net capital equal to 20 percent of its aggregate indebtedness and must have a minimum of \$50,000. A broker who buys stock must deduct 30 percent of its value from his net capital. If he buys a municipal bond, he must deduct 2½ to 10 percent depending upon the bond's rating.

Enforcement of a comparable deduction for Government bonds would have limited the capacity of the brokers to take on bond commitments last spring.

NO COMPLETE ANSWER

The Securities and Exchange Commission has a similar rule that covers all brokers and dealers but the regulation does not apply either to Government bonds or to municipal securities. Both sets of obligations enjoy a statutory exemption from SEC rules. Repeal of the exemption would enable the SEC to subject Government bonds to its net capital requirements.

There is no complete answer to the problem of preventing excessive speculation in the U.S. Government securities market. But measures can be taken that will help to keep the speculators within bounds.

Last spring's speculative activity disrupted the market so badly that the Federal Reserve had to buy \$1,090,000,000 of Government securities to support an essential Treasury cash borrowing during the mid-East crisis in late July. The Government can't afford to give the speculators another field day. The risks are too great.

Americans Traveling Abroad Can Be Better Ambassadors of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the task of giving the people of foreign nations a better understanding of the United States is a difficult and continuing one. Recently Mr. Elmer L. Winter, Milwaukee attorney and businessman, made a 7-week trip to Europe. On his return, he made a number of excellent and down-to-earth suggestions for using the abilities of Americans traveling abroad more fully in the role of good will ambassadors.

I submit for the Record an article from the Milwaukee Journal summarizing Mr. Winter's recommendations, and excerpts from a letter written by Mr. Winter to George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, on this important subject:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

LET TRAVELERS TELL OF U.S. WAY, PLEA

Intensified effort to better present our American way of life abroad should be undertaken by the United States, Elmer L. Winter is convinced. Recently returned from a 7-week tour of Europe, Winter has proposed to the U.S. Information Agency that more of the 600,000 Americans who travel abroad each year, especially businessmen, be enlisted in spreading understanding of the American way of life.

Winter, an attorney and businessman, is president of Manpower, Inc., an international temporary help service with headquarters in Milwaukee. In an address last week before the Milwaukee Rotary Club, he described Europeans' interest in American business and how he believed American businessmen could help in creating better understanding of this country among foreign nations.

EUROPE ON MARCH

"Europe, through the Common European Market (a federation for economic reasons and trade, including France, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Italy) and through the vast strides made by the Germans since World War II, is literally on the march again," Winter declared.

"We in America had better do some hard and constructive thinking to determine how we can keep apace with Europe, as well as how we can match and stay ahead of Russia in the cold economic war that is going on today. * * *

"I say, that since we were able to utilize the skills, techniques, and manpower of business during World War II on such an effective basis, we should call upon business in this cold economic war to offer its services in assisting the Government in explaining more fully our way of life to peoples abroad."

Winter described the U.S. Information Agency as "one of our most effective fighting arms in this cold war." He said that he has suggested 21 areas where businessmen, service organizations, teachers, students, corporate foundations and other groups could be called in by the agency to develop programs for their members to better present the American way of life abroad.

CALLS TO ARMS

When a businessman applies for a passport, he suggested, he should be asked whether he would be willing to assist the Department of Commerce at foreign trade fairs, whether he would be willing to address students, business associations or trade groups while overseas, whether he would include visits to foreign industrial concerns on his itinerary.

These questions would assist in enlisting aid of American businessmen in presenting more fully our way of life, he explained. "This is a call to arms—not the arms of missiles, atomic submarines and rockets, but the arms of truth and integrity—to bring about better understanding between America and Western Europe," he declared.

The Common European Market will present challenge to the United States, including tariff barriers, and to meet the latter "we must expand our business operations abroad, open new plants in Europe and modernize our present plants," Winter said. His firm, he reported, has opened 10 additional Manpower offices in Europe.

"We must continue to expand our exports, but we must also increase the imports into this country," he added. "International business is always a two-way street. We must buy if we want to sell."

AUGUST 29, 1958.

MR. GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Director, U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am deeply convinced that a far-reaching program should be developed whereby the American traveler in Europe will serve as a good will ambassador with specific duties and responsibilities.

In our struggle with Russia to beat them on the economic front, we, in my opinion, should utilize more fully the skills of the American businessman traveling abroad.

The program I would recommend to you for consideration is as follows:

1. Plan of close cooperation with Secretary of State, Passport Division, and Department

of Commerce: I recommend that a joint program be developed, so that when an American businessman applies for a passport he would receive a questionnaire to be answered by him before going abroad. This questionnaire would contain the following types of questions:

(a) Would you be willing on your forthcoming trip to assist the Department of Commerce at trade fairs?

(b) Would you be willing to address trade groups in your field while you are abroad?

(c) Would you be willing to talk to students, businessmen's associations, graduates of business schools?

(d) Do you wish to visit foreign industrial concerns in Europe?

(e) Would you like to receive materials on how to present effectively the American way of life to people abroad?

(f) Would you like to have reports on political and economic conditions abroad?

(g) Do you wish to have materials on export and import, reports on doing business abroad, the European Common Market, etc.?

2. Program for foreign businessmen coming to America: I recommend that a plan be established whereby foreign businessmen will be asked by our foreign consuls the following questions before they come to America:

(a) Do you wish to visit American factories, schools, etc.?

(b) Do you wish to attend trade meetings, business seminars, chamber of commerce meetings, etc.?

(c) Do you want research material on American business, customs, the American way of life, etc.?

(d) Do you have family and friends in the United States? If you do not, would you like to meet Americans in their homes and visit with them?

3. Service clubs: I feel that the service clubs should be asked by your organization to tackle the problem of creating a closer relationship between the members of service clubs abroad and those in the United States. With proper advance planning, service clubs could do a more thorough and important job in giving visitors, whether they go to Europe or the European comes to America, a more complete understanding of the community being visited.

4. Chambers of commerce: Most chambers of commerce have a world trade committee. The chambers of commerce should be called upon by your agency to develop a program which will assist us in fighting the economic cold war.

5. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Association of Manufacturers, and American Management Association: These organizations print a great deal of material for circulation among people in this country. It would be well, in my opinion, for these materials to be sent abroad and particularly to European businessmen who have a great desire to obtain research reports, management materials, etc.

6. Distribution of trade magazines: These magazines, after they are read by the subscriber, are, for the most part, thrown away. Most businessmen would welcome an opportunity to send on these magazines to businessmen abroad and to business colleges, students, etc. A program of exchange should be developed.

7. Committee for Economic Development: This organization has among its board of directors the leaders of American business. I urge you to call upon CED to work with your organization in developing a program for a better and more complete understanding between the peoples of Europe and the United States.

8. Foundations: There are many foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation, that I believe would be interested in a program of broader understanding between America and countries abroad. These foundations

should be invited by your organization to bring together their collective thinking as to how this program could be implemented.

9. Cooperation with American firms having branch offices abroad: I would recommend that your organization call in the major American firms that have offices abroad. These major companies should be asked for their recommendations as to how a more complete program can be developed in indoctrination of representatives going abroad, transfer of information, interchange of publications, setting up of libraries abroad, etc.

10. Problems of doing business abroad: With the advent of the Common European Market many American businessmen recognize the need for them to open branches abroad.

Let's develop a program through your organization and the Department of Commerce of providing clear cut information which will encourage businessmen to go into the markets abroad.

11. Business colleges and business school associations: While we recognize that language barriers present serious problems, obstacles of this type can be overcome through proper training. Representatives of business schools should be invited by your organization to suggest ways and means for developing an interchange of ideas, technical teaching materials, teaching techniques, etc., with our friends abroad.

12. Foreign trade fairs: The Department of Commerce, in my opinion, has done an excellent job in presenting American business life to those visiting the exhibits at the trade fairs. However, this is a limited program and could well be expanded.

13. American Chamber of Commerce in Europe: I do not think sufficient information has been given to American businessmen traveling abroad as to the work of the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe. This organization should be requested by your office to develop a program, so that American businessmen traveling to Europe will use the facilities of these offices. Likewise, the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe can do a great deal to initially advise the people of Europe before they travel to America.

14. United States consul offices abroad: A similar program should be discussed with the State Department as outlined for the American Chamber of Commerce in Europe. I do not feel full utilization is made of our consular offices abroad, and greater emphasis should be placed on their work.

15. Film libraries: As a visitor to Europe, I found that the American movies very often poorly portray our American way of life. I would suggest that film library associations should be consulted for a program as to how we can expand the distribution of our American industrial films abroad.

16. Students going abroad: After seeing many of these young people abroad, I question whether they are always presenting in the best light the American way of life. A good solid training program should take place before these students go abroad. This could be developed through the schools, travel agencies, etc., that arrange for these trips.

17. Teachers traveling abroad: Arrangements should be made for them to meet teachers abroad, visit schools abroad, talk to student groups, etc. They should have an opportunity to study the European educational system and visit in European homes, so they, too, will learn we are living in a shrunken world and can pass this information on to their students.

18. Professional organizations in America: There are many professional societies that should be called upon for a suggested program as to how the members of their organizations can be helpful in developing a better understanding between the countries

of the world, particularly where these organizations operate on an international basis.

CONCLUSION

If we were in a shooting war, you would call upon every available resource to assist our Government. I maintain that the urgency is as great in the cold war we are presently engaged in and that organizations throughout America would rise to the challenge of developing programs for their respective groups which would aid in winning out, particularly on the economic front.

I know you agree we need desperately to accomplish two purposes. One, prepare our businessmen, teachers, students, etc., to do a better job of creating good will, imparting information, knowledge, etc., to the peoples abroad. Two, we must provide the forum and the material for Americans returning to tell their friends in America in group and association meetings, as well as across the back fence, the story of the peoples abroad—their hopes, their quests for peace, and their reliance upon America.

Most of us appreciate that the Russian system directs all of its efforts toward influencing people to the Russian way of life. I submit that we must be constantly alert to this struggle and direct our fullest attention and effort to the development of programs which will bring about a better understanding between America and the peoples of the world who are not committed to the Russian way of life. Action is required. There is no longer time for sweet sounding phrases and platitudes. I suggest that a call to action be sent out from your office to every organization that has the resources for meeting the serious problems facing us.

I have a deep conviction that time is running out and that action is required. Let us call upon the best minds and talents in the country to aid your agency in the furtherance of greatly needed improvement in our relationships with the peoples of the world at large.

Sincerely,

ELMER L. WINTER,
President, Manpower, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.

Prayer for Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 15, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Pius X section of the Young Christian Workers in Milwaukee devoted much time last fall to studying and discussing the responsibilities and duties of public office. In the course of these studies, the Young Christian Workers came upon a "Prayer for Legislators" by the late Pope Pius XII.

I am indebted to Donna Saladino, secretary of the Pius X section, for sending me this prayer, and include it in the Record hoping that it may be a source

of inspiration to this Congress and to legislators everywhere.

PRAYER FOR LEGISLATORS

Great and eternal God, Creator and Lord of all things, Supreme Legislator and Supreme Ruler, all power proceeds from You and depends upon You, and it is only in Your name and as a reflection of Your divine wisdom that those who must make laws determine what is just and unjust.

Therefore, we, the Christian members of this legislature, statesmen upon whom rests the weight of a responsibility which places us at the center of the entire Nation, implore Your help in a task that we intend to accept and fulfill for the greatest spiritual and temporal welfare of our people.

Grant that we may not omit any preparation or effort in the fulfillment of this high purpose. Grant us as well that objectivity and that healthy realism which will help us constantly to see clearly the course which seems best.

Grant that we may never stray from that sound impartiality through which we must be mindful of the welfare of all without unjust preference. Grant that we may never lack loyalty to our own people, faith in the principles we openly profess, or such greatness of spirit as is needed to keep ourselves above every possible kind of corruption and petty interest.

May our deliberations be calm, marked by no other passion than that which is inspired by a holy thirst for truth. May our resolutions be consistent with Your principles, even if the service of Your will should impose sufferings and renunciations upon us. May we strive, even in our lowliness, to imitate that rectitude and holiness with which You yourself govern and rule, for Your greater glory and the true welfare of human society and all Your creatures.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, in order that Your light may never fail our minds, that Your strength may never be lacking to our wills, and that the warmth of Your charity will always fill our hearts, these hearts which must love our people with such tenderness.

Withdraw from us every human ambition and every illicit craving for wealth. Instill in us a lively, deep, and ever present attachment to all that pertains to a sound social order and is in accord with the rules of right and equity.

And thus may it one day come to pass that, as a supreme reward, we may enjoy Your blessed presence for all eternity, along with all those who are entrusted to our care. Amen.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.